Introduction to the Grades PreK-5 Literacy Instruction Practice Profile

Handout 1: Grades PreK-5 Literacy Instruction Practice Profile

Philosophy, Values and Guiding Principles:
PreK-5 Literacy Instruction includes the continuum of literacy development from emergent literacy to early literacy and reading.

Based on Section 1002.67, F.S., curriculum and instruction used in prekindergarten classrooms (specifically VPK programs) is developmentally appropriate[1] and designed to prepare learners for kindergarten through the use of the *Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards: 4 Years Old to Kindergarten*. These standards specify skills in the Language and Literacy Domain (listening and understanding, speaking, vocabulary, sentences and structure, conversation, emergent reading, emergent writing).

According to Rule 6A -6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan, reading instruction for kindergarten through third grade focuses on and builds learner capacity in the six components of reading (oral language, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension) as appropriate to the age/grade level. According to the rule, reading instruction:

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

Additionally, early literacy and reading instruction in prekindergarten through third grade must be:

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

Early literacy and reading instruction are to be inclusive of all learners, incorporating the principles of Universal Design for Learning and providing appropriate accommodations for students with a disability, students with an Individual Educational Plan and students who are English language learners. Finally, high-quality early literacy and reading instruction are guided by careful planning of appropriate instructional goals, content, methods/routines, use of materials and text selection, including quality texts, such as the sample texts by grade and standard included in the B.E.S.T. Standards for English Language Arts and domain-related books included in the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards Educator's Guide.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria: Includes instruction provided to all prekindergarten through third grade students.

Desired Outcomes:

1. Increase the percentage of students ready to learn when entering kindergarten.
2. Increase the percentage of students reading on grade level by the end of third grade by 3%–4% per year to reach the goal of 90% of third grade students performing at or above grade level on Florida's state summative assessment for reading/ELA.
3. Close the achievement gap for Florida's most vulnerable students.
4. Rank #1 nationally in fourth grade reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

---

[1] National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), *Principles of Child Development and Learning and Implications That Inform Practice.* https://www.naeyc.org/resources/position-statements/dap/principles

Core Component	Contribution to the Desired Outcomes	Accomplished Use	Ineffective Use
Description of the component	An explanation of how the components contribute to the desired outcome	Activities and behaviors that exemplify adult practitioners who are able to generalize required skills and abilities to a wide range of settings and contexts; skills are used consistently and independently – skills are sustained over time while continuing to grow	Activities and behaviors that exemplify adult practitioners who are not yet able to implement the required skills or abilities in context
EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION is intentional teaching with a clear and direct presentation of new information to learners, which does not require student inferencing during the introduction of new or previously taught content, concepts or skills. One example is the gradual release model.	Explicit instruction contributes to the learner's: 1. Clear understanding of newly introduced or previously taught content, concepts and skills; 2. Positive engagement in relating to the new learning; and 3. Strong early literacy progress.	1. Introduces the new or previously taught content, concept or skill clearly and directly. 2. Models or demonstrates use of the new or previously taught content, concept or skill. 3. Provides clear visual and/or auditory examples (and non-examples when needed) to illustrate specific application of content, concept or skill. 4. Provides learners frequent opportunities for guided and independent practice of new or previously taught content, concept or skill.	1. Introduces new or previously taught content, concept or skill indirectly, relying upon student inferencing; does not provide clear and concise explanation. 2. Provides instruction without modeling or demonstrating new or previously taught content, concepts or skills; does not clarify potential misconceptions. 3. Provides instruction without visual and/or auditory examples and non-examples; does not illustrate specific application of new or previously taught content, concepts or skills. 4. Provides instruction without follow-up opportunity for learners to practice new or previously taught content, concepts or skills; does not guide learners toward independence as soon as possible.
SYSTEMATIC INSTRUCTION is a planned sequence that includes a logical progression of content, concepts and skills, from simple to complex, with cumulative teaching/review, and practice to enable learners to achieve learning goals.	Systematic instruction contributes to the learner's continuous acquisition of increasingly complex content, concepts and skills in order to become a confident reader. It decreases the prospect of a learner developing a reading difficulty over time.	1. Uses a logical progression of content, concept and skill, proceeding from simple to more complex. 2. Conducts a cumulative review, enabling learners to make connections to previously learned material. 3. Provides opportunities for students to practice previously taught content, concepts and skills to progress toward learning goals.	1. Teaches content, concepts or skills that do not proceed from simple to more complex. 2. Does not provide cumulative reviews for learners to build content, concepts and skills or make connections to new and previously learned material. 3. Does not provide opportunities for learners to practice new and previously taught content, concepts and skills in order to progress toward learning goals.

Core Component	Contribution to the Desired Outcomes	Accomplished Use	Ineffective Use
SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION is the intentional support provided by a teacher for learners to carry out a task or solve a problem, to achieve a goal that they could not do without support. It is temporary support matched to the current understanding or skill level of learners. The intent is to provide a decreasing level of support until learners are empowered to perform independently.	Scaffolded instruction contributes toward the quality of a learner's efforts in relating to new or unfamiliar content, concepts and skills that fortify the development of language and literacy skills orally and in written form.	1. Identifies learners who are having difficulty carrying out a task or solving a problem on their own. 2. Provides intentional support matched to the learner's need, such as asking an open-ended question, providing prompts and cues, breaking down the problem into smaller steps, using visual aids, providing an example or offering encouragement. 3. Monitors the learner's response to the scaffold and provides the next level of support needed on a scale from intense to moderate, gradually releasing ownership of learning to the student until they are able to perform the task independently.	1. Overlooks learners having difficulty carrying out a task or solving a problem on their own. 2. Does not provide appropriate support that relates to the needs of the learner. 3. Does not monitor learner response to scaffolding; does not identify next level of requisite support for further learning; does not empower the learner to perform the task independently.
CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK is clearly communicated, timely and developmentally appropriate information aligned to learning goals or objectives that specifically addresses learners' errors or misconceptions. It is one type of ongoing instructional feedback.	Corrective feedback contributes to a learner's awareness of errors and increases self-correction and self-regulation, the quality of a learner's literacy engagement, motivation and independence for improved performance, behavior and academic achievement.	1. Identifies learner's misunderstanding/error relative to the target instructional goal. 2. Communicates immediate/timely feedback clearly using student-friendly language. 3. Provides the learner the opportunity for timely self-correction. 4. Repeats the process as needed or confirms accuracy based on learner response.	1. Overlooks learner's misunderstanding/error relative to the target instructional goal. 2. Provides no feedback to learner response. 3. Provides the learner no opportunity for self-correction. 4. Provides no confirmation or follow-up correction of the learner's accurate or inaccurate response.

Core Component	Contribution to the Desired Outcomes	Accomplished Use	Ineffective Use
DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION is adapting instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners in order to increase their access and opportunities to meet specific learning goals.	Differentiated instruction contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner's distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing.	1. Delivers individualized instruction using one or more of the following adaptations to meet specific learning needs of each learner or group of learners: the content (what is taught), process (how learning is structured), product (what is produced and assessed) and/or the physical learning environment. 2. Monitors the ongoing understandings and progress toward meeting specific learning goals to determine further adaptations.	1. Delivers generalized instruction using none of the following adaptations: content, process, product or physical environment; does not address specific needs of individual learners or groups of learners. 2. Does not monitor learner's ongoing understandings and progress toward meeting specific learning goals to determine further adaptations.

Glossary of Terms:

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

Developmentally Appropriate Practice: Teaching young children (birth through age 8) in ways that: meet children where they are, as individuals and as a group; and help each child reach challenging and achievable goals that contribute to their ongoing development and learning. It includes intentionally planned instruction, clearly defined learning goals, thoughtful instructional decisions to support children to meet those goals, continually assessing children's progress and adjusting instruction accordingly. Additionally, developmentally appropriate practice emphasizes curricular goals that build knowledge and attend to learning progressions in curriculum and teaching methods and child-guided and teacher-guided experiences.

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

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

Intense Support: Directs the student's thinking but does not provide the answer.

Moderate Support: Encourages a student to utilize their own thinking without stretching the student beyond their capacity.

Citation of Research Used:

Corrective Feedback

Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 9*(6), 672-677. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0906.09.

Archer, A.L. & Hughes, C.A. (2011). *Explicit Instruction: Effective and Efficient Teaching*. Guilford Press.

Beesley, A., & Apthorp, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Classroom instruction that works, second edition: Research report*. McREL International. https://www.mcrel.org/classroom-instruction-that-works-research-report/.

Chappuis, J. (2012, September). How am I doing? *Educational Leadership*, *70*(1), 36-41. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept12/vol70/num01/%C2%A3How-Am-I-Doing%C2%A2%C2%A3.aspx.

Hattie, J & Timperly, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487.

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System, 84*, 93-109. https://www.academia.edu/39644523/Li_S_and_Vuono_A_2019_Twenty_five_years_of_research_on_oral_and_written_corrective_feedback_in_System_System_84_93_109.

Liu, X., & Pong, L. (2020). A study of corrective feedback in integrated English classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 11*(5), 825-835. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1105.19.

McLeskey, J., Barringer, M-D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M. C., Winn, J., & Ziegler, D. (2017, January). High-leverage practices in special education. *Council for Exceptional Children & CEEDAR Center*. https://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/CEC-HLP-Web.pdf.

Truckenmiller, A.J., Eckert, T.L., Codding, R.S., & Petscher, Y. (2014, December). Evaluating the impact of feedback on elementary aged students' fluency growth in written expression: A randomized control trial. *Journal of School Psychology*, *52*(6), 531-548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.09.001.

Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K. & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087.

Differentiated Instruction

Al Otaiba, S., Connor, C. M., Folsom, J. S., Greulich, L., Meadows, J., & Li, Z. (2011). Assessment data–informed guidance to individualize kindergarten reading instruction: Findings from a cluster-randomized control field trial. *The Elementary school journal*, *111*(4), 535-560. https://doi.org/10.1086/659031.

Bondie, R. S., Dahnke, C., & Zusho, A. (2019). How does changing "one-size-fits-all" to differentiated instruction affect teaching? *Review of Research in Education*, *43*(1), 336-362. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821130.

Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., Fishman, B., Crowe, E. C., Al Otaiba, S. A., & Schatschneider, C. (2013). A longitudinal cluster-randomized controlled study on the accumulating effects of individualized literacy instruction on students' reading from first through third grade. *Psychological Science*, *24*(8), 1408–1419. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612472204.

Deunk, M. I., Smale-Jacobse, A. E., de Boer, H., Doolaard, S., & Bosker, R. J. (2018). Effective differentiation practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies on the cognitive effects of differentiation practices in primary education. *Educational Research Review, 24*, 31-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.002.

Gadzikowski, A., (2013). Differentiation strategies for exceptionally bright children. *Young Children*, *68*(2), 8-14.

Puzio, K., Colby, G.T., & Algeo-Nichols, D. (2020). Differentiated literacy instruction: boondoggle or best practice? *Review of Educational Research*, *90*(4), 459-498. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320933536.

Reis, S. M., McCoach, D. B., Little, C. A., Muller, L. M., & Kaniskan, R. B. (2011). The effects of differentiated instruction and enrichment pedagogy on reading achievement in five elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(2), 462-501. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210382891.

Tomlinson, Carol Ann. (2000). Differentiation of Instruction in the Elementary Grades. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED443572.

Valiandes, S. (2015). Evaluating the impact of differentiated instruction on literacy and reading in mixed ability classrooms: Quality and equity dimensions of education effectiveness. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *45*, 17-26. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0191491X15000188.

Watts-Taffe, S., Laster, B.P., Broach, L., Marinak, B., Connor, C.M., Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2012). Differentiated instruction: making informed teacher decisions. *The Reading Teacher*, *66*(4), 303-314. https://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01126.

Explicit and Systematic Instruction

Al Otaiba, S. Kosanovich, M.L., & Torgesen, J.K. (2012). Assessment and instruction for phonemic awareness and word recognition skills. In A.G. Kamhi & H.W. Catts (Eds.), *Language & Reading Disabilities* (3rd ed., 112-139). Allyn & Bacon.

Archer, A., & Hughes, C. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching.* The Guilford Press

Buckingham, J., Wheldall, R., & Wheldall, K. (2019). *Systematic and explicit phonics instruction: A scientific, evidence-based approach to teaching the alphabetic principle*. In R. Cox, S. Feez, & L. Beveridge (Eds.), *The alphabetic principle and beyond* (49-67). Primary English Teaching Association Australia.

Clark, R.E., Kirschner, P.A., & Sweller, J. (2012). Putting students on the path to learning: The case for fully guided instruction. *American Educator*, *36*(1), 6-11. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ971752.pdf.

Finlayson, K., & McCrudden, M.T. (2020) Teacher-Implemented Writing Instruction for Elementary Students: A literature review. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *36*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1604278.

Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). *Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide.* U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National

Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/writing_pg_062612.pdf.

Graham, S., MacArthur, C., & Fitzgerald, J. (2013). *Best Practices in Writing Instruction* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.

Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuhara, S., & Harris, K.R. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of Writing Instruction for Students in the Elementary Grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(4), 879-896. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029185.

Hough, T.M., Hixson, M.D., Decker, D., Bradley-Johnson, S. (2012). The Effectiveness of an Explicit Instruction Writing Program for Second Graders. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 21*(2), 163-174. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43551236.

Lavoie, N., Morin, M., Coallier, M., & Alamargot, D. (2020). An explicit multicomponent alphabet writing instruction program in grade 1 to improve writing skills. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 35*(2), 333-355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00428-6.

Nelson-Walker, N.J., Fein, H., Kosty, D.B., Smolkowski, K., Smith, J.M., & Baker, S.K. (2013). Evaluating the effects of systemic intervention on first grade teachers' explicit reading instruction. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *36*(4), 215-230. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948712472186.

Schultz, K.M. & Rainey, E.C. (2019). Making sense of modeling in elementary literacy instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 73*(4), 443-451. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1863.

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*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/14.

Spear-Swerling, L. (2019). Structured literacy & typical literacy practices: Understanding differences to create instructional opportunities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 51*(3), 201-211. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059917750160.

Traga Philippakos, Zoi A., Munsell, S., Robinson, L.B. (2018) Supporting primary students' story writing by including retellings, talk, and drama with strategy instruction. *The Language and Literacy Spectrum*, *28*(1), Article 1. https://digitalcommons.buffalostate.edu/lls/vol28/iss1/1/.

Scaffolded Instruction

Ankrum, J.W., Genst, M.T., & Belcastro, E. G. (2013). The Power of Verbal Scaffolding: Showing Beginning Readers How to Use Reading Strategies. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 42*(1), 39-47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10643-013-0586-5.

Copp, S.B., Cabell, S.Q., & Invernizzi, M.A. (2019). Kindergarten teachers' use of writing scaffolds to support children's developing orthographic knowledge. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, *58*(3), 164-183. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2019.1617374.

Pentimonti, J.M., & Justice, L.M. (2010). Teachers' use of scaffolding strategies during read alouds in the preschool classroom. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 37*(4), 241-248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-009-0348-6.

Pentimonti, J.M., Justice, L.M., Yeomans-Maldonada, G., McGinty, A.S., Slocum, L., & O'Connell, A. (2017). Teachers' Use of High- and Low-Support Scaffolding Strategies to Differentiate Language Instruction in High-Risk/Economically Disadvantaged Settings. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *39*(2), 125-146. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053815117700865.

Pesco, D., & Gagne, A. (2017). Scaffolding narrative skills: A meta-analysis of instruction in early childhood settings. *Early Education and Development*, *28*(7), 773-793. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2015.1060800.

Reynolds, D. (2017). Interactional Scaffolding for Reading Comprehension: a systematic review. Sage Publications. *Literacy Research*: *Theory, Method, and Practice,* (66), 135-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917718820.

van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in Teacher-Student Interaction: A Decade of Research. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(3), 271-296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9127-6.

Wood, D., Bruner, J.S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*, 89-100. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x.

Zucker, T.A., Cabell, S.Q., Oh, Y., & Wang, X. (2020). Asking Questions is Just the First Step: Using upward and downward scaffolds. *The Reading Teacher*, *74*(3), 275-283. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1943.

Handout 2: Practice Profile Recording Chart

Directions: As we discuss each component, use the chart below to record notes in the appropriate column.

Questions	Core Components				
	Explicit Instruction	**Systematic Instruction**	**Scaffolded Instruction**	**Corrective Feedback**	**Differentiated Instruction**
What are important characteristics of _____ _____*?* *In other words, what instructional behaviors would I expect to see in an observation of Tier 1 literacy instruction?*					
What is NOT a characteristic of _____ _____*?* *What specific elements of* _____ _____ *are missing in Ineffective Use?*					
How do learners benefit from _____ _____*?*					

Handout 3: Video Observation Notetaker

Core Component	Notes
Explicit Instruction	
Systematic Instruction	
Scaffolded Instruction	
Corrective Feedback	
Differentiated Instruction	