

Name of Meeting/Session: Deans Compact P20 Literacy Collaborative

Date of Meeting or Session: Thursday, June 1, 2023, 9:30 am to 2:00 pm

Keynote Speakers: Dr. Jade Wexler, University of Maryland & Dr. Tara Johnston, York College, PA, (formerly at University of Maryland)

Participants in Attendance (by name, affiliation):

Participants:

Amanda Rider, Marietta College
Anna Baird, Findlay City Schools
Charles Kemp, Shawnee State University
Daria DeNoia, Ohio Education Association
Dottie Erb, Co-Facilitator, P20 Literacy Collaborative, Marietta College
Earl Focht, ODE, Office for Exceptional Children
Eugenia Johnson-Whitt, Walsh University
Gail Evanchan, University of Akron
Jennifer Walker, OH Adolescent Literacy Lead
Jade Wexler, University of Maryland
Joanne Krajeck, State Support Team 9
Julie McIntosh, University of Findlay
Kate Doyle, University of Cincinnati
Kerry Teeple, University of Findlay
Krista Maxson, ODHE
Lindsey Roush, Walsh University
Liza Grossman, Stark Education Partnership
Lucie Collier, Mount St. Joseph University
Maggie Lehman, Lourdes University
Marcy Keifer Kennedy, Ohio University
Maria Pappas, Youngstown City Schools
Mary Heather Munger, University of Findlay
Mary Murray, Co-Facilitator, P20 Literacy Collaborative, Bowling Green State University
Mary-Kate Sableski, University of Dayton
Michelle Elia, Ohio Literacy Lead
Raven Cromwell, Marietta College
Sandi Sumerfield, Central State University
Sandra Beam, Shawnee State University
Shayne Piasta, Ohio State University
Sherine Tambyraja, ODE
Susan Riley, University of Cincinnati

Tara Johnston, York College
Tatiana Wells, Cuyahoga Community College

UC SDI Staff: David Brobeck, Research Associate; Elizabeth Lilly, Program Coordinator; Jennifer Ottley, Research Director; Jesse Conway, Educational Consultant; Jihye Shin, Research Associate; Sam Giammarco, Research Associate; Sarah Smith, Research Associate; Sloane Storie, Research Associate; Stanley Dudek, Technical Consultant; Yohimar Sivira Gonzalez, Jr., Research Associate; Deb Telfer, Director

WFA Staff: Edwina Pendarvis, Note-taker

Part 1: 9:30 to 11:45 am EST

Agenda Item #1: Welcome & Introduction (Mary Murray, EdD, & Dottie Erb, PhD, Co-Facilitators)

Mary Murray welcomed participants to the P20 Collaborative's fourth quarterly meeting of the year, thanked them, and reviewed the meeting outcomes and agenda highlights.

Agenda Item #2: Spring 2023 P20 Literacy & Math Tutoring Action Forum Spotlight (Raven Cromwell, PhD, & Amanda Rider, EdD, Marietta College; Lucie Collier, MEd, Mount St. Joseph University; Lindsey Roush, EdD, & Eugenia Johnson-Whitt, PhD, Walsh University; Kerry Teeple, EdD, University of Findlay, & Anna Baird, BS, Findlay City Schools; David Brobeck, PhD, Research Associate, Systems Development and Improvement Center, University of Cincinnati)

David Brobeck introduced the action forum spotlight, explaining that the forums were part of a year-long comprehensive professional learning program for institutions of higher education with ODE-funded Tutoring Grants. He said the Center staff was glad to be able to host four in-person action forums, one in each of four regions of the state: Marietta College in the southeast, Walsh University in the northeast, Mount St. Joseph University in the southwest, and University of Findlay in the northwest. He noted that all four institutions of higher education were committed to preparing teachers to teach all children to read well by using evidence-based practices grounded in the Science of Reading.

Dr. Cromwell (Marietta) discussed challenges encountered by Marietta faculty involved in the tutoring program. A major challenge was finding time in the school day schedule for tutoring. The time needed to provide training for the three interns in the tutoring program constituted another challenge. This training took a few months, making the window of time for the tutoring smaller than in ordinary internships when teacher candidates are in the schools within a couple of weeks of the beginning of the term. Communication was challenging as well, particularly when interns were tutoring in another location than the cooperating teacher's classroom, a circumstance that also made it difficult for tutors to get substantial feedback on their progress. Amanda Rider discussed challenges encountered by tutors from Marietta College. She said the students were sometimes worried that they might inhibit a child's achievement or even set a child back in skill. They were also often reluctant to ask their cooperating teacher questions

because the teachers were so busy. Tutors were also concerned that they were not fully aware of the impact of their tutoring. They would have liked a follow-up informing them of the results of their efforts. Students also indicated a desire for training to include mock tutoring sessions and to include teachers modeling effective tutoring methods.

Lucie Collier (Mount St. Joseph University) said Brian Connors, principal of Delhi Middle School, could not be present but hoped to join later. She credited the college and school's common goal as the main driver of the project. They decided mutually that timely, frequent communication must involve the university, school, tutored students, teachers of tutored students, and, in many cases, parents. Much of the communication had to do with the tutoring process, obstacles to the process, and instructional resources, but often also included data and determining what assessments were needed beyond monthly school assessments so tutors would know what was working. Communication was key to scheduling and locating sessions as well as celebrations of success. A discussion blackboard site was useful in providing tutors a means of communicating with each other and for her to respond to tutors' questions. She said she and Mr. Connors worked hard to communicate with each other and as a team, together with the tutors, toward the goal of implementing an effective tutoring program. She found it gratifying that the middle-school tutees enjoyed their interactions with the tutors, with the principal, and with her.

Dr. Roush and Dr. Johnson-Whitt (Walsh University) focused their presentation on the culture of higher education, connecting behavior management to different settings, teaching in a poverty setting, and recognizing that all teachers are teachers of reading and writing. In regard to higher education culture, they helped tutors learn how to communicate in a professional manner with other professionals and with tutees. They helped tutors to be aware of college expectations (e.g., being organized, taking charge of their own learning, and engaging with their peers). She and Dr. Johnson-Whitt communicated faith in the students' success, provided feedback to help them succeed, and modeled the behavior for tutors they wanted them to use with tutees. In regard to behavior management, they offered resources and examples, making sure the tutor candidates knew that even when a strategy didn't work, they could learn from it. They also made sure the tutors understood the importance of learning the child's perspective and identifying possible reasons for "problematic" behavior. In regard to the poverty setting, Eugenia Johnson-Whitt talked about students' need for experience in a variety of settings. Interning in a poverty setting, students learn to understand and be considerate of children's circumstances, such as having responsibilities at home that interfere with homework and that some children's only meal may be the one at school—and that food should not be made contingent on certain behavior. In concluding her comments, she noted that for students in poverty settings and other settings, the school culture should be one of community, with all teachers recognizing that reading instruction is important for all grades and all subject areas. Lindsey Roush noted that some teachers think their students have mastered higher-level reading skills and are unaware that some middle-school students struggle with basic skills, such as word recognition. Her own and Dr. Johnson-Whitt's commitment to the action forum effort is based on an understanding that reading is important in all subjects, K-12.

Kerry Teeple (University of Findlay) introduced Anna Baird, one of two cooperating teachers for their tutoring project, and a fourth-grade teacher at Bigelow Hill Elementary. Anna Baird noted that she and the reading teacher, were the first two on board with the project, as both had open schedules that lent themselves well to it. They started with two tutors, one in education and one not; and both did an excellent job in working with students. One issue both tutors faced early on was a tendency to overload their tutees. The tutors needed help in identifying sequential learning and practice techniques and skills, so she discussed with them how to break the reading skills into manageable tasks and how to explain those steps. She worked with both tutors (on different days) and could help them with planning and staying on task, as well as give them feedback. Dr. Teeple said she saw a transformation in the tutors when she visited the school. One of the school's goals for the year was fact fluency, a skill the tutors clearly promoted. Anna Baird elaborated on the fact fluency effort, sharing that the school had adopted a game-based computer program to teach arithmetic facts. The program wasn't enough for some students, so tutors pulled those fourth graders out and worked with them, using addition, subtraction, multiplication, and addition flash cards or activities. She said the math students enjoyed being tutored in math facts and vocabulary, and the tutors learned how important it is for teachers and tutors to use the same math vocabulary. She shared that one student went from not knowing any addition or subtraction facts to knowing addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division facts. She concluded the presentation by noting that the teacher partners provided critical assistance to the tutors that contributed to the high quality of the tutelage.

David Brobeck concluded the spotlight session. He announced that UC SDI and the ODE are bringing the Meadows Center team back to Ohio on October 9, 10, and 11, 2023, just before the International Dyslexia Association conference at the end of the same week. All are welcome to attend these in-person action forums.

Agenda Item #3: Keynote - The IES Adolescent Literacy Practice Guide Recommendations: Practical Applications for Preservice and Inservice Teachers (Jade Wexler, PhD, Associate Professor, University of Maryland & Tara Johnston, PhD, Assistant Professor, York College)

The keynote presentation centered on [SW-PACT](#), a schoolwide model for literacy instruction at the secondary school level. This model promises a means of significantly improving the literacy skills and content knowledge of secondary school students. According to Dr. Wexler, SW-PACT addresses the results of data from research from NAEP, which found that 30% of 8th graders were not performing at even the basic level of proficiency. The data indicated even lower achievement among 8th graders receiving free or reduced lunch, 8th graders with disabilities, and 8th-grade English learners.

Like other secondary school students, 8th graders deal with reading informational text in the face of higher expectations, dense content, and difficult text. Many struggle with the task. Contributing to the difficulty is the tendency for teachers, recognizing student problems in reading, to circumvent the use of text, thus inadvertently reducing opportunities for students to master content reading. In 2008, the Institute of Education Sciences recommended that

secondary school students be provided explicit vocabulary instruction; explicit comprehension-building practices; and opportunities for extended discussion and interpretation of text meaning. It noted a need to increase student motivation and engagement in literacy learning and to provide intensive interventions for struggling readers. In regard to the former need, Jade Wexler pointed out that good instruction is one of the best ways to motivate and engage students. In regard to the second, she noted that so many students need supplemental intensive intervention that it is not practicable to serve all those who need it. Consequently, she sees a need for educators to intensify Tier One instruction. In 2022, the Institute of Education Sciences provided recommendations for teaching students who need interventions; the recommendations included building students' decoding skills, enabling them to read multisyllabic words; ensuring that they're engaging in [stretch text](#); providing fluency-building activities; and routinely using comprehension-building practices. Dr. Wexler regards these recommendations as a call for increasing the "dosage" of explicit instruction in literacy related to academic content. The SW-PACT model increases such instruction without placing the entire responsibility on one teacher. It is based on the Promoting Adolescents' Comprehension of Text (PACT) model originally developed through a Reading for Understanding grant at the University of Austin. Primarily designed for US History content and integrated into existing units, PACT takes a content approach to increase knowledge and reading comprehension skills. The model practices—Comprehension Canopy, Essential Words, and Critical Reading—as well as team-based learning, comprehension checks, and knowledge application—were evaluated rigorously. Students in the history classrooms that received PACT treatments outperformed students in the "business as usual" history classrooms on content knowledge, content reading comprehension, and general reading comprehension. Subsequent projects adapted this set of practices to other content areas. Dr. Wexler and her colleagues adapted the practices to work schoolwide.

Tara Johnston stated that because PACT is curriculum and text-independent, teachers can use PACT practices to incorporate evidence-based literacy instruction into any content area. She provided specifics in relation to using the model. In selecting text for PACT instruction, for example, teachers select passage(s) that cover key concepts; support lesson objectives; and link to content standards. Additionally, the passage(s) must be comprehensible at the average instructional level, clearly organized; a manageable length for promoting student engagement, and worthy of a good discussion. She noted that SW-PACT practices can be customized and recommended that potential adopters identify the schedule and practices most vital for their students. However, the schedule is adapted, she cautioned, it should incorporate a gradual release of responsibility from "I do" (teacher modeling), to "we do" (guided practice with feedback), to "you do" (independent practice with feedback). She added that students may need a great deal of scaffolding, such as graphic organizers, which should be used and then faded. She said that in PD on PACT, they begin with Critical Reading. During Critical Reading, students have extended discussions of text meaning. In planning Critical Reading instruction, teachers think about how to introduce the purpose for reading the selected passage, how to facilitate students' getting the gist of the passage, and what the culminating question about the passage should be. In discussing "getting the gist" of a section of the text, she said teachers need to tell students that the "gist" of a passage is the same as the "main idea" or the "most

important information.” She explained that Critical Reading instruction has the same structure every time it is used. The teacher introduces the passage; teaches (or reviews) how to get the gist; models how to get the gist; has students practice getting the gist; and has them answer the culminating question. Dr. Johnston presented an example of this process using a passage about the Venus flytrap and the culminating question, “Why and how is the Venus flytrap designed specifically for its surroundings?” She explained that the culminating question helped students remember the important information included in the text and was also useful as an advance text organizer. She demonstrated how teachers model getting the gist of the text by answering the questions, “Who or what is the passage mostly about?” and, “What is the most important information about the who or what?”, and then writing class-developed “gist statements.” A gist cue card identifies steps in finding the main idea of a passage:

- Step 1: Who or what is mentioned most frequently in the passage? The teacher reads the text aloud and then says, “I need to look back and take notes about who or what is mentioned most frequently.”
- Step 2 asks the teacher to model or teachers to answer the question, “What is the most important information about that who or what?” This step’s process is more subjective, and answers may differ; however, the culminating question guides this step.
- In Step 3, the gist statement students write should include the who or what most frequently mentioned and the most important information about the who or what is a short, complete sentence (generally about 10 words in length). After teacher modeling, students should participate in guided practice with feedback and then independent practice with feedback.

Jade Wexler shared that in evaluating the original SW-PACT model, in four middle schools, they found many students were unable to comprehend the gist of the section they had just read, much less answer a high-level question about the text. Data also showed that the “get the gist process” they used didn’t give students enough guidance. That is why they came up with the “gist pointers” as a way to embed more explicit instruction into this process. Once students are familiar with the “get the gist” routine, the goal is to move into partner reading and peer-mediated practice. At that point, the teacher should re-introduce the culminating question and prompt students to review their gist statements and discuss their ideas in class or with a team or partner. Engaging students with disabilities in text-based discussion is an effective way to increase comprehension.

She noted that the Comprehension Canopy provides students with a motivational springboard and necessary background information. Its focus, like that of Essential Words, depends on the focus of Critical Reading. Resources used in the Comprehension Canopy can include an oral scaffold (e.g., informal class survey, quote, statistic); a written scaffold (e.g., lines from literature, song lyrics, headlines); or a multimedia scaffold (30 seconds to 2 minutes maximum length) such as a video clip, artifact, or photo. Comprehension Canopy helps students get the gist and answer the culminating question. She continued the use of the Venus flytrap text example, showing images and some information for Comprehension Canopy.

In describing explicit instruction in Essential Words, Dr. Wexler noted that teachers select one to

two keywords (depending on the culminating question) that help build background knowledge; teach content concepts; and support comprehension. The words chosen as essential can be projected on a smart board or whiteboard with a student-friendly definition, an image or two, related words, an example, and if helpful, a non-example. After being presented with the words, students do a quick “turn and talk” about the words (e.g., for “nutrients” students could talk about their favorite foods). Of these three components—Comprehensive Canopy, Essential Words, and Critical Reading—Critical Reading gets the most time (30 minutes in the Option 1 version of the model) as students most need “eyes on the text.” Resources available to support the implementation of SW-PACT include model lessons (AIMcoaching.org); partner reading lessons in science, social studies, and English; PD modules on PACT—a module on schoolwide literacy and a module on each of these practices. Because many students struggle with pronouns, there is also a mini-lesson on pronouns that models 10 to 15 minutes of review on pronouns; and there are Criteria for Success checklists useful for reflection on Comprehensive Canopy, Essential Words, and Critical Reading. The success criteria feature quality indicators that coaches use in reflecting sessions with their coachees, and they also include criteria for monitoring partner reading as well as a self-monitoring checklist for students.

Part 2: 12:15 pm to 2:00 pm

Agenda Item #4: Keynote Continued – Par 2: SW-PACT for Preservice Teachers (Jade Wexler, PhD, University of Maryland & Tara Johnston, PhD, York College)

Part two of the keynote presentation described two PD assignments included in personnel preparation coursework: SW-PACT Assignment 2: Promoting Adolescents' Comprehension of Text and Assignment 3: Explicit Instruction Teaching Demo - Sentence Level Gist. Dr. Wexler described the course context for the assignments as a course on reading and writing in special education and a course on reading and writing methods for grades four through eight. The courses address issues in upper elementary and middle school literacy, such as response to intervention at the middle school level and considerations when building school-wide literacy models; delivery of specially designed instruction (SDI) using evidence-based explicit instructional practices; content of SDI, (i.e., evidence-based reading and writing strategies for students with reading difficulties and disabilities); and methodology of SDI (i.e., ways to intensify instruction for students who continue to struggle with reading). The three main SW-PACT components are assigned separately and sequentially.

Dr. Johnston discussed that the SW-PACT Assignment 2: Promoting Adolescents' Comprehension of Text requires a *planning phase*—text selection (6th-grade content-area text), a “get the gist” log; identifying and defining one or two keywords for Essential Words instruction and scaffolding to be used in the Comprehensive Canopy. The *instruction phase* includes practicing Essential Word instruction with avatars, receiving peer and instructor feedback, and using the RISE (reflect, inquire, suggest, and elevate) model to help candidates reflect on their own instruction and pedagogical skills. Resources for Assignment 2 include a text selection PD video, SW-PACT sample lessons, “get the gist” cards and graphic organizer; a PPT template; planning

guides to Comprehension Canopy and Essential Words; Criteria for Success checklists; rubrics; and detailed assignment descriptions. They give the teacher candidates guidance in text selection. When candidates turn their text selection in, they tell why they chose it, and then they fill out the gist log and come up with the culminating question so they can plan the Comprehensive Canopy and Essential Words lessons. Using avatars in the demonstration of their instruction offers candidates an opportunity for low-stakes practice. She shared an Essential Words video with avatars that one of their teacher candidates did and noted that peers and the instructor watched the videos and provided feedback.

SW-PACT Assignment 3, Explicit Instruction Teaching Demo, focuses on critical reading. This assignment is used with the same text used for assignment 2. In planning, the PD participants script out Critical Reading and build a PowerPoint with a partner. In the instruction phase of the assignment, the teacher models how to “get” the gist of a text. The educator will introduce the text and ask the “students” to write down the culminating question on their graphic organizer. The teacher tells them the three steps to take in getting the gist. Dr. Johnston noted that candidates/teachers can plan with a partner but must teach the Critical Reading lesson alone. In instruction, they demonstrate Critical Reading and record it using Zoom. They then complete a reflection of content instruction. Assignment 3 resources include sample PACT lessons. In the example offered, the culminating question was “What is a refugee and what does their journey look like?” Teachers learn how to teach students to identify the most important who or what in the section; identify the most important information about the who or what; and write a gist statement in a short but complete sentence.

Dr. Wexler discussed the process of helping teachers in reviewing the children’s gist statements to assess how to adapt and intensify instruction for children who need more instruction. She said that children who are still struggling may benefit from sentence-level gist instruction, progressing to paragraph-level gist and then to passage level. In sentence-level instruction, teachers provide sentence-level scaffolding and how to complete the “get the gist” practice; and, for each sentence, students write down who or what the sentence is about. They then select two important words about the who or what from the sentence. They may then write a gist statement about the sentence or about the paragraph (by combining all the who’s and what’s of the sentence-level analysis). A sentence-level level gist log with a “who/what” heading for one column and an “essential words” heading for the other column can be helpful to students in this process. The website <https://aimcoaching.org/resources/adolescent-literacy/> includes assignment descriptions and rubrics. Dr. Wexler showed one more example, a sentence-level gist log for a text selection about a civil rights activist named Fred Korematsu, a civil rights activist from Oakland, California. She informed the P20 meeting attendees that in their folder is the website information for AIM, PACT PD, assignment descriptions and rubrics, and other SW-PACT resources. She concluded by thanking attendees and welcomed questions.

Agenda Item #5: Small Group Discussion

Participants engaged in a breakout discussion of their responses to three questions: 1. What are the current strengths and weaknesses of your adolescent literacy preparation and/or tutoring

program? 2. What opportunities exist to sustain the practices for teacher candidates or tutoring personnel? 3. What barriers exist, what support would be needed to implement assignments like those presented, and what resources would be needed to support these trainings?

Agenda Item #6: Small Group Share-Outs

Dr. Brobeck shared that their group considered that one current area that might be weak in terms of evidence-based reading instruction tied to content is K-5 special education and that reflection on that area is needed. Barriers to better adolescent literacy instruction include that many teacher candidates in secondary-level programs think they shouldn't be in the same literacy training as early childhood candidates. Another issue raised by the group was the tendency to use "just right" text instead of stretch text for improving reading in content areas.

Another group discussed needing to align MCAYA to try to integrate the science of reading. In terms of opportunities, the group was excited about partnering with districts. The group also discussed the applicability of literacy strategies for English learners as applicable to students of poverty, as many of them could be considered "quasi ELs." Teachers' limited time was identified as a barrier. An important strength to develop may be having different teachers within the same grade level work on reading and writing skills and share resources.

Tatiana Wells said her group discussed challenges with hiring teachers and the advantages of partnering with a university, such as Cleveland State, to get tutors into classrooms. The group emphasized the need, especially for low-performing districts, to learn about, adopt, and adapt to their school culture's evidence-based practices. Educators' practices and academic language need to be recognized as blending with other levels, such as Early Childhood. Another group member stated that one of the strengths their group identified was the recent revamping of their literacy classes to adopt evidence-based practices aligned with an emphasis on vocabulary and the science of reading. The use of revision as a learning tool and the value of teaching a lesson, reflecting on it, and re-teaching it was also raised in their discussion. They saw strengths in IHEs that are building partnerships with local schools to provide field experiences for teacher candidates, as it allows them to see evidence-based literacy practices in action. They noted that the mindset of content area teachers can work against explicit instruction for reading comprehension. The rhetoric and negativity around the science of reading were identified as a barrier, as were schools and district programs and mandated practices overload.

Agenda Item #7: Facilitator Wrap-Up

Dr. Dottie Erb thanked the group and announced that the 2023-2024 P20 Literacy Collaborative meetings will be virtual and will be on Thursdays, from 9:30 a.m. to 2:00 pm, September 21, 2023; December 14, 2023; March 28, 2024; and June 13, 2024. She asked participants to complete the meeting feedback survey. Stanley shared the link to the survey in the chat.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm