Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS: MENU OF BEST PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES RESOURCES & REFERENCES

2024

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

MENU OF BEST PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

2024

Jon Mishra, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent of Elementary, Early Learning, and Federal Programs

Prepared by:

- **Carey Kirkwood**, Associate Director, Elementary English Language Arts
  carey.kirkwood@k12.wa.us | 360-995-3235
- **Annie Pennell**, Program Supervisor, Learning Assistance Program
  LAP@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6100

Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOUNDATIONAL LITERACY SKILLS

Combining the findings from the National Reading Panel (2000), National Early Literacy Panel (2008) and National Council on Teacher Quality (2014), guidance on early literacy skills instruction and interventions is essential to our success to increase 4th-grade reading achievement scores. Educator understanding of these skills is essential for the successful implementation of best practices and strategies in K–4 literacy classrooms and K–12 literacy interventions.

The National Reading Panel identifies five pillars of reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The Washington state literacy vision supports the five pillars and includes oral language and alphabet knowledge as being essential components of the foundational literacy skills. High-quality instruction in the foundational literacy skills is vital to students' literacy success. Each component is directly correlated with an early predictor of literacy success (NELP, 2008; NICHD, 2000). Deep understanding of essential foundational literacy skills must guide professionals as they plan and develop appropriate and engaging instruction and supplemental services for students who have not yet met literacy standards and for their teachers through professional learning opportunities (Pittman & Dorel, 2014; Strickland & Shanahan, 2004).

Appendix A of the ELA Standards provides additional information on the following areas: oral language, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, and fluency.

Oral Language

Research demonstrates that oral language ability impacts children's success in learning to read, as well as overall academic success (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). "Oral language is the foundation of learning to read and write" (Roskos et al., 2009, p. 1). The English oral language ability of children as they enter school varies widely and may be impacted by various cultural factors (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000; Crawford-Brooke, 2013). Some factors affecting English oral language development can include:

- Exposure to language and print
- Opportunities to expand their background experiences
- Opportunities for oral conversations

Early gaps in reading ability and language development that result from a weak foundation in English oral language can continue throughout a student's academic experience (Crawford-Brooke, 2013; Fielding et al., 2007; Juel et al., 2003). However, lack of oral language exposure should not be interpreted as a learning disability. Proficiency in a language other than English is also powerful. Families should engage their children in the strongest language of the home, and

schools should engage their students in the strongest language of the classroom.
Speaking a second language in the home is very beneficial to oral language and literacy development. Families should be encouraged to speak languages in which they are fully fluent to aid oral language development, especially vocabulary and concept understanding. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing are all important skills for learning. Therefore, children who have had a wide variety of language experiences will bring a stronger, intuitive, knowledge of how language works.
Oral language is an integral part of learning to read and write (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002; Crawford-Brooke, 2013); literacy instruction must therefore incorporate a focus on oral language for all students. Beginning readers use their oral vocabulary to make sense of the words they see in print. Readers must know what most of the words mean before they can understand what they are reading. Because students' vocabularies are an essential factor in student success in school and beyond (Beck & McKeown, 2007), students also need to be exposed to a wide variety of words and texts and to solid blocks of time for independent reading. One's use of oral language enables students to learn not just in literacy but also in all areas (Munro, 2009).
According to Kirkland and Patterson (2005), the development of oral language may be facilitated through an authentic environment for students to engage in conversations and thoughtfully planned oral language activities. For example, classrooms should be print-rich and include student work. Print on the walls should be functional, instructional supports (e.g., anchor charts, visual word walls—with picture support), signs for routine activities, (e.g., marking lunch choices), and all should be accompanied by picture support. Time should be scheduled for routine opportunities for students to converse with each other, such as a ritual class meeting at the end of the day for students to discuss challenges and successes of the day, and book clubs throughout the day and across content areas. Thoughtfully planned oral language activities may include think-alouds where oral language is modeled, shared reading, reader's theater, daily news, book clubs, turn and talk, and interactive read-alouds. "Teachers can no longer afford to squeeze a read-aloud book between lunchtime and bathroom break. Because reading aloud is so important to language development, we must systematically and explicitly plan for its use in the daily routine" (Kirkland & Patterson, 2005, p. 393).
For successful oral language implementation, the classroom environment must be supportive and nurturing. Specific time designated for listening and speaking activities must start in kindergarten or, even better, in preschool. Using the precise language of the content is important because development of language needs to be simultaneous with content learning. Not only does attention to oral language help develop language and reading, it benefits writing. Students benefit from talking about what they are thinking and what they plan to write before attempting to write.

Phonological Awareness

Reading success in English, especially decoding, is connected to phonological awareness. Listening, rhyming, and identifying sounds in oral words or pictures are early literacy skills that help develop successful readers of English (Sullivan-Dudzic, Gearns, & Leavell, 2007). Phonemic awareness can be stimulated through parent-child activities [such as] playing rhyming games and reading rhymes (Pressley & Allington, 2015).

The most advanced area of phonological awareness is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate individual sounds-phonemes–in spoken words, called phonemic awareness. With phonemic awareness comes the understanding of the idea that spoken words can be broken down into sounds. Before children learn to read print, they need to become aware of how the sounds in words work. They must understand that words are made up of speech sounds (phonemes), the smallest parts of sound in a spoken word. Based on a simple view of reading, research suggests that two types of striving readers emerge—poor decoders and poor comprehenders. The group of poor decoders may not have strong skills in phonological awareness (Elwér, et al., 2013).

Equally important to understand is that phonemic awareness is not critical in all languages. For example, Spanish is taught by syllables, not by single sounds. Therefore, a student who reads and writes in Spanish may not demonstrate phonemic awareness in English, even though the student is a reader and writer (Hernandez, 2015).

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (p. 19–20) describes various aspects of phonological awareness and ends with a general progression of phonemic awareness development in grades K–2. Note that this progression refers to spoken language, not print.

All aspects of phonological awareness, including the sophisticated aspects of phonemic awareness refer to spoken language:

- Phoneme Identity (Spoken Language)
- Phoneme Isolation (Spoken Language)
- Phoneme Blending (Spoken Language)
- Phoneme Segmentation (Spoken Language)
- Phoneme Addition (Spoken Language)
- Phoneme Substitution (Spoken Language)
- Phoneme Deletion (Spoken Language)

Phonemic Awareness can be developed through spoken language activities:

- Identify and categorize sounds
- Blend sounds to form words
- Delete or add sounds to form new words

- Substitute sounds to make new words

Phonemic awareness instruction is usually taught in kindergarten and sometimes continued in 1st grade. Early readers can show they have phonemic awareness in several ways. The basics include:

- Recognizing which words in a set of oral words start with the same sound
- Isolating and saying the first or last sound in a spoken word
- Combining or blending the separate sounds in a spoken word in order to say the word
- Breaking up or segmenting a spoken word into its separate sounds
- Representing each phoneme when spelling (e.g., doktr for doctor)

Alphabet Knowledge (AK)

The NELP (2008) recognizes alphabet knowledge (AK) as an essential component in literacy and an early predictor of literacy success. Jones & Reutzel (2012) identify AK as "an essential prerequisite for developing early reading proficiency" (p. 448). Studies have shown that AK is a predictor in reading proficiency of multilingual students. AK is also thought to be a predictor of reading proficiency in students who are genetically at-risk for dyslexia. (Jones & Reutzel, 2012, p. 449).

AK instruction has been predominately based on what has *traditionally* been done and not research–based best practice. For example, teaching a letter a week in sequential order of the alphabet is not a research-based best practice, and it has many disadvantages. Teaching a letter a week has been criticized because it takes 26 weeks to teach (Mort, 2014). Research has identified numerous factors that influence and can enhance AK instruction that are highly effective for all students. For example, research regarding the advantages of the letters in the student's name, alphabetic order (at the beginning and the end of the alphabet), letter frequency, letter pronunciation, and consonant phoneme acquisition order, can inform AK instruction (Jones & Reutzel, 2012).

When students have AK, they develop the foundation for early decoding, spelling, and working toward comprehension (Jones & Reutzel, 2012; Strictland, D.S. & Shanahan, T., 2004). It is, however, essential to remember that saying a word correctly does not mean that one understands the word or concepts. Some students will be able to say words or decode words without understanding what they are reading (Riddle Buly & Valencia, 2002; Valencia & Riddle Buly, 2004). Riddle Buly and Valencia have identified various profiles of readers, which are important to consider when working with students, especially students who are adding English as an additional language. AK can be supported in a variety of ways at home such as letter puzzles, reading to children, and talking about the book and the words and letters, alphabet games, alphabet songs, and carefully selected electronic programs. In addition, it is a common focus of children's television shows, storybooks, and computerized applications (Pressley &

Allington, 2015).
Suggested tips for instruction: (1) frequent, brief, explicit, and repetitive instruction, (2) letter-a-day instructional cycles, (3) 10/20 review cycles, (4) name, sound, upper/lower case, and text identification, (5) each pacing cycle has a different sequence, and (6) focus on difficult-to-learn letters in additional pacing cycles and reviews (Jones & Reutzel, 2012).

Phonics (Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondences)

Phonics comes from the term graphophonics, meaning the relationships between symbol and sound. When simply referred to as *phonics*, the definition can be muddled.
Appendix A of the ELA Standards refers to this area as phoneme-grapheme (or sound-symbol) correspondence, and is a more accurate label for this foundational area. Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondence defines the relationship between written letters and the spoken sounds that those letters represent. Conclusions from decades of research in reading related to grapheme-phoneme correspondence are summarized in the following set of recommendations:

- Teach every letter-sound correspondence explicitly. Research supporting this idea is simply overwhelming. Children who have been taught explicitly to decode words are far more likely to decode words successfully in the early grades than children who have had limited experiences.
- Teach high-frequency letter-sound relationships early. Successful materials tend to involve students in activities in which they can experience immediate and ongoing success. A successful grapheme-phoneme correspondence program gets children reading as soon as possible by teaching the highest frequency relationships early.
- Teach sound-blending explicitly. Students do not necessarily understand how to connect the phoneme-grapheme connections in unfamiliar words. Students with explicit teaching outperform those who have had little or no training.
- Teach high-frequency letter-sound relationships early. Successful materials tend to involve students in activities in which they can experience immediate and ongoing success. A successful grapheme-phoneme correspondence program gets children reading as soon as possible by teaching the highest frequency relationships early.
- Teach sound-blending explicitly. Students do not necessarily understand how to connect the phoneme-grapheme connections in unfamiliar words. Students with explicit teaching outperform those who have had little or no training.
- Teach students how to chunk words.

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (p. 22) provides three useful principles for chunking longer words into syllables:

Fluency

Reading fluency is the ability to read with appropriate rate, expression, and accuracy. Allington (2006) describes fluency as "reading in phrases, with appropriate intonation and prosody—fluency is reading with expression" (p. 94). Rasinski defines fluency as the bridge between grapheme-phoneme relationships and comprehension. Reading with a lack of fluency is directly associated (correlated, but not causal) with lower reading comprehension. Rasinski (2002) suggests that fluent readers simply read more than those who struggle with reading because they are self-motivated and they read for pleasure (Rasinski, 2002), thus they get more practice with reading. Signs of reading disabilities begin with decoding and develop into slow, dysfluent, inaccurate reading (Kiuru et al., 2013). High-quality reading fluency instruction "lays the foundation for success in reading" (Rasinski & Zimmerman, 2013).

Although Classroom-based Measurements (CBMs) that measure words correct per minute (wcpm) are commonly used, they have been identified as being problematic. Allington (2006) notes that practicing speed-reading of words and non-words to increase students' wcpm "does not improve text-reading performances (p. 95)". To be efficient readers, students must have many opportunities to practice appropriate intonation, prosody, and phrasing (Allington, 2001; Rasinski, 2006) and lots of opportunity to read text independently. Recent research shows that wcpm in upper elementary grades and beyond has only a moderate correlation to comprehension, with a higher correlation as an accurate performance indicator for primary-aged students (Hunley, et al., 2013; Valencia, et al. 2010). However, it is important to understand that a correlation is simply a relationship; it does not show that fast reading creates stronger readers: what it does suggest is that strong readers are likely to read faster.

The misunderstanding of fluency has led to many educators focusing on speed and accuracy, since these are easily measured, without consideration of the other critical components of fluency described by Allington (2006), and cited above, as "reading in phrases, with appropriate intonation and prosody—fluency is reading with expression." If speed and accuracy are used in isolation as a screening tool, it is imperative to understand that false negatives are likely to occur when calculating wcpm. What that means is that students who are actually at-risk are not identified. Valencia, et al. (2010) report, "findings of under-identification parallel several other studies of screening accuracy using wcpm oral reading measures...rates ranged from 15 percent to as high as 47 percent, depending on the benchmark used" (p. 287). When students are screened for rate and accuracy, nearly half of the students identified receive the wrong intervention (Valencia, et al., 2010). This results as a misunderstanding of the purpose of a screening measure.

According to Allington (2001), "[w]e cannot get too carried away with a focus on reading rate" (p. 71). We must be careful not to lose sight of all the indicators of oral reading fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody; or, as Dawn Chrisitiana, from Bellingham Public Schools, likes to say, "rate is not a teaching point."

Fountas and Pinnell (2008) describe fluency in six dimensions, with descriptions and rubrics for each dimension:

1. Pausing—how the reader is guided by punctuation to reflect meaning.
2. Phrasing—how the reader groups words to reflect meaning.
3. Stress—how the reader emphasizes words to reflect meaning.
4. Intonation—how the reader uses expression to reflect meaning.
5. Rate—how the reader uses appropriate rate–not too fast and not too slow—to reflect meaning.
6. Integration—how the reader uses 1–5 together to reflect meaning.

Rasinski (2004) describes an analogy between reading aloud and giving a speech: the reader, like the speaker, uses the voice in a variety of tones, speeds, and expressions to capture the attention of the audience. "Speaking in appropriate phrases, emphasizing certain words, raising and lowering volume, and varying intonation help the listener understand what the speaker is trying to communicate" (Rasinski, 2004, p. 2). Just like giving a speech, reading aloud is a performance task that can be intimidating for some students, especially those with anxiety, striving to read, and those who speak English as an additional language. Thus, oral fluency is important when reading to others, and may be an indicator of internal fluency. However, it is critical to remember that the purpose of fluent reading, as a developing reader, is that fluency in our heads assists us as readers to understand the author's meaning. The goal is for students to read fluently and with meaning—it is an essential learning component for students to become proficient readers (Rasinski, 2002; Rasinski 2013).

Vocabulary

Vocabulary knowledge can be a predictor of reading fluency and comprehension success (Hickman, et al., 2004). Students' depths of knowledge in vocabulary varies significantly when they start school. The number of vocabulary words a student starts with on the first day of school can be as low as zero (for students who do not speak English as their primary language at home), and it generally ranges from 5,000 words to 20,000 words. Vocabulary knowledge is highly correlated to the family's socio-economic status (Marulis & Neuman, 2010), and it can be acquired in multiple ways: by listening, speaking, reading, writing, and sight (word practice) (International Reading Association, 2002). "The relationship between vocabulary is thought to be reciprocal—knowing more words facilitates successful comprehension, while successful comprehension and wider reading lead to opportunities to learn more words" (Lesaux, et al., 2010, p. 197).

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (p. 32) provides information on vocabulary acquisition and the three tiers of words.

Jensen (1998) supports that vocabulary skills start developing in infancy when adults talk to, sing

to, and read to children. Natural approaches to vocabulary acquisition are effective strategies for multilingual students; however, the classroom cannot easily replicate primary language learning experiences (Jesness, 2004). Tim Rasinski (2014) advocates using poetry and songs to build vocabulary. A careful balance of formal study and natural approaches enable multilingual students to acquire active knowledge. Younger students benefit more from natural techniques, and intermediate students require a more explicit approach. Educators need to decide which words are best taught naturally and which words are best taught analytically. Vocabulary acquisition requires a significant time allotment for students to be successful. Larger classes need to have English-speaking volunteers and assistants to support vocabulary acquisition (Jesness, 2004).

Reading Standard 4 and *Language Standards* 4, 5 & 6 explicitly focus on vocabulary in English language arts. Vocabulary can be an indirect focus, but it is a necessary comprehension tool across multiple content area standards (Fisher & Frey, 2014). Vocabulary knowledge is "emphasized…more than 150 times" in the Common Core Standards (Manyak et al., 2014, p. 13). Learning vocabulary is multifaceted. It is both implicit and explicit. Vocabulary instruction should be provided both directly and indirectly to support all areas of learning (International Reading Association, 2002). The National Reading Panel (2000) recognized there is not a single approach to teaching and learning vocabulary and suggests the following to support vocabulary instruction:

- Direct and indirect instruction,
- Repetition
- Rich contexts
- Active engagement

Manyak et al. (2014) recognize that vocabulary instruction outcomes are dependent on high quality implementation of research-informed instruction and activities—simply applying these techniques and strategies "does not in and of itself guarantee efficient and effective vocabulary instruction" (p. 22). For example, in more than 50 studies where educators implemented Marzano's *the six-step process* for teaching vocabulary, student outcomes varied from negative effects to gains greater than 40 percentile points (Marzano, 2009). In reviewing these studies, the findings show that implementing the strategy as it was intended had a greater impact on student outcomes than when educators adapted, changed, or modified the delivery of the strategy. Vocabulary interventions that are taught explicitly versus passively also have better results (Marulis & Neuman, 2010). Explicit vocabulary interventions have the greatest effect on students with lower vocabulary knowledge, and interventions that combine explicit vocabulary instruction with implicit instruction (e.g. exposure in books and oral language) had that largest effect size (Bowne, Yoshika, & Snow, 2017).

It is important to identify when educators are not using best practices to support vocabulary

learning. For example, instructional time devoted solely to completing worksheets and looking up word lists are not best practice; unfortunately, Fisher and Frey (2014) report that during vocabulary instructional time this practice occurs 39 percent of the time. Moreover, in lower elementary classrooms, vocabulary instruction is often taught during read-aloud times, but this strategy only results in 20-40 percent improvement on target words. "Few read-aloud interventions have shown effects on general vocabulary knowledge" (Silverman & Crandell, 2010).

Providing students with "more opportunities to interact with and process word meanings have been found to be the most effective at supporting both learning of the words taught and growth in overall receptive vocabulary" (Bowne, Yoshika, & Snow, 2017). Some effective strategies to support vocabulary instruction include:

- Connecting words to personal experiences
- Comparing and contrasting words
- Providing simple definitions of words
- Creating and answering questions about words
- Connecting words to photos, videos, and books
- Making relationships between words (e.g. synonyms/antonyms)
- Teaching words in groups and word families (Bowne, Yoshika, & Snow, 2017)

Effective vocabulary instruction should be part of rich routines, provide explicit definitions and examples with anchor experiences to support active and deep processing. Vocabulary instruction needs to be multi-faceted and varied for all students. A one-size-fits-all approach does not work for two reasons: (1) students come to classrooms with various depths of vocabulary knowledge, and (2) words simply "differ in nature, ranging from concrete nouns like peninsula . . . to densely conceptual terms like democracy" (Manyak et al., 2014).

Comprehension

Mastery of foundational skills in literacy is directly correlated to successful reading comprehension. Fluency and vocabulary knowledge are both strong predictors of student success in reading comprehension. When approaching interventions for reading comprehension, it is necessary to also assess the student's proficiency in fluency and vocabulary to ensure the intervention services provided meet the individual needs of the student. It is important to scaffold the interventions accordingly to ensure the reading intervention is comprehension-focused and not decoding-centered (Watson et al., 2012).

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (p. 27) highlights the need for ELA classrooms to explicitly make the connection between oral and written language because listening comprehension surpasses reading comprehension in the early grades.

The What Works Clearing House Practice Guide (2010) on Improving Reading Comprehension in

Kindergarten Through 3rd grade outlines five recommendations that support reading comprehension. These recommendation are:

- "Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies;
- Teach students to identify and use the text's organizational structure to comprehend , learn, and remember content;
- Guide students through focused, high quality discussion on the meaning of text;
- Select texts purposefully to support comprehension development; and
- Establish an engaging and motivation context in which to teach reading comprehension."

Having the ability to process information to analyze text, to synthesize text, and to draw conclusions from text are strategies that can be practiced and supported in the classroom both orally and in writing. Activating prior knowledge, or schema, is one of the most effective ways to help students connect to text and build understanding (Messenger, 2015). Background knowledge enhances reading and reading builds background knowledge for future reading experiences; prior knowledge helps the reader understand plot and conflict, make inferences, and draw conclusions (Lemov, 2017). Research supports explicit instruction benefits for students who have not yet met reading comprehension standards (Watson et al., 2012). Writing about texts also strengthens reading comprehension (Shanahan, 2014).

Current studies specify that direct teaching of text structure and exposure to informational text is beneficial to students as early as pre-school (Culatta et al., 2010). Close reading of complex text is essential for college and career readiness, and is correlated to reading proficiency success (Boyles, 2013). Close reading is a strategy that invites students to examine texts. Close reading provides students opportunities to expand their schema by connecting the reader's background knowledge and prior experiences to the text. Close reading also builds stamina and essential reading habits needed for complex, independent practice. Strategies for close reading include: using short passages (from a few paragraphs to a couple of pages), providing opportunities for re-reading text, annotating text, identifying areas needed for clarification, modelling reading, leading text discussions, asking text-dependent/specific questions, and focusing on observing and analyzing text (Fisher & Frey 2012; Boyles, 2013).

The following reading strategies can help guide scaffolding for reading comprehension (Messenger, 2015; Watson et al., 2012):

- Activate prior knowledge
- Make predictions
- Draw conclusions
- Ask questions
- Make inferences

- Synthesize text
- Build fluency
- Develop vocabulary
- Self-regulation
- Text structure

Shanahan (2014) encourages the following five steps to support student reading success:

- Students should read extensively during instruction across content areas
- Teachers should scaffold guidance and support of grade-level text to increase stamina and rigor
- Texts should be rich in content and challenge students' reading ability
- Students need to explain their answers by using text evidence to support claims
- Students need to write about (summarize and synthesize) texts

MENU REFERENCES

2016. Developed by Molly Branson Thayer, Ed.D in coordination with the English Language Arts-Learning and Teaching Department at the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Learning Pathways in Literacy: Addressing Early Literacy Skills.

Adelman, H., & Taylor, L. (2008). Addressing barriers to student learning: Closing gaps in school community practice. Los Angeles: Center for Mental Health in Schools, UCLA.

Adler, M., & Rougle, E. (2005). Building literacy through classroom discussion: Research-based strategies for developing critical readers and thoughtful writers in middle school. New York: Scholastic.

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. The Reading Teacher, 61, 364-373.

Afterschool Alliance. (2014). America after 3PM: Afterschool Programs in Demand. Report.

Ahtola, A., Poikonen, P. J., Kontoniemi, M., Niemi, P., & Nurmi, J. E. (2011). Successful handling of entrance to formal schooling: Transition practices as a local innovation. International Journal of Transitions in Childhood, Vol. 5.

Akopoff, T. M. (2010). A Case Study Examination of Best Practices of Professional Learning Communities. ProQuest LLC. Ann Arbor, MI.

Allington et al. (2010). Addressing summer reading setback among economically disadvantaged elementary students. Reading Psychology, 31, 411–427.

Allington, R. & Gabriel, R. (2012). Every Child, Every Day. Educational Leadership, Volume 69 (6), 10–15.

Allington, R. & McGill-Franzen, A. (2013). Summer Reading: Closing the Rich/Poor Reading Achievement Gap. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Allington, R. L. (2001). What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-

based programs. New York, NY: Longman.

Allington, R. L. (2006). Fluency: Still waiting after all these years. In S. J. Samuels, & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), What research has to say about fluency instruction, 94–105. International Reading Association.

Allington, R., & McGill-Franzen, A. (2003). The impact of summer setback on the reading achievement gap. Phi Delta Kappan, 85(1), 68–75.

Allington, R.L. (1994). What's special about special programs for children who find learning to read difficult? Journal of Reading Behavior, 26(1), 95–115.

Allington, R.L. (2001). What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research-Based Programs. New York: Longman.

Allington, R.L. (2009). What Really Matters for Response to Intervention. Pearson.

Andrews, C., & Bishop, P. (2012). Middle grades transition programs around the world. Middle School Journal, 44(1), 8–14.

Applebee, A.N., Langer, J. A., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. American Educational Research Journal, 40, 685-730.

Archambault, L. D.-A.-C. (2010). Research committee issues brief: An exploration of at-risk learners and online education. International Association for K–12 Online Learning.

Armbruster, B. B., Lehr, F., Osborn, J., & Adler, C. R. (2009). Put reading first: The research building blocks of reading instruction: Kindergarten through grade 3 (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Literacy.

Au. K. H. (2006). Multicultural Issues and Literacy Achievement. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Auerbach, S. (2012). School leadership for authentic family and community partnerships. New York, NY: Routledge.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth. Center for Applied Linguistics, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, NJ.

August, D., Beck, I., Calderon, M., Francis, D. L., & Shanahan, T. (2008). Instruction and professional development. In D. August, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), Developing reading and writing in second-language learners, 131–250. Routledge.

Bailey, T. R. (2010). What is response to intervention (RTI). National Center on Response to Intervention.

Baker, S., Leseaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Balfanz, R. I., Herzog, L., & Iver, D. J. M. (2007). Preventing student disengagement and keeping students on the graduation path in urban middle-grades schools: Early identification and effective interventions. Educational Psychology, 43(4), 223–235.

Ball, A. F. (2000). Empowering pedagogies that enhance the learning of multicultural students. Teachers College Record, 102(6), 1006–1034.

Barnett, E., Fay, M., Pheat, L., & Trimble, M. (2016). What we know about transition courses. Community College Research Center.

Barton, R., & Stepanek, J. (2012). The impact of professional learning communities. Principal's Research Review, 7(4), p. 1-–7.

Bazerman, C. (Ed.). (2009). Handbook of research on writing: History, society, school, individual, text. Routledge.

Bean, R., & Isler, W. (July 2008). The school board wants to know: Why literacy coaching? Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse26, 1–3.

Beard, R., Myhill, D., Riley, J., & Nystrand, M. (Eds.). (2009). The SAGE handbook of writing development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2007). Increasing young low-income children's oral vocabulary repertoires through rich and focused instruction. The Elementary School Journal, 107(3), 251–273.

Beck, I., & McKeown, M.G. (2006) Improving Comprehension with Questioning the Author: A Fresh and Expanded View of a Powerful Approach. Scholastic.

Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). Teaching for Biliteracy: Strengthening Bridges between Languages. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages. Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Beninghof, A. & Leensvaart, M. (2016). Co-Teaching to Support ELLs. Educational Leadership, February, 70–73.

Bettencourt, A., Gross, D., & Ho, G. (2016). The Costly Consequences of Not Being Socially and Behaviorally Ready by Kindergarten: Associations with Grade Retention, Receipt of Academic Support Services, and Suspensions/Expulsions. Baltimore Education Research Consortium.

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C.E. (2004). Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A. S., & Dexter, E. R. (2010). Assessing the value-added effects of literacy collaborative professional development on student learning. The elementary school journal, 111(1), 7–34.

Birsch, J. R. (2005). Multisensory teaching of basic language skills (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Company.

Bixby, K. E., Gordon, E. E., Gonzali-Lee, E., Akyea, S. G., & Nippolt, P. L. (2011). Best practices for tutoring programs: A guide to quality. Saint Paul, MN: Saint Paul Public Schools Foundation.

Blachowicz, C. L., Obrochta, C., & Fogelberg, E. (2005). Literacy coaching for change. Educational Leadership, 62(6), 55–58.

Blank, M.J, Villarreal, L. (2015). Where it all comes together: How Partnerships connect communities and schools. American Educator.

Blankstein, A. M. (2010). Failure is not an option. California: Corwin Press.

Blazer, C. (2011). Summer learning loss: why its effect is strongest among low-income students and how it can be combated. Research Services: Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

Blazer, C. (2011). Summer learning loss: why its effect is strongest among low-income students and how it can be combated. Research Services: Miami-Dade County Public Schools.

Block, C.C., Parris, S.R., & Morrow, L.M. (Eds.). (2008). Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices (2nd ed.). New York: Guildford.

Boaler, J. (1998). Alternative approaches to teaching, learning, and assessing mathematics. Paper presented at the European Conference for Research on Learning and Instruction. Athens, Greece.

Boaler, J. (March 31, 1999). Mathematics for the moment, or the millennium? Education Week.

Bohan-Baker, M., & Little, P. M. D. (2004). The transition to kindergarten: A review of current research and promising practice to involve families. Retrieved from the Harvard Family Research Project website.

Borman, G. (2000, February). The effects of summer school: Questions answered, questions raised. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 119–127.

Borman, T.H., Bos, J.M., O'Brien, B.C., Park, S.J., & Liu, F. (2017). I3 BARR validation study

impact findings: cohorts 1 and 2. American Institutes for Research.

Bottoms, Gene. (2008). Redesigning the ninth-grade experience: Reduce failure, improve achievement and increase high school graduation rates. The Southern Regional Education Board.

Boulware-Gooden, R. M., Carreker, S., Thornhill, A., & Joshi, R. M. (2007). Instruction of metacognitive strategies enhances reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third-grade students. Reading Teacher, 61(1), 70–77.

Bowman-Perrot, L., Davis, H., Vannest, K., Wiliams, L., Greenwood, C., & Parker, R. (2013). Academic benefits of peer tutoring: a meta-analytical review of single-case research. School Psychology Review, 42(1), 39–55.

Bowne, J.B., Yoshika, H., & Snow, C.E. (2017). Relationships of teachers' language and explicit vocabulary instruction to students' vocabulary growth in kindergarten. Reading Research Quarterly, 52(1), 7-29.

Boyles, N. (2013). Common core: Now what? Educational Leadership, 70(4), 36-41.

Brown, R. (2010). The road not yet taken: A transactional strategies approach to comprehension instruction. The Reading Teacher, 61, 538-547.

Bruce, M., Bridgeland, J., Fox, J., & Balfanz, R. (2011). On Track for Success: The use of early warning indicator and intervention systems to build a grad nation. Civic Enterprises.

Burkins, J.M., & Ritchie, S. (2007). Coaches coaching coaches. Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 3(1), 32–47.

Burrus, J., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). Dropping out of high school: Prevalence, risk factors and remediation strategies. R & D Connections, 18, 1–9.

Callahan R., & Gandara P. (2014). The Bilingual Advantage: Language, Literacy, and the US Labor Market. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Caspe, M., & Lopez, E. M. (2006). Lessons from family-strengthening interventions: Learning from evidence-based practice. Harvard Family Research Project.

Cazden, C. (2001). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Center for Prevention Research and Development. (2009). Background research: Tutoring programs. Champaign, IL: Center for Prevention Research and Development, Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois.

Chanmugam, A. & Gerlach, B. (2013). A co-teaching model for developing future educators' teaching effectiveness. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 25(1), 110–117.

Chapman, M. (2006). Preschool through elementary writing. In P. Smagorinsky (Ed.) Research on composition: Multiple perspectives on two decades of change. New York: Teachers College.

Chapman, M. L. (1996). More than Spelling: Widening the lens on emergent writing. Reading Horizons, 36(4), 3.

Chau Leung, K. (2015). Preliminary empirical model of crucial determinants of best practice for peer tutoring on academic achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 107(2), 558-579.

Cheatham, G. A., & Santos, R. M. (2011). Collaborating with families from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds: Considering time and communication orientations. Young Children, 66(5), 76-82.

Christenbury, L., Bomer, R., & Smagorinsky, P. (Eds.), Handbook of Adolescent Literacy Research. New York: Guilford. pp. 98-112.

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2015). The Aftermath of Accelerating Algebra: Evidence from District Policy Initiatives. Journal of Human Resources, 50(1), 159–188.

Coll, C. G. (2005). Pathways to reading: the role of oral language in the transition to reading. Developmental Psychology, 41(2), 428–442.

Colorín Colorado. (2012). Toolkit for Educators Reaching Out to Hispanic Parents of English

Language Learners.

Conley, D. T. (2013). Rethinking the notion of 'noncognitive'. Education Week, 32(18), 20–21.

Connors, L. J., & Epstein, J. L. (1995). Parent and school partnerships. In M. Borustein (Ed.), Handbook of parenting: Vol. 4. Applied and practical parenting (p. 437-458). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crawford-Brooke, E. (2013). The critical role of oral language in reading for Title I students and English language learners.

Crawford, P. A., & Zygouris-Coe, V. (2006). All in the family: Connecting home and school with family literacy. Early Childhood Education Journal, 33(4), p. 261-267.

Culatta, B., Hall-Kenyon, K. M., & Black, S. (2010). Teaching expository comprehension skills in early childhood classrooms. Topics in Language Disorders, 30(4), 323–338.

Curby, T. W., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Ponitz, C. C. (2009). Teacher-child interactions and children's achievement trajectories across kindergarten and first grade. Journal of Educational Psychology, 101(4), p. 912-925.

D.Chall, J. (1996). The great debate. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

D'Agustino, S. (2013). Providing innovative opportunities and options for credit recovery through afterschool and summer learning programs. In T. K. Peterson, Expanding minds and opportunities: Leveraging the power of afterschool and summer learning for student success.

Dalton, B., Glennie, E., & Ingels, S. J. (2009). Late high school dropouts: Characteristics, experiences, and changes across cohorts. NCES 2009-307. National Center for Education Statistics.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA:

National Staff Development Council and the School Redesign Network.

Davis, M.M., & Wilson, E.K. (1999). A Title I teacher's beliefs, decision-making, and instruction at the third and seventh grade levels. Reading Research and Instruction, 38(4), 289–300.

Dawson, S. M. (2014). Pull-out or push-in service delivery model: Conducive to students or teachers? (Unpublished Master's thesis.) St. John Fischer College, Rochester, New York.

Del Razo, J.L. & Renée, M. (2013). Expanding equity through more and better learning time. Voices in Urban Education, 36, 23-34.

Delpit, L. (1996). Skills and other dilemmas of a progressive black educator. American Educator, 20(3), 9.

Domina, T., McEachin, A., Penner, A., & Penner, E. (2015). Aiming high and falling short: California's eighth-grade algebra-for-all effort. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 37(3), 275–295.

Drummond, K.V., & Stipek, D. (2004). Low-income parents' beliefs about their role in children's academic learning. The Elementary School Journal, 104(3), 197-213.

Dudley-Marling, C., & Paugh, P. (2009). A classroom teacher's guide to struggling writers: How to provide differentiated support & ongoing assessment. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Duffy, A. (2001). Balance, literacy acceleration, and responsive teaching in a summer school literacy program for elementary school struggling readers. Reading Research and Instruction 40(2), 67–100.

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? Educational Leadership, 61(8), 6–11.

DuFour, R. (2008). Revisiting professional learning communities at work. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2012). Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work:

New Insights for Improving Schools. Solution Tree Press.

DuFour, R., & Reeves, D. (2016). The futility of PLC lite. Phi Delta Kappan, 97(6), p. 69–71.

Duke, N., & Taylor, B. (Eds.). Handbook on effective literacy instruction: Research-based practice K-8. New York: Guilford.

Duncan, G. J., Dowsett, C. J., Claessens, A., Magnuson, K., Huston, A. C., Klebanov, P., Pagani, L. S., Feinstein, L., Engel, M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Sexton, H., Duckworth, K., & Japel, C. (2007). School readiness and later achievement. Developmental Psychology, 43(6), p. 1428-1446.

Durlak, J., Weissberg, R., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., & Schellinger, K. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405-432.

Dutro, E., Selland, M. K., & Bien, A. C. (2013). Revealing writing, concealing writers: High-stakes assessment in an urban elementary classroom. Journal of Literacy Research, 45(2), 99-141.

Dyson, A.H. (1997). Writing superheroes: Contemporary childhood, popular culture, and classroom literacy. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dyson, A.H. (2006). On saying it right (write): "Fix-its" in the foundations of learning to write. Research in the Teaching of English, 41(1), 8-42.

Easton, J. Q., Johnson, E., & Sartain, L. (2017). The predictive power of ninth-grade GPA. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Consortium on School Research.

Echevarría, J. E., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2012). Making content comprehensible for English learners (4th ed.). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Echevarria, J.J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D. (2012). Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model. New York, NY: Pearson.

Education Data Research Center (2017). Washington State Office of Financial Management. High School Feedback Reports.

Educational Opportunity Gap Oversite and Accountability Committee (EOGOAC), (2017).

Closing the opportunity gap in Washington's public education system. 2017 Annual Report.

Egbert, J.L., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2010). Access to academics: Planning instruction for K–12 classrooms with ELLs. New York, NY: Pearson

Eilers, L. H., & Rogers, C. P. (2006). Metacognitive strategies help students to comprehend all text. Reading Improvement, 43(1), 13–29.

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M., & Moody, S. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92(4), 605–619.

Elish-Piper, L. (2014). Parent involvement in reading: Growth mindset and grit: Building important foundations for literacy learning and success at home. Illinois Reading Council Journal, 42(4), 59–63.

Elish-Piper, L. and L'Allier, S. (2011). Examining the relationship between literacy coaching and reading gains in grades K–3. Elementary School Journal, 112 (1), 10–21.

Epstein, J. (2001). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Epstein, J. L. (2005). A case study of the partnership schools comprehensive school reform model. The Elementary School Journal, 106(2), 151–170.

Epstein, J. L., & Salinas, K. C. (2004). Partnering with families and communities. Schools as Learning Communities, 61(8), 12–18.

Erickson, J., Peterson, R. L., & Lembeck, P. (2013, May). Middle to high school transition. Strategy brief. Lincoln, NE: Student Engagement Project, University of Nebraska.

Erion, J. & Ronka, C.S., (2004). Improve Reading Fluency with Parent Tutoring. Teaching Exceptional Children Plus, 1(2), 1–8.

Erion, J., & Ronka, C. S. (2004). Improve reading fluency with parent tutoring. Teaching

Exceptional Children Plus, 1(2), 1–8.

Escamilla, K. (2007). Considerations for literacy coaches in classrooms with English Language Learners. Retrieved April 2014, from Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse: http://www. literacycoachingonline.org

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Figueroa-Ruiz, O., & Escamilla, M. (2013). Biliteracy from the start: Literacy squared in action. Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Faltis, C., & Coulter, C. (2008). Teaching English language and immigrant students in secondary schools. Saddle River, NJ: N.J. Pearson.

Faltis, C., & Coulter, C. (2008). Teaching English language and immigrant students in secondary schools. Saddle River, NJ: N.J. Pearson.

Fantuzzo, J. W. & Rohrbeck, C. A. (1992). Self-managed groups: Fitting self-management approaches into classroom systems. School Psychology Review, 21(2), 255–263.

Feldman, D., Smith, A., & Waxman, B. (2013). Pathways to dropping out part 1: Common patterns. Washington Student Oral Histories Project.

Ferlazzo, L. (2011). Involvement or engagement? Educational Leadership, 68(8), 10–14.

Ferretti, L. K., & Bub, K.L. (2017). Family routines and school readiness during the transition to kindergarten. Early Education and Development, 28(1), 59-77.

Fielding, L., Kerr, N., & Rosier, P. (2007). Annual growth for all students, catch-up growth for those who are behind. Kennewick, WA: The New Foundation Press, Inc.

Fink, J.L.W. (2012). Summer reading goes high tech. Scholastic Instructor, summer, 33–37.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2012). Our practical principals for enhancing vocabulary instruction. The Reading Teacher, 66(3), 179–188.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2014). Content area vocabulary learning. The Reading Teacher, 66(8), 597-599.

Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). Building and activating students' background

knowledge: It's what they already know that counts. Middle School Journal, 43(3), 22–31.

Fleming, M.H. (2005). "Two together" after school: a literacy tutoring project. School Community Journal, 15(1), Spring/Summer, 75-88.

Flood, J., Lapp, D., Squire, J.R., & Jensen, J.M. (Eds.). Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum.

Flores-Gonzalez, N. (2002). School kids/street kids: Identity development in Latino students. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2008). Assessing Fluency and Phrasing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Franco, M. S., & Patel, N. H. (2011). An interim report on a pilot credit recovery program in a large suburban Midwestern high school. Education 132(1), 15– 27.

Freedman, S. W., Delp, V., & Crawford, S. M. (2005). Teaching English in untracked classrooms. Research in the Teaching of English, 40, 62-122.

Freeman, Y.S., & Freeman, D.E. (1998). ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Friend, M.P. (2014). Co-teach!: Building and Sustaining Effective Classroom Partnerships in Inclusive Schools. Marilyn Friend, Inc.

Friend, M.P. (2016). Co-Teaching 2.0. Educational Leadership, January, 16–22.

Fu, D. (2009). Writing between languages: How English language learners make the transition to fluency. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L. S. (2005). Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies: Promoting word recognition, fluency, and reading comprehension in young children. The Journal of Special Education, 39(1), 34–44.

Fullan, M. (2006, November). Leading professional learning. The School Administrator, Retrieved March 14, 2018, from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=7620

Gallagher, K. (2006). Teaching adolescent writers. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Garet, M. S., Cronen, S., Eaton, M., Kurki, A., Ludwig, M., Wehmah, J., Sztejnberg, L. (2008). The impact of two professional development interventions on early reading instruction and achievement. Institute of Education Science, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Washington, DC: Department of Education.

Garet, M., Porter, A., Desimone, L., Birman, B., & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4).

Geiser, K. F., Horwitz, I. M., & Gerstein, A. (2013). Improving the Quality and Continuity of Practice across Early Childhood Education and Elementary Community School Settings. John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities.

Gelzheiser, L. M., Meyers, J., & Pruzek, R. M. (1992). Effects of pull-in and pull-out approaches to reading instruction for special education and remedial reading students. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 3(2), 133–149.

Genay, T. (2015). Books on Bikes. Knowledge Quest: Summer Learning, 43(5), 8–11.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2006). Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Genishi, C., & Dyson, A. H. (2015). Children, language, and literacy: Diverse learners in diverse times. Teachers College Press.

Gersten, R., Baker, S. K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (2007). Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learnings in the Elementary Grades: A Practice Guide (NCEE 2007-4011). Washington, D.C.: National Center Education Evaluation and Regional Research Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., & Tilly,

W. (2009). Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to intervention (RtI) and multi-tier interventions in the primary grades. Institute of Education Sciences. US Department of Education, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance

Gibbons, P. (2002). Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gibbons, P. (2009). English learners academic literacy and thinking. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Gibbons, P. (2009). English learners, academic literacy, and thinking. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Glaser, D. (2005). ParaReading: A training guide for tutors. Boston: Sopris West Educational Services.

Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the research on English learners: What we know—and don't yet know—about effective instruction. American Educator, 37(2), 4–11.

Goldenberg, C., Hicks, J., & Lit, I. (2013). Dual language learners: Effective instruction in early childhood. American Educator, 37(2), 27–29.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gordon, D.M., Iwamoto, D. K., Ward, N., Potts, R., & Boyd, E. (2009). Mentoring urban black middle school male students: Implications for academic achievement. The Howard University Journal of Negro Education 78(3), 277–289.

Gordon, E. E. (2009). 5 ways to improve tutoring programs. Phi Delta Kappan, 90 (6), 440–445.

Gottlieb, M. & Ernst-Slavit, G. (Eds.) (2014). Academic language in diverse classrooms: promoting content and language learning. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Graham-Clay, S. (2005). Communicating with parents: Strategies for Teachers. School Community Journal 16(1), p. 117-129.

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. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Graves, M. F., & Graves, B. B. (2003). Scaffolded reading experiences: Designs for student success. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 71, 79-127.

Groff, S. (2015). Mobile is born. Knowledge Quest: Summer Learning, 43(5), 29–31.

Gutierrez, K.D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. Reading Research Quarterly, 43(2), 148-164.

Gutierrez, K.D. (2009). Re-mediating literacy: Culture, difference, and learning for students from nondominant communities. Review of Research in Education

Habeeb, S. (2013). The ninth grade challenge. Principal Leadership, 13(6), 18–22.

Halgunseth, L. C., Peterson, A., Stark, D. R., & Moodie, S. (2009). Family engagement, diverse families, and early childhood education programs: An integrated review of the literature. National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

Hanan, A. (April 2009). Modeling and observing sheltered instruction charts: Lesson planning and note-taking tools for ESL/ELL coaches. Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse, (20), 1–5.

Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers. New York: Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers. New York: Routledge.

Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77, 81-112.

Henderson, A. T., & Berla, N. (1994). A new generation of evidence: The family is critical

to student achievement. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education.

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Annual Synthesis 2002. National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools.

Henderson, A. T., Mapp, K. L., Johnson, V. R., & Davies, D. (2007). Beyond the bake sale. New York: The New Press.

Herlihy, C. (2007). State and district-level support for successful transition into high school. Policy brief. National High School Center.

Herrenkohl, L.R., & Mertl, V. (2010). How students come to be, know, and do. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., McMaken, J. (2011). Mentoring in schools: An impact study of Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring. Child Development 82(1), 346–361.

Heyns, B. (1978). Summer learning and the effects of schooling. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hickman, P., Pollard-Durodola, S., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Storybook reading: Improving vocabulary and comprehension for English-language learners. The Reading Teacher, 57(8), 720-730.

Hiebert, E.H., & Sailors, M. (2008). Finding the right texts: What works for beginning and struggling readers. New York: Guilford.

Hill, J.D., & Flynn, K.M. (2006). Classroom instruction that works with English language learners. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Hinchman, K.A., & Sheridan, H.T. (Eds.). (2009). Best practices in adolescent literacy instruction. New York: Guilford Press.

Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, M.G. (2016). Co-Teaching ELLs: Riding a Tandem Bike. Educational Leadership, January, 56–60.

Hord, S. M., & Sommers, W. A. (2008). Leading professional learning communities;

Voices from research and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Horowitz, R. (Ed.). (2007). Talking texts: How speech and writing interact in school learning. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, D., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. http://www.cal.org/resource-center/publications-products/gp3-pdf.

Huang, M., Hass, E., Zhu, N., & Tran, L. (2016). High school graduation rates across English learner student subgroups in Arizona (REL 2017-205). Washington, DC: Department of Education, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

Hubbell, R., Plantz, M., Condelli, L., & Barrett, B. (1987). The transition of Head Start Children into public school: Final report, Washington, D.C.: Administration for Children, Youth, and Families.

Hunley, S. A., Davies, S. C., & Miller, C. R. (2013). The relationship between curriculum-based measures in oral reading fluency and high-stakes tests for seventh graders. Research in Middle Level Education, 35(5), 1–8.

International Reading Association (2004). The Role and Qualifications of the Reading Coach in the United States. [Brochure]. Newark, DE.

International Reading Association. (2002). Vocabulary development. In International Reading Association (Ed.), Evidence-based reading instruction: Putting the National Reading Panel Report into practice, 112–113. International Reading Association.

International Reading Association. (2010). Standards for reading professionals—revised 2010. Newark, DE: Author.

Jacobson, D. (2010). Coherent instructional improvement and PLCs: Is it possible to do

both? Phi Delta Kappan, 91(6), p. 38–45.

Jacobson, R. J. & Blank, M.J. (2015). A Framework for More and Better Learning through Community School Partnerships.

Jensen, E. (1998). Teaching with the brain in mind. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Jesness, J. (2004). Teaching English language learners K–12: A quick-start guide for the new teacher. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Jeynes, W. (2012). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of different types of parental involvement programs for urban students. Urban Education, 47(4), 706-742.

Johnson, E. (2016). Funds of Knowledge and Home Visits Toolkit.

Jones, C. D., & Ruetzel, D. R. (2012). Enhanced alphabet knowledge instruction: Exporting a change of frequency, focus, and distributed cycles of review. Reading Psychology, 33(5), 448–464.

Jones, G., Ostojic, D., Menard, J., Picard, E., & Miller, C. J. (2017). Primary prevention of reading failure: Effects of universal peer tutoring in the early grades. The Journal of Educational research, 110(2), 171-176.

Jones, L., Stall, G. & Yarbrough, D. (2013). The importance of professional learning communities for school improvement. Creative Education 4(5), 357–361.

Joyce, B. R. & Showers, B. (2002). Student achievement through staff development. ASCD.

Juel, C., Biancarosa, G., Coker, D., & Deffes, R. (2003). Walking with Rosie: a cautionary tale of early reading instruction.60 (7), 12–18.

Juel, C., Hebard, H., Haubner, J.P., & Moran, M. (2010). Reading through a disciplinary lens. Educational Leadership, 67(6), 12-17.

Kagan, S. L., & Neuman, M. J. (1998). Lessons from three decades of transition research. The Elementary School Journal, 98(4), 365-381.

Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson P.D., & Barr, R. (Eds.). (2000). Handbook of reading

research, Vol. III. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kennelly, L., & Monrad, M. (2007). Easing the Transition to High School: Research and Best Practices Designed to Support High School Learning. National High School Center.

Kidron, Y., & Lindsay, S. (2014). The effects of increased learning time on student academic and nonacademic outcomes: Findings from a meta-analytic review (REL 2014–015), Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia.

Killion, J. (2013). Comprehensive professional learning system: A workbook for states and districts. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward.

Killion, J., & Crow, T. L. (2011). Standards for professional learning. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward.

Kirkland, L. D., & Patterson, J. (2005). Developing oral language in primary classrooms. Early Childhood Education Journal, 32(6), 391–395.

Kiuru, N., Lerkkanen, M., Niemi, P., Poskiparta, E., Ahonen, T., Poikkeus, A. M., & Nurmi, J. E. (2013). The role of reading disability risk and environmental protective factors in students' reading fluency in grade 4. Reading Research Quarterly, 48(4), 349–368.

Klingner, J. K. & Vaughn, S. (1996). Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities who use English as a second language. The Elementary School Journal, 96(3), 275-293.

Knight, J. (2011). Unmistakable Impact: A partnership approach for dramatically improving instruction. Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.

Kraft-Sayre, M. E., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). Enhancing the transition to kindergarten: Linking children, families, and schools. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

Kruse, S. D., Louis, K. S., & Bryk, A. S. (1995). An emerging framework for analyzing

school-based professional community. Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools. Long Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

L'Allier, S.K., Elish-Piper, L., & Bean, R.M. (2010). What matters for elementary literacy coaching? A Guiding principle for instructional improvement and student achievement. The Reading Teacher, 63, 544–554.

La Paro, K. M., Kraft-Sayre, M., & Pianta, R. C. (2003) Preschool to Kindergarten Transition Activities: Involvement and Satisfaction of Families and Teachers. Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 17(2), 147-158.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 465–491.

Langer, J. A. (2001). Beating the odds: Teaching middle and high school students to read and write well. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 837–80.

Larose, S., Cyrenne, D., Garceau, O., Brodeur, P., & Tarabulsy, G. M. (2010). The structure of effective academic mentoring in late adolescence. New Directions for Youth Development 126, 123–140.

Larson J., & Maier, M. (2000). Co-authoring classroom texts: "Shifting participant roles in writing activity." Research in the Teaching of English, 34, 468-497.

Learning Forward (2011). Standards for professional learning. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward.

Lee, C. (2007). Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lemov, D. (2017). Literacy in every classroom. Educational Leadership, 74(5), 10-16.

Lesaux, N. K., Crosson, A. C., Kieffer, M. J., & Pierce, M. (2010). Uneven profiles: Language minority learners' word reading, vocabulary, and reading comprehension skills. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 31(6), 475-483.

Lesaux, N.K., Kieffer, M.J., Faller, S.E., & Kelley, J.G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse

students in urban middle schools. Reading Research Quarterly, 45(2), 196–228.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). How languages are learned. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15, 129–151.

Livingston, J. A. (2003). Metacognition: An overview. US Department of Education, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), ED474273

LoCasale-Crouch, J., Mashburn, A. J., Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2008). Prekindergarten teachers' use of transition practices and children's adjustment to kindergarten. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23, 124-139.

Mahiri, J. (Ed.). (2005) What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives of urban youth. New York: Peter Lang.

Malloy, C., Ph.D., & Vital Research, LLC. (2010). Lessons from the Classroom: Initial Success for At-Risk Students. California Teachers Association.

Manyak, P. C., VonGunten, H., Autenrieth, D., Gillis, C., Mastre-O'Farrell, J., Irvine-McDermott, E., Blachowicz, C. L. Z. (2014). Four practical principals for enhancing vocabulary instruction. The Reading Teacher, 68(1), 13–23.

Mapp, K.L. & Kuttner, P.J. (2013). Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships. Austin, TX: SEDL.

Marten, S., Hill, S., & Lawrence, A. (2014). Who's afraid of the big bad core? Afterschool Matters.

Marulis, L. M., & Neuman, S. B. (2010). The effects of vocabulary intervention on young children's word learning: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 80(3), 300–335.

Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P. C., Krajcik, J.S., & Soloway, E. (1997). Enacting project-based science: Challenges for practice and policy. Elementary School Journal, 97, 341–358.

Marzano, R. (2003). What works in schools: Translating research into action. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. (2004). Building background knowledge for academic achievement: Research on what works in schools. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Marzano, R.J. (2009). The art and science of teaching: Six steps to better vocabulary instruction. Educational Leadership, 67(1), 83-84.

Mazzolini, B., & Morley, S. (2006). A double dose of reading class at the middle and high school levels. Illinois Reading Council Journal, 34(3), 9–24.

McCarthey, S. J. (2001). Identity construction in elementary readers and writers. Reading research quarterly, 36(2), 122-151.

McCarthey, S. J., Lopez-Velasquez, A.M., Garcia, G.A., Lin, S., & Guo, Y. (2004). Understanding writing contexts for English language learners. Research in the Teaching of English, 38(4), 351-394.

McConachie, S.M., & Petrosky, A.R. (Eds.). (2010). Content Matters: A Disciplinary Literacy Approach to Improve Student Learning. University of Pittsburgh.

McIntosh, K., Flannery, K. B., Sugai, G., Braun, D., & Cochrane, K. (2008). Relationships between academics and problem behavior in the transition from middle school to high school. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 10(4), 243–255.

McKeown, M.G., & Kucan, L. (Eds.). (2009). Bringing reading research to life. NY: Guilford Press.

McKeown, M.G., Beck, I., & Blake, R.G.K. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. Reading Research Quarterly, 44 (3), 218-253.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001). Professional communities and the work of high school teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Messenger, C. G. (2015). Information + literacy: Evidence-based practice in the classroom and school library. Knowledge Quest, 43(3), 20–28.

Mitchell, C.C. (2016). Learning from rising sixth grade readers: how Nooks shaped students' reading behaviors during a summer independent reading initiative. Literacy Research and Instruction, 55(1), 67–90.

Moje, E.B. (2007). Developing socially just subject-matter instruction: A review of the literature on disciplinary literacy teaching. Review of Research in Education, 31(1), 1-44.

Moje, E.B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and Identity: Examining the Metaphors in History and Contemporary Research. Reading Research Quarterly, 44(4), 415–437.

Moje, E.B., & McCarthy, S.J. (2002) Identity Matters. Reading Research Quarterly, 37(2), 228-238.

Moore, K. & Emig, C. (2014). Integrated Student Supports: A summary of the Evidence Base for Policymakers. Child Trends.

Moore, K., Lantos, H., Jones, R., Schindler, A., Belford, J., Sacks, V., & Harper, K. (2017). Making the grade: A progress report and next steps for integrated student supports. Child Trends.

Morgan, E., Salomon, N., Plotkin, M., & Cohen, R. (2014). The school discipline consensus report: Strategies from the field to keep students engaged in school and out of the juvenile justice system. The Council of State Governments Justice Center.

Mort, J. N. (2014). Joyful literary interventions: Early learning classroom essentials. CREATESPACE.

Moughamian, A. C., Rivera, M. O., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Instructional models and strategies for teaching English language learners. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Munro, J.K. (2009). Language Support Program, Professional Learning Guide. East Melbourne: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

National Center for Early Development & Learning. (2002). Transition to kindergarten. NCDEL Spotlight, No. 35.

National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement. (2013). Family engagement in transitions: Transition to kindergarten. Cambridge, MA.

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2014). Teacher prep review. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/Teacher_Prep_Review_2014_Report.

National Early Literacy Panel (NELP). (2008). Developing early literacy: report of the national literacy panel. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Literacy.

National Education Association. (2011). Family-School-Community partnerships 2.0: Collaborative strategies to advance student learning.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: an evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.

National Institute on Out-of-School Time. (2009). Making the case: a 2009 fact sheet on children and youth in out-of-school time.

National Reading Panel (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction [on-line]. Available: https://www.nichd.nih.gov/sites/default/files/publications/pubs/nrp/Documents/report.pdf

Nelson, T. H., Deuel, A., Slavit, D. & Kennedy, A. (2010). Leading deep conversations in collaborative inquiry groups. The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 83(5), p. 175–179.

Newhouse, C., Neely, P., Freese, J., Lo, J., & Willis, S. (2012). Summer matters: How summer learning strengthens students' success. Oakland: Public Profit, supported by the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1991). Instructional discourse, student engagement, and

literature achievement. Research in the Teaching of English, 261-290.

O'Connor, M. C., & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.), Discourse, learning and schooling (pp. 63-103). MA: Cambridge University Press.

O'Donnell, J., & Kirkner, S. L. (2014). The impact of a collaborative family involvement program on Latino families and children's educational performance. School Community Journal, 24(1), 211-234.

OEO: The Washington State Governor's Office of the Education Ombuds (Prepared with Input from the Educational Opportunity Gap Oversight and Accountability Committee). (2016). Family and Community Engagement Recommendations (Report to the Legislature, In Response to SSHB 1408).

Ohio Department of Education. (n.d.). Ohio Community Collaboration Model for School Improvement: Implementation Guide, Version 2.

Olson, C. B., Collins, P., Scarcella, R., Land, R., van Dyk, D., Kim, J., & Gersten, R. (2011). The pathway project: A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for teachers of secondary English Language Learners. Irvine, CA: Institute of Education Sciences.

Olulade, O. A., Jamal, N. I., Koo, D. S., Perfetti, C. A., LaSasso, C. , & Eden, G. F. (2016). Neuroanatomical evidence in support of the bilingual advantage theory. Cerebral Cortex, 26(7), July 2016, p. 3196–3204, https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhv152

Palumbo, T. J., & Willcutt, J. R. (2002). Perspectives on fluency: English language learners and students with dyslexia. What Research Has to Say About Fluency Instruction, 159–178. International Reading Association.

Pennucci, A., Morris, M., Nicolai C., & Lemon, M. (2015). Updated inventory of evidence- and research-based practices: Washington's K–12 Learning Assistance Program. (Doc. No. 15-07-2201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Perkins-Gough, D. (2013). The significance of grit: A conversation with Angela Lee Duckworth. Resilience and Learning, 71(1), 14–20.

Pianta, R. C., & Kraft-Sayre, M. (1999). Parents' observations about their children's transitions to kindergarten. Young Children, 54(3), 47-52.

Pianta, R. C., & Kraft-Sayre, M. (2003). Successful kindergarten transition. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Pianta, R. C., Cox, M. J., Taylor, L., & Early, D. (1999). Kindergarten teachers' practices related to the transition to school: Results of a national survey. The Elementary School Journal, 100(1), 71-86.

Pinkham, A. and Neuman, S. (2012). Early Literacy Development. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), Handbook of family literacy, 2e. 23-37. New York, New York, NY: Routledge.

Pittman, R. T., & Dorel, T. G. (2014). Experiential learning and literacy: Preservice teachers' perspectives. Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 10(2), 87–97.

Pittman, R.T. & Dorel, T.G., (2014). Experiential learning and literacy: Pre-service teachers' perspectives. Journal of Language & Literacy Education, 10(2), 87–97.

Plowman, L., Stephen, C., & McPake, J. (2010). Growing up with technology: Young children learning in a digital world. New York, NY: Routledge.

Powell, W., & Kusuma-Powell, O. (2011). How to teach now: Five keys to personalized learning in the global classroom. Alexandria, VA: ACSD.

Pressley, M., & Allington, R. L. (2015). Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

RAND Education, American Councils for International Education, & Portland Public Schools (2015). Study of Dual-Language Immersion in the Portland Public Schools: Year 4 Briefing.

Rasinski, T. (2002). Speed does matter in reading. Evidence-Based Reading Instruction: Putting the National Reading Report into Practice, 91–96. International Reading Association.

Rasinski, T. (2004). Assessing Reading Fluency. Pacific Resources for Education and Learning (PREL).

Rasinski, T. (2006). Reading fluency instruction: Moving beyond accuracy, authority, and prosody. The Reading Teacher, 59(7), 704–706.

Rasinski, T. (2014). Tapping the power of poetry. Educational Leadership, 72(3), 30–34.

Rasinski, T., & Zimmerman, B. (2013). A poem a day can keep fluency problems at bay. Policy into Practice, 4.

Ray, K.W. (2001). Teaching and the Development of Writing Identities. In The writing workshop: Working through the hard parts (and they're all hard parts). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Reninger, K. B., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (2010). Using discussions to promote striving readers' higher level comprehension of literary texts. In J. L. Collins and T. G. Gunning (Eds.), Building struggling students' higher level literacy: Practical ideas, powerful solutions (pp. 57-83). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Rex, L., & Schiller, L. (2009). Using discourse analysis to improve classroom interaction. New York: Routledge.

Reynolds, D. (2008). How professional learning communities use student data for improving achievement (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California).

Riddle Buly, M., & Valencia, S.W. (2002). Below the bar: Profiles of students who fail state reading assessments. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24(3), 219-239.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). An ecological perspective on the transition to kindergarten: A theoretical framework to guide empirical research. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 21, 491-511.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Pianta, R. C., & Cox, M. J. (2000). Teachers' judgments of problems in the transition to kindergarten. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 15, 147-166.

Ritter, G. W., Barnett, J. H., Denny, G. S., & Albin, G. R. (2009). The Effectiveness of

Volunteer Tutoring Programs for Elementary and Middle School Students: A Meta-Analysis. Review of Educational Research, 79(1), 3–38.

Roderick, M., Bryk, A.S., Jacob, B.A., Easton, J.Q., & Allensworth, E. (1999). Ending social promotion: Results from the first two years. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K., & Glass, G. (2005). The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English language learners. Educational Policy, 19, 572-594.

Rosenfeld, S., Scherzo, Z., Breiner, A., & Carmeli, M. (1998). Integrating content and PBL skills: A case study of teachers from four schools. Paper presented at the European Association for Research in Learning and Instruction (EARLI), Sweden.

Roskos, K.A., Tabors, P.O., Lenhart, L.A. (2009). Oral Language and Early Literacy in Preschool (2nd ed.), United States of America: International Reading Association.

Ryan, S., Whittaker, C.R., & Pinckney, J. (2002). A school-based elementary mentoring program. Preventing School Failure 46(3), 133–138.

Samway, K.D. (2006). When English language learners write: Connecting research to practice, K-8 (pp. 21-60). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Saunders, W., Goldenberg, C., & Marcelletti, D. (2013). English language development: Guidelines for instruction. American Educator, 37(2), 13–25.

Sayre-Kraft, M. E., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). Enhancing the Transition to Kindergarten Linking Children, Families, and Schools. Charlottesville: University of Virginia, National Center for Early Development and Learning Kindergarten Transition Studies.

Scanlon, D. M., Gelzheiser, L. M., Vellutino, F. R., Schatschneider, C., & Sweeney, J. M. (2010). Reducing the incidence of early reading difficulties: Professional development for classroom teachers versus direct interventions for children. In P. H. Johnston (Ed.), RTI in literacy: Responsive and comprehensive, 257–291.

Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., & Murphy, L. (2012). Reading for understanding: How reading apprenticeship improves disciplinary learning in secondary and college classrooms. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schulting, A. B., Malone, P. S., & Dodge, K. A. (2005). The effect of school-based kindergarten transition policies and practices on child academic outcomes. Developmental Psychology, 41(6), 860-871.

Schwalm, J. & Tylek, K.S. (2012). Systemwide implementation of project-based learning: The Philadelphia Approach. Afterschool Matters.

Shanahan, T. (2008). Implications of RTI for the reading teacher. Response to intervention: A framework for reading educators, 105–122.

Shanahan, T. (2013). Letting the text take center stage: How the common core state standards will transform English language arts instruction. American Educator, 37(3), 4–11.

Shanahan, T. (2014). How and how not to prepare students for the new tests. The Reading Teacher, 68(3), 184-188.

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education.

Shanklin, N.L. (2006). What are the characteristics of effective literacy coaching? Literacy Coaching Clearinghouse.

Shenderovich, Thurstion, & Miller, (2015). Cross-age tutoring in kindergarten and elementary school settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis. International Journal of Education Research, 76, 190–210.

Shinn, M. R., Deno, S. L., & Fuchs, L.S. (2002). Using curriculum-based measurements in a

problem-solving model. New York: Guilford.

Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2001). From neurons to neighborhoods. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies.

Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Silverman, R., & Crandell, J. D. (2010). Vocabulary practices in prekindergarten and kindergarten classrooms. Reading Research Quarterly, 45(3), 318–340.

Simmons, R.J. & Magiera, K. (2007). Evaluation of co-teaching in three high schools within one school district: how do you know when you are truly co-teaching? TEACHING Exceptional Children Plus, 3(3) Article 4.

Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (2011). Effective programs for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis. Educational Research Review, 6(1), 1–26.

Smagorinsky, P. (2000). Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smink, J., & Reimer, M. (2009). Rural School Dropout Issues: Implications for Dropout Prevention Strategies and Programs. (June 2009). Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center/Network.

Smith, B. (2007). Inspiring students with peer tutoring, Learning & Leading with Technology, December/January 2006–07.

Smith, K. G., & Foorman, B. R. (2015). Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide (REL 2015–070). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast.

Snow-Renner, R. &. (2005). McREL insights: Professional development analysis. Aurora, CO: McREL.

Snow, C.E. (2002) Reading for understanding: Toward a research and development program in reading comprehension. RAND: Santa Monica, CA.

Somers, C. L., Owens, D., & Piliawsky, M. (2009). A study of high school dropout prevention and at risk ninth-graders' role models and motivation for high school completion. Education, 130(2), 348–356.

Soter, A.O., Wilkinson, I. A. G., Murphy, P. K., Rudge, L., Reninger, K., & Edwards, M. (2008). What the discourse tells us: Talk and indicators of high-level comprehension. International Journal Educational Research, 47, 372-391.

Souto-Manning, M., & Martell, J. (2016). Reading, writing, and talk: Inclusive teaching strategies for diverse learners, K-2. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Souto-Manning, M., & Swick, K. J. (2006). Teachers' beliefs about parent and family involvement: Rethinking our family involvement paradigm. Early Childhood Education Journal, 34(2), 187-193.

St. Clair, L., Jackson, B., & Zweiback, R. (2012). Six years later: Effect of family involvement training on the language skills of children from migrant families. School Community Journal, 22(1), p. 9–19.

St. Martin, K., Harms, A., Walsh, M., & Nantais, M. (2022). Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory Elementary-Level Edition. (Version 2.0). Michigan Department of Education, Michigan's Multi-Tiered System of Supports Technical Assistance Center. Retrieved from https://mimtsstac.org/evaluation/fidelity-assessments/reading-tiered-fidelity-inventory-r-tfi.

Storch, S. A., & Whitehurst, G. J. (2002). Oral language and code-related precursors to reading: Evidence from a longitudinal structural model. Developmental Psychology, 38, 934-947.

Strickland, D. S., & Shanahan, T. (2004). Laying the groundwork for literacy. Educational Leadership, 61(6), 74–77.

Sullivan-Dudzic, L., Gearns, D. K., & Leavell, K. (2007). Making a difference: 10 essential

steps to building a preK–3 system. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Sullivan-Dudzic, L., Gearns, D. K., & Leavell, K. (2010). Making a Difference: 10 Essential Steps to Building a PreK–3 System. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Sweeney, D, (2011). Student Centered Coaching: A Guide for K–8 coaches and principals. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sweet, A.P. & Snow, C.E. (Eds.). Rethinking reading comprehension. New York: Guilford.

Swenson, K., & Watzinger-Tharp, J. (2012). Setting a Research Agenda for Dual Language Immersion in Utah. [Presentation]. Paper presented at the Center for Advanced Research and Language Acquisition's International Conference on Language Immersion Education. St. Paul, Minnesota.

Tatum, A.W. (2008). Toward a more anatomically complete model of literacy instruction: A focus on African American male adolescents and texts. Harvard Educational Review, 78(1), 155-180.

The Community Toolbox. (2016). University of Kansas. Work Group for Community Health and Development, 1–33.

The National Mentoring Partnership. (2015). Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring. Mentoring.org.

Thomas, J.W. (March, 2000). A review of research on project-based learning. Retrieved January 2014, from New Tech Network.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, University of California-Santa Cruz.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). Dual language education for a transformed world. Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). School effectiveness for language minority students. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Timmons, V. (2008). Challenges in researching family literacy programs. Canadian Psychology, 49(2), 96–102.

Topping, K. (2008). Peer-assisted learning: A practical guide for teachers. Newton, MA: Brookline Books.

Topping, K., Miller, D., Thurston, A., McGavock, K., & Conlin, N. (2011). Peer tutoring in reading in Scotland: Thinking big. Literacy, 45(1), 3-9.

Tran, H., & Winsler, A. (2011). Teacher and center stability and school readiness among low-income, ethnically diverse children in subsidized, center-based child care. Children and Youth Services Review 33, 2241-2252.

Tucker, V., & Schwartz, I. (2013). Parents' perspectives of collaboration with school professionals: Barriers and facilitators to successful partnerships in planning for students with ASD. School Mental Health, 5(1), 3–14.

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (2006). Shared book reading. What Works Clearinghouse.

Urow, C., & Beeman, K (2009). Initial Literacy Instruction in Dual Language Programs: Sequential or Simultaneous? https://www.teachingforbiliteracy.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Initial-Literacy-Instruction-in-Dual-Language-Programs-Sequential-or-Simultaneous.pdf

Uvaas, T., & McKevitt, B. (2013). Improving transitions to high school: a review of current research, Preventing School Failure, 57(2), 70–76.

Valencia, S. W., Smith, A. T., Reece, A. M., Min, L., Wixson, K. K., & Newman, H. (2010). Oral reading fluency assessment: Issues of construct, criterion, and consequential validity. Reading Research Quarterly, 45(3), 270–291.

Valencia, S.W. & Riddle Buly, M. (2004). Behind test scores: What struggling readers really need. The Reading Teacher, 57(6), 520-531.

Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Effectiveness of four instructional programs designed to serve English learners: Variation by ethnicity and initial English

proficiency. Retrieved from https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/Valentino_Reardon_EL%20Programs_12_15_14.pdf

Van Voorhis, F. L., Maier, M. F., Epstein, J. L., Lloyd, C. M., & Leuong, T. (2013). The impact of family involvement on the education of children ages 3 to 8: A focus on literacy and math achievement outcomes and social-emotional skills. New York, NY: Center on School, Family and Community Partnerships, MDRC.

Van Voorhis, Frances L.; Maier, Michelle F.; Epstein, Joyce L.; Lloyd, Chrishana M. (2013). The Impact of Family Involvement on the Education of Children Ages 3 to 8: A Focus on Literacy and Math Achievement Outcomes and Social-Emotional Skills. New York, NY: MDRC.

Vandal, B. (2010). Getting Past Go: Rebuilding the Remedial Education Bridge to College Success. Education Commission for the States.

Vandell, D. L. (2014). Afterschool Program Quality and Student Outcomes: Reflections on Positive Key Findings on Learning and Development.

Villa, R. A., Thousand, J. S., & Nevin, A. I. (2013). A guide to co-teaching: New lessons and strategies to facilitate student learning. Corwin Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (Eds.), Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waldner, H. M. (2004). Family fun night: When stories come alive! Odyssey: New Directions in Deaf Education, 5(2), 32–33.

Walqui, A. (2000). Strategies for success: Engaging immigrant students in secondary schools. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Walqui, I., & van Lier, L. (2009). Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Walsh, M., Wasser Gish, J. Foley, C., Theodorakakis, M., & Rene, K. (2016). Principles of

Effective Practice for Integrated Student Support. Center for Optimized Student Support.

Warkentien, S. & Grady, S. (2009). Students' Use of Tutoring Services, by Adequate Yearly Progress Status of School. Statistics in Brief. NCES 2010-023. National Center for Educational Statistics.

Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. Reading Research Quarterly, 28(2), 179-200.

Wasik, B. H., & Herrmann, S. (2004). Family literacy: History, concepts, and services. In B. H. Wasik (Ed.), Handbook of family literacy, 3-22. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Watson, J. A. (2008). Using online learning for at-risk students and credit recovery: Promising practices in online learning. Retrieved April 2014, from North American Council for Online Learning.

Watson, S.M.R., Gable, R.A., Gear, S.B., & Hughes, K.C. (2012). Evidence-based strategies for improving the reading comprehension for secondary students with learning disabilities. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 23(2), 77–89.

Weiss, H., Caspe, M., & Lopez, M. E. (2006). Family involvement in early childhood education. Family Involvement Makes a Difference 1 (Spring).

Wessels, S., & Trainin, G. (2014). Bringing Literacy Home: Latino Families Supporting Children's Literacy Learning. Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning ad Teacher Education. Paper 160.

West, C.S. (2012). Effective coaching strategies for increased use of research-based instructional strategies for linguistically diverse classrooms. Master's Thesis, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Wharton-McDonald, Pressley, M., & Hampston, J. M. (1998). Literacy instruction in nine first-grade classrooms: Teacher characteristics and student achievement. The Elementary School Journal, 99(2), 101-128.

Whittingham, J. & Rickman, W.A. (2015). Booktalking: Avoiding Summer Drift. Knowledge Quest: Summer Learning, 43(5), 18–21.

Wissman, K. (2007). "Making a way": Young women using literacy and language to resist the politics of silencing. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 51(4), 340–349.

Wood, D. (2007). Teachers learning communities: Catalyst for change or a new infrastructure for the status quo. Teachers College Record, 109(3), p. 699–739.

Zeneli, M., Thurston A., & Roseth, C. (2016). The influence of experimental design on the magnitude of the effect size—peer tutoring for elementary, middle and high school settings: A meta-analysis. International Journal of Educational Research, 76, 211–233.

Zwiers, J. & Crawford, M. (Eds.). (2011). Academic conversations: Classroom talk that fosters critical thinking and content understandings. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

LEGAL NOTICE

Download this material in PDF at *https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/support-programs/learning-assistance-program-lap/menus-best-practices-strategies*). This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: 20-0022.

ESTD
1889

All students prepared for post-secondary pathways, careers, and civic engagement.

Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Chris Reykdal | State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building | P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200