Utah State Office of Education
Reading Endorsement Course Framework

Requirement:	**Reading Comprehension Instruction (5)**
Revision Date:	**2016**

The intent of this framework is (1) to ensure a level of consistency statewide among all institutions providing courses for the Reading Endorsement, and (2) to provide criteria for reviewing and approving coursework from out-of-state submitted to meet this requirement. This framework should be used as the basis for curricular and instructional planning for the required area named above.

Course Description

The purpose of this graduate-level course is to help practicing teachers acquire knowledge and understanding of current theories and research that impact reading comprehension and apply that knowledge in instruction. The course will focus on understanding reading comprehension, increasing the range, quality and complexity of reading materials used by students, and supporting students' use of strategies and responses to text. Teachers will build students' abilities to use texts efficiently and effectively to develop and express complex, critical thinking.

Prerequisite: Level 1, 2, or 3 Teacher Certification

ILA Standards for Reading Professionals (2010) to be addressed in this course

STANDARD 1: FOUNDATIONAL KNOWLEDGE
Candidates understand the theoretical and evidence-based foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.

> Element 1.1 Candidates understand major theories and empirical research that describe the cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and sociocultural foundations of reading and writing development, processes, and components, including word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading–writing connections.

> Element 1.2 Candidates understand the historically shared knowledge of the profession and changes over time in the perceptions of reading and writing development, processes, and components.

> Element 1.3 Candidates understand the role of professional judgment and practical knowledge for improving all students' reading development and achievement.

STANDARD 2: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
Candidates use instructional approaches, materials, and an integrated, comprehensive, balanced curriculum to support student learning in reading and writing.

> Element 2.1 — Candidates use foundational knowledge to design or implement an integrated, comprehensive, and balanced curriculum.

> Element 2.2 — Candidates use appropriate and varied instructional approaches, including those that develop word recognition, language comprehension, strategic knowledge, and reading– writing connections.

Element 2.3 Candidates use a wide range of texts (e.g., narrative, expository, and poetry) from traditional print, digital, and online resources.

STANDARD 3: ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
Candidates use a variety of assessment tools and practices to plan and evaluate effective reading and writing instruction.

Element 3.1 Candidates understand types of assessments and their purposes, strengths, and limitations.
Element 3.3 Candidates use assessment information to plan and evaluate instruction.

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY
Candidates create and engage their students in literacy practices that develop awareness, understanding, respect, and a valuing of differences in our society.

Element 4.1 Candidates recognize, understand, and value the forms of diversity that exist in society and their importance in learning to read and write.

STANDARD 5: LITERATE ENVIRONMENT
Candidates create a literate environment that fosters reading and writing by integrating foundational knowledge, instructional practices, approaches and methods, curriculum materials, and the appropriate use of assessments.

Element 5.2 Candidates design a social environment that is low risk and includes choice, motivation, and scaffolded support to optimize students' opportunities for learning to read and write.

Participant Objectives
As a result of this course, participants will:
- Explain theories and models of reading comprehension and how they inform instruction (1.1, 1.2, 1.3).
- Use text-dependent questioning (TDQ) to collect evidence to support an argument or position (1.1).
- Explain the role of linguistic and cultural background knowledge (e.g., English learners, SES) in reading comprehension (2.2, 4.1).
- Plan and implement lessons to motivate and engage students to improve comprehension (2.1, 2.3, 3.3, 5.2).
- Describe links between vocabulary and reading comprehension (2.2).
- Identify and apply appropriate cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies (e.g., close reading, summarizing, visualizing) in support of comprehension (1.3, 2.2).
- Use Utah Core Standards to plan and implement instructional tasks to support deeper levels of student knowledge in a variety of settings (e.g., whole class, small groups).
- Explain text complexity and the selection of appropriate texts (2.2, 2.3).
- Select and use formative and summative assessments to evaluate depth and complexity of reading comprehension to inform instruction (3.1, 3.3).

Required Course Topics

1. Theories and models of reading comprehension.
    - Schema-Theoretic View of Reading (Anderson & Pearson, 1984)
    - The Simple View of Reading (Hoover & Gough, 1990)
    - Construction-Integration Model (Kintsch, 1988, 2004)
    - Differentiation and Inferential Mediation Model (DIME, Cromley & Azevedo, 2007)
2. Reading and writing processes to support comprehension and understanding of texts.
3. Text-dependent questioning (TDQ) to collect evidence and demonstrate understanding of the text.
4. The role of linguistic and cultural background knowledge (e.g., English learners, SES) in reading comprehension.
5. The role of motivation and engagement in reading comprehension.
6. Links between vocabulary and reading comprehension.
7. Cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies (e.g., close reading, summarizing, visualizing) in support of comprehension.
8. Utah Core Standards to plan and implement instructional tasks to support deeper levels of student knowledge in a variety of settings (e.g., whole class, small groups).
9. Reading critically and analyzing (a) content, (b) the author's purpose, and (c) the author's craft to comprehend text at appropriate levels.
10. Text complexity and the selection of appropriate texts.
11. Formative and summative assessments.
12. Reading and writing connections.
13. Compare and contrast information across related texts and digital formats.
14. Textual evidence to support an argument or position.
15. Explicit comprehension instruction.
16. Comprehension differences in narrative and expository texts

---

Suggested Assignments

This suggested assignments section is provided to give instructors a sense of the type, length, and depth of assignments appropriate for this class and is not to be viewed as a required list or as a complete list of assignments.

- **Comprehension Lesson Plans:** Create multiple standards-based comprehension lesson plans to include a combination of explicit instruction of comprehension strategies instruction, vocabulary, reading and writing connections, motivation, formative and summative assessments.

- **Beyond Strategy Demonstration:** To demonstrate knowledge of comprehension strategy instruction, prepare and present a 15-20 minute demonstration on the strategy (including what the strategy is, how to use it in elementary <u>and</u> secondary classroom (activities), and ways to go beyond the strategy).

- **Online Presentation:** Use technology (e.g., Prezi, PowerPoint, Voice Thread) and narration to present a critical analysis of reading comprehension theories and models. This project is an online assignment that will be shared with all students.

- **Professional Learning Communities:** Students use a variety of research articles, books (professional and children's or young adult), and materials (from suggested resources) to help augment their professional practices. Students can participate in a variety of formats (e.g., book clubs, literature circles, study groups, individual and/or group projects).

- **Reading Reactions**. After reading the assigned text each week, summarize and respond via online formats (e.g., discussion threads, blogs, Google forums). Discussion threads should ask questions, compare with other texts, discuss concerns, and explore ideas for classroom instruction.

Core Texts

Brown, R., & Dewitz, P. (2013). *Building comprehension in every classroom: Instruction with literature, informational texts, and basal programs*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Parris, S.R., Headley, K., & Morrow, L.M. Eds. (2015). *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices. Solving Problems in Teaching Literacy, 3rd Ed*. New York: Guilford Press.

Utah Core Standards for English/Language Arts (2010). Utah State Office of Education. Retrieved February 22, 2013 from http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/main/Core-Curriculum/By-Subject.aspx (*Common Core State Standards*).

Suggested Resources—

Adams, M. J. (2010-2011). Advancing our students' language and literacy: The challenge of complex texts. *American Educator*, 3-11, 53. Retrieved at: https://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/winter1011/Adams.pdf

Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts*. (pp. 243-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baker, L & Beall, L. C. (2009). Metacognitive processes and reading comprehension. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 373-388). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown, S., & Kappes, L. (2012). *Implementing Common Core State Standards: A primer on close reading*. Retrieved from: http://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/implementing-common-core-state-standards-primer-close-reading-text

CCSSO. (2014). Navigating text complexity. Chief Council of State School Officers. Retrieved at: http://www.ccsso.org/Navigating_Text_Complexity.html

Dougherty Stahl , K A. (2016). A new priority: Comprehension intervention in the primary
grades. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(6), 627-631.

Duke, N. (2004). The case for informational text. *Educational Leadership, 61(6),* 40-44.

Gambrell, L. B. (2011). Seven rules of engagement: What's most important to know about motivation
to read. *The Reading Teacher, 65(3),* 172-178.

Gambrell, L. B., Palmer, B. M., Codling, R. M., & Mazzoni, S. A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read.
The Reading Teacher, 49(7), 518-533.

Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the research on English language learners: What we know—and
don't know yet about effective instruction. *American Educator*, 4-11, 38. Retrieved from:
http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/summer2013/Goldenberg.pdf

Hess, K.K, Jones, B.B., Carlock, D., & Walkup, J.R. (2009) "Cognitive Rigor: Blending the Strengths of
Bloom's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge to Enhance Classroom-level Processes"
downloaded 5.31.2013 http://standardsco.com/PDF/Cognitive_Rigor_Paper.pdf.

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

Hiebert, E. H. (2002). Standards, assessment, and text difficulty. In A.E. Farstrup & S.J. Samuels (Eds.),
What research has to say about reading instruction (3rd Ed.). (pp. 337-369) Newark, DE:
International Reading Association.

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., Torgesen, J., Cai, X., Helsel, F., Yael, K., &
Spier, E. (2009). *Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices*.
Washington DC: What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved at
http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide.aspx?sid=8

Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
Press.

Kintsch, W. (1988). The use of knowledge in discourse processing: A construction-integration model.
Psychological Review, 95, 163-182.

Kintsch, W. & Van Dijk, T.A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production.
Psychological Review, 85 (5), 363-394.

Liang, L. A., & Dole, J. A. (2006). Help with reading comprehension: Comprehension instructional
frameworks. *The Reading Teacher, 58,* 2-13.

Neuman, S. B. (2006). How we neglect knowledge and why. *American Educator* (Spring, 24-27).

O'Brien, E. J., Cook, A. E., & Lorch R. F. (Eds.). (2015). *Inferences during reading.* Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, P. D. (2009). The roots of reading comprehension instruction. In S. E. Israel & G. G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp. 3-31). New York: Routledge.

Rasinski, T. (Ed.) (2011). *Rebuilding the foundation: Effective reading instruction for 21st century literacy.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Shanahan, T. (2013). Letting the text take center stage: How the Common Core Standards will transform English language arts instruction. *American Educator*, 4-12. Retrieved at: https://www.aft.org/newspubs/.../ae/

Shanahan, T., Fisher, D. & Frey, N. (2012). The challenge of challenging text. *Educational Leadership, 69(6),* 58-62.

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through third grade: A practice guide*. Washington D.C.: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/readingcomp_pg_092810.pdf

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Willingham, D. T. (2006). How knowledge helps: It speeds and strengthens reading comprehension and learning—and thinking. *American Educator*, 1-6. Retrieved at: http://www.aft.org/newspubs/periodicals/ae/spring2006/willingham.cfm

Willingham, D. T. (2006-07). The usefulness of *brief* instruction in comprehension strategies. *American Educator*, 39-50. Retrieved at: http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/winter0607/CogSci.pdf