EXAMINING THE BALANCE IN LITERACY INSTRUCTION

Effective literacy instruction includes both code-based and meaning-based instruction.[1,2,3]

- Students must develop solid code-based skills that support fluent word reading in order to construct meaning from text.
- Vocabulary and background knowledge must be developed along with code-based skills to strengthen comprehension.

Instructional time spent on code-based and meaning-based skills varies according to grade and the individual needs of the student.[1,2,3]

- More focus is spent in the early grades on code based instruction to promote automaticity.
  - Students at risk for reading failure require more time and repetition to master code-based skills.

- More focus is spent on meaning-based instruction as students progress and master code-based skills.
  - Students in upper grades who are unable to read words automatically require more time in code-based instruction.

All instructional time promotes a love of reading and learning.

All Instructional methods are based on scientifically tested structured literacy practices.

STRUCTURED LITERACY PRACTICES TO SUPPORT CODE-BASED SKILLS AND WORD RECOGNITION[2,4,5]

- Explicit, systematic, sequential and cumulative
- Involve a high level of student-teacher interaction
- Include carefully chosen examples and non-examples
- Students read decodable text
- Teachers provide prompt, corrective feedback
- Beneficial for all students learning to read, including students with dyslexia and other learning disabilities

STRUCTURED LITERACY PRACTICES TO SUPPORT MEANING-BASED SKILLS AND READING COMPREHENSION[2,5,6]

- Direct and indirect vocabulary building strategies
- Direct cumulative instruction to build background knowledge
- Explicit instruction in the role of sentence structure in comprehension
- Promote engagement with text through explicit instruction in the strategies most effective for various text structures
- Explicit instruction in listening comprehension lessons

INTERACTION BETWEEN CODE-BASED AND MEANING-BASED SKILLS[7,8,9,10]

Reading Comprehension = Word Recognition x Language Comprehension

- As students become more automatic in decoding skills, they become more automatic in word recognition.
- As students develop more robust language comprehension skills, they become more strategic in their reading.

Together, word recognition and language comprehension interact to produce skilled reading.

ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR TEACHERS [2,11,12]

- **The reading development process**
  - The neurobiology of reading
  - The relationship between oral language development and reading
  - Typical progression of skill development
  - Diverse learning profiles, including knowledge of dyslexia and other learning disabilities
  - Environmental, cultural and social factors that affect literacy development
- **Deep knowledge of English language structures across all language domains: phonology, orthography, morphology, semantics, syntax and discourse organization**
- **Understanding of, and ability to identify, evidenced-based instructional practices and how to implement in the classroom**
- **Ability to administer assessments, and interpret and use the data to inform instruction**

ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE STANDARDS FOR TEACHERS OF READING? [2,13]

- **Provide detailed guidelines for teacher preparation at the pre-service and in-service levels**
- **Prepare teachers to implement explicit, systematic instruction that integrates listening, speaking, reading and writing**
- **Emphasize the structure of the English language across all language domains**
- **Detail structured literacy methodology and guidelines for applied training**
- **Teach about student assessment in the context of multi-tiered systems of support**
- **Outline ethical standards for professional practices**

Additional resources can be found at bit.ly/RB4StructuredLiteracy

NOTES

[1]Ehri, L., Nunes, S. R., Willows, D. M., Schuster, B. V., Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z., & Shanahan, T. (2001). Phonemic awareness instruction helps children learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36, 250-287.

[2]International Dyslexia Association (2018). *Knowledge and practice standards for teachers of reading*. Baltimore, MD: International Dyslexia Association. Retrieved from https://dyslexiaida.org/knowledge-and-practices/

[3]Young, Nancy (2012). The ladder of reading. Retrieved from https://www.nancyyoung.ca/research-and-links

[4]Spear-Swerling, L. (2019a). Structured literacy. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy,* 45(3), 7-9.

[5]Spear-Swerling, L. (2019b). Structured literacy and typical literacy practices: Understanding differences to create instructional opportunities. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 51(3), 201-211.

[6]Oakhill, J., Cain, K., (2019). Supporting reading comprehension development: From research to practice. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy,* 45(2), P. 46-53.

[7]Hoover, W. A., & Gough, P. B. (1990). The simple view of reading. *Reading and Writing,* 2(2), 127-160. doi:10.1007/BF00401799

[8]Hoover, W. A., & Tunmer, W. E. (2018). The simple view of reading: Three assessments of its adequacy (2018). *Remedial and Special Education*, 39(5), 304-312. doi:10.1177/0741932518773154

[9]McCardle, P., Scarborough, H. S., & Catts, H. (2001). Predicting, explaining and preventing children's reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities, Research and Practice*, 16(4), 230-239.

[10]Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory and practice. In S. Neuman & Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook for research in early literacy* (pp. 97-110). New York: Guilford Press.

[11]Moats, L. C. (2014). What teachers don't know and why they aren't learning it: Addressing the need for content and pedagogy in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 19(2), 75-91. doi: 10.1080/19404158.2014.941093 Guilford Press.

[12]Wolf, M., Ullman-Shade, C. & Gottwald, S. (2016). Lessons from the reading brain for reading development and dyslexia. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 21(2), 143-156 doi:10.1080/19404158.2016.1337364

[13]National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidenced based assessment of the scientific research on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Bethesda, MD: The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institute of Health. Retrieved from: https://www1.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/nrp/Pages/smallbook.aspx

These Talking Points were developed by Philadelphia Read by 4th campaign partners - Arcadia University, Drexel University, Saint Joseph's University, Temple University, AIM Institute for Learning and Research, and the Pennsylvania Branch of the International Dyslexia Association.