

Learning by design: developing the know-how to improve teaching and learning
in high poverty schools

Carol Barnes, Kristin Khorsheed, Danae de Los Rios, and Richard Correnti

School of Education
University of Michigan
and
Consortium for Policy Research in Education

DRAFT*

This paper was prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, CA, April 7, 2005. The research reported here was conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education as part of the *Study of Instructional Improvement (SII)*. The authors gratefully acknowledge funding received from the Atlantic Philanthropies, USA; the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; the U.S. Department of Education; and the National Science Foundation. Address all correspondence regarding this paper to: Carol Barnes, University of Michigan, School of Education, 610 East University, Room 3112, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. **Please do not distribute without authors' permission.*

The history of education reform in the US is one of varying and diminishing effects on student achievement, at least in part because influencing the core technology of schooling—instruction—has proven to be so difficult (Berman and McLaughlin 1978; Stake and Easley 1978; Ball 1990; Peterson 1990; Wiemers 1990; Tyack and Cuban 1995). While some organizational reforms have been widely adopted, and a few instructional interventions have been implemented narrowly, innovations aiming at more complex, widespread instructional change have often been implemented quite superficially (Elmore and McLaughlin 1981; Knapp, 1997; Spillane 2004; Spillane and Zeuli 1999; Barnes 2002; Cohen and Ball 1991). But the instructional designs in this study—America’s Choice and Success for All—provided educators with much more in terms of resources for implementing instructional innovations--specified instructional routines, scripts, tools and materials--than most past reform attempts.

The conceptual frame we use here centers on instruction and the organization of its core features—students, teachers and content--in classrooms, schools and environments. Whether viewed as routine work or based on professional judgment (Rowan, 1990; Rowan, Raudenbush et al. 1993) instruction is fundamentally interactive and thus is in part constructed in the “situated action” between teacher and students with content (Greeno 1998; Cohen and Ball 1999; Lampert 2001). We view the two Comprehensive School Reform’s (CSR) models in our study as different, but systematic designs for

improving instruction. Each design links new forms of organizational routines, leadership roles, artifacts and knowledge in schools, to new forms of routines, artifacts and knowledge for instruction and curriculum in classrooms. The classroom and organizational components are intended to function interdependently.¹ Thus, we consider not only the implementation of the classroom level designs aimed at improving teaching and learning, but also the school level routines or roles designed to support educators' improvement attempts.

Each design offered enactors rich resources for improving instruction in their schools: For example, improved interpersonal connections that could provide teachers with opportunities for increasing their understanding, not only of the classroom design, but the work of the entire school organization—that is, what other teachers and students were doing (Feldman and Rafaeli 2002; Cameron, Dutton et al. 2003). And, new knowledge products or tools for collecting information provided teachers with higher quality, more relevant information about their students. Classroom routines, scripts or other artifacts set tasks for students in ways that research suggests are effective for improving achievement, that is, produced “evidence-based practices” (NRP 2000; Snow 2002).

Still novel evidence-based instructional practices are not “self-implementing”. These designs were interventions, developed externally for use by teachers and school leaders. Thus, the educators in our study had to learn

¹ Cohen, Peurach, Glazer and Gates, SII internal document.

how to productively use the resources the designs provided for them. They had to recognize and make sense of them (Spillane, Reiser et al. 2002; Cohen, Raudenbush et al. 2003). Moreover, not all of the performances the designs required of teachers were scripted, or even routine; some were non-routine and had to be created or elaborated by the enactors.² Finally, in order to be responsive to their situation educators who were enacting the designs had to sometimes make decisions about what was most relevant or useful to address the problems they faced in their context (Lipsky 1980; Bereiter and Scardamalia 1993; Greeno 1998; Lampert 2001).

While traditional conceptions of organizational routines have argued that they reduce complexity and thus the need for thinking by enactors, more recent work focuses on the “mindful use” of routines. This work suggests that enactors “create and recreate” their understanding of routines and organizations (Feldman 2003). We extend this idea to classrooms and the content underlying the routines as well. Both school-wide and in classrooms educators’ stance toward or understanding of the routines, materials and tools they were using could constrain as well as enable, even expand their performances. Thus a knowledgeable, mindful, informed use of the resources the instructional designs provided could enhance some features of their effectiveness, more than simply “doing” the routines without understanding them could do.

Hence, how these designs functioned to improve instruction depended at least in part on teachers having meaningful, coherent opportunities to learn how

² For more on this topic of how interventions tend to require that enactors “fill in” or construct some portion of the work, see for example, *Instructional Improvement and the Problem of Scale*, Ball and Cohen, unpublished paper. University of Michigan (2003).

to use them in the interaction of classroom practice (Borko and Wolf, 2003; Crandall, Eiseman et al. 1986; Cohen and Barnes 1993; Richardson and Hamilton 1994; Stringfield 1997; Sykes 1999; Cohen, Raudenbush et al. 2001; Barnes 2002; Berends, Bodilly et al. 2002) Research into professional development associated with instructional change (Garet, Birman et al. 1999; Desimone, Porter et al. 2002) and even improved student achievement (Fennema, Carpenter et al. 1996; Cohen and Hill 2001) as well as work on the nature of learning opportunities that adults need to acquire expertise, have begun to identify key features of effective professional learning programs for adult practitioners (Bransford, 1999; Nemser 1983; Kennedy 1987; Ball and Cohen 1999; Sykes, 2002). Through new roles and routines the designs intended to provide formal and informal learning opportunities that among other things were sustained, focused on instructional content in a conceptually coherent manner, socially organized, and embedded in part, in teachers' practice (Peurach, Glazer et al. 2004)

In what follows, we illustrate the extent to which and how the Success For All (SFA) and America's Choice (AC) designs for instruction shaped literacy instruction in a set of high-poverty elementary case study schools over time.

Data

All the data for this paper are from the Study of Instructional Improvement (SII), a longitudinal study in 120 mainly high poverty public elementary schools, 90 of which were implementing one of three CSR designs. We use primarily qualitative data drawn from a sub-sample of the survey schools, a set of nested

case studies of schools—classrooms, in schools, in district and state environments. The design coaches or facilitators, principals and teachers in the 8 schools we focus on here were implementing either SFA or AC. But we also use data from an ELA instruction log completed by 10 of our SFA case study teachers and 9 of our AC teachers. Given the data the SII generated, we are able to use a mixed method approach triangulating multiple data sources collected and interpreted by multiple researchers to produce and analyze evidence on the nature of teachers' use of the instructional designs (Newman and Benz 1998; Tashakkori and Teddlie 1998; Camburn and Barnes 2004). Through such methods we provide detailed portraits of instructional change and practice, as well as broader views of the implementation process.³

The Designs for Instruction

SFA's instructional design was highly specified through scripts, routines and student materials for teaching foundational reading skills; and it provided clear guidance for comprehension instruction--particularly in the early grades. By contrast, AC's instructional design specified guidance for *student* tasks (NCEE 1999) through core assignments in writing, performance standards, samples of high quality student work and so on. The AC design elaborated student-teacher interaction and behavior through rituals and routines—e.g. routines for formative assessment--but routines were not as tightly scripted as those that SFA used.

³ Though we integrated descriptions of our data throughout the paper to make our findings clearer for the reader, we describe the data, analytic method and rationale for using it in more detail in the appendix. Please see our website for an example of the ELA Instructional Log and accompanying Glossary under Project Instruments at <http://www.sii.soe.umich.edu/>.

Importantly, at the time of our study, AC, unlike SFA, focused on writing before reading.

Success for All

Generally, SFA's design elaborated guidance for teachers on those comprehension strategies that could be routinized, scripted, embedded in student work materials or otherwise structured for transfer in standard formats across classrooms: For example, explicit instruction on certain reading strategies such as making connections or visualizing, or cooperative learning formats such as "think-pair-share". The routines and student materials included in SFA's "Treasure Hunts" are another example; this last required teachers to engage students in active question and answer activities on previously read stories. Finally, graphic organizers such as SFA's story maps could be readily standardized through materials and routines for using them. These specified instructional practices are consistent with the seven that the National Reading Panel (NRP) recently judged as having "a solid scientific basis" for improving student achievement (2000).

A core feature of the SFA comprehension design was assembling students in pairs or small groups to work together on tasks, among them discussing text to enhance understanding. Thus, teachers used the Treasure Hunts and other routines, to structure small teamwork and whole class discussions. Both encouraged students to actively interact, think, talk and collectively formulate quality responses to questions—within smaller teams as well as across cooperative teams within the classroom. In reviewing a wide array

of studies on cooperative grouping methods a developer of the SFA design concluded, "group goals and individual accountability are essential elements in improving achievement through cooperative strategies" (Slavin 1991). According to Slavin the most effective forms of cooperative learning formats, "emphasize the use of team goals and team success"--only achievable if all members of the team learn the lesson's objectives (p. 73). In this scenario, SFA student teams would be rewarded based on the individual learning of all group members. The SFA cooperative learning standards tend to reflect this conclusion.

Thus, the defining characteristics of the Roots and Wings reading programs include students' active participation in fast-paced instruction, explicit instruction by the teacher, repetition, and a systematic coverage of many skills or strategies using a cooperative learning format. In reading comprehension instruction, for example, our classroom observations show some teachers explicitly teaching reading strategies as they read aloud a text too challenging for students to read independently. In keeping with the design, a teacher would identify a strategy she was targeting—using context clues to understand the meaning of a word for example—and then make her own use of this strategy transparent to students by clearly using these clues aloud as she read to the class. The design also encouraged teachers to ask students to practice the strategy with a partner in keeping with the cooperative team approach that frequently engaged students in discussing text. This activity, the Treasure Hunts and other active, cooperative formats provided teachers and students with multiple well-specified activities for developing lower level comprehension skills

and reading level specific skills--skills such as, vocabulary, decoding, and basic grammar and punctuation skills.

But these kinds of scripted or scaffolded routines grew thin in the SFA design as instructional goals became more complex—for example engaging students in discussion that required “higher order” reasoning with and about text. While more complex instructional tasks were meant to replace the structured comprehension strategies as students progressed, specifying or routinizing such instruction is difficult because it requires not only knowledge of subject matter but the capacity to use it with agility in interaction with particular students and the content of texts.

America’s Choice

Generally, AC’s instructional design specified students’ tasks and performances more than teachers’ (NCEE 1999). But it did elaborate student-teacher interactions through a set of “rituals and routines”—routines for formative assessment, for Writers Workshop processes, classroom organization and so on. While these routines were not as tightly scripted or detailed as those that SFA used in terms of teachers’ actions, they did provide a blueprint for teachers’ and students’ work together—especially in writing. Thus, while AC embedded some of the same reading comprehension strategies into their design as SFA did—for example both “accountable talk” and “peer conferencing” engaged students in discussion of text in small groups--writing was the primary focus. The design for writing instruction, called the Writers Workshop, was more elaborated than the reading design, called the Readers Workshop (at least it was interpreted as such

by our case study teachers) and was typically implemented first. In keeping with the AC design, we were able to observe AC teachers' tendency, to use explicit writing instruction focused on how to identify text structures embedded in different genre—narrative, informational or poetry e.g.—as well as on literary techniques.

Such instruction could serve not only as frameworks for students' writing tasks, but as a device for teaching them to comprehend text. A recent report by the RAND Reading Study Group (RSG) drew on research examined by the NRP and concluded that a “knowledge of text structure is an important factor in fostering comprehension” (Snow 2002). The report's authors argued that instruction in how different texts are organized, as well as in methods for questioning and responding to these texts, not only provided students with routines for monitoring their own understanding, but influenced their ability to recognize, and retain important information (Mandler and Johnson 1977; Meyer, Brandt et al. 1980). Likewise, Goldman and Rakestraw reviewed experimental studies and concluded that explicit instruction in how to identify text structures—ranging for example from how paragraphs or sentences mark discourse organization in different genre's, to authors' devices for setting and solving problems--can be effective in improving students understanding and recall of text content. Furthermore, “. . . readers active involvement in creating representations of text appears to be critical” for students' to draw useful and useable knowledge from the text (p. 329). While we found little research on writing as a comprehension device, here, the AC routine of engaging students in

genre studies and literary techniques, in identifying different text structures, in actively responding to text in writing, and-or in revising key features of its structure; all of these qualify as the kind of “comprehension–monitoring” and active engagement with text that improves not only students’ recall of content, but their understanding.

Thus, largely through the Writers Workshop design, the AC model provided students and teachers in our case study schools with sets of routines that had the potential to integrate reading comprehension with writing, embedding both in content related to genre studies and literary techniques. The design prescribed opportunities for students to read, listen to and respond in writing to different texts-- as a method for better comprehending them, and, at the same time, for modeling quality writing. Routines specified student tasks for organizing ideas, for writing extended responses to text, for sharing their work with peers, and for revising that work based on feedback.

By design, in an AC classroom, the process of sharing student writing was much more than the traditional show and tell format used in elementary schools. In an ideal AC classroom students would read aloud their drafts and receive feedback, then revise their writing accordingly. Students were meant to critique their peers’ writing, and other work using rules for “accountable talk”—for example, students were expected to justify their comments with references to text, agreed-upon criteria, or sound rationale. In some of our case study classrooms, as an alternative to whole class sharing, students worked in small groups on this kind of critique, or teachers assigned “writing buddies” so that

students had an audience, and could get feedback. We observed instances where the AC routine engaged students in self-critique as well, through rubrics that offered indicators for where their writing performance stood in relation to the standard for high quality work.

Hence, in addition to routines and elaborated student tasks, the Writers Workshop design provided teachers and students with public, commonly shared, concrete criteria for assessing progress--performance goals, samples of high quality student work, and rubrics containing clear indicators for such work. Threaded throughout Writers Workshop--from a "mini-lesson" in which teachers were directed to use explicit writing instruction, through the student work session in which students were required to be actively engaged in sustained writing, to the "Authors Chair" activity, in which students were meant to "share" their work with an authentic "audience" of peers--the AC blueprint for writing instruction relied upon criteria that was established externally, and elaborated within the classroom. Those criteria helped to frame the teacher's instruction, served as a measure against which to assess students' work, and functioned as a target toward which students could aim.

In other words, the routines, artifacts and materials provided by the AC design guided AC teachers and students through a formative assessment process. Based on a review of "careful quantitative experiments" Black and William (1998) concluded that improving formative assessment in classrooms--that is, a cycle of instruction in which teachers actually use assessment evidence to change their teaching—could produce "substantial learning gains" for students.

Based on the model of formative assessment they derived from this review, the authors argue that teacher, peer and self assessment based on clear goals are critical to raising student-teacher expectations, and to improving achievement. Their model maps on to the AC design elements that guide teacher–student interactions in writing instruction—for example peer and teacher feedback based on clear performance goals, rubrics for self-assessment, revision and editing.

Thus, the AC design created cognitively demanding work for students embedded in rigorous content. But like SFA, it also created challenges for teachers. The design left much for our AC case study teachers to “finish” or invent in terms of planning, selecting productive text, providing generative feedback to students’ work and more

Putting the Designs into Practice: Change Across Contexts and Schools

The history of education reform in the US has been “steady work” (Elmore and McLaughlin 1988) and the influence on instruction mostly superficial.⁴ But our study shows that the instructional designs and elaborated routines for supporting their use did influence teachers’ instruction and their capacity to do complex work with students in the domain of literacy. In contrast to most past reform efforts, instruction in SFA and AC case sites changed and was shaped by

⁴ The effective schools reform, previous restructuring reforms, or the standards reform for example, by intent, often provided educators with guiding principles along with high stakes accountability systems in which testing data was often distant from classroom practice Edmonds, R. R. (1979). "Effective schools for the urban poor." *Educational Leadership* **37**: 17-23, Purkey, S. C. and M. S. Smith (1983). "Effective schools: A review." *The Elementary School Journal* **83**(4): 427-452, Knapp, M. S. (1997). "Between systemic reforms and the mathematics and science classroom: The dynamics of innovation, implementation, and professional learning." *Review of Educational Research* **67**(2): 227-266, Spillane, J. (1999). "External reform initiatives and teachers' efforts to reconstruct their practice: the mediating role of teachers' zones of enactment." *Curriculum Studies* **31**(2): 143-175.

the designs. In some instances instruction in these schools reflects versions of the “evidence-based” practices we described earlier; that is, practices that research reports suggest have a positive influence on students’ learning.

Nevertheless, triangulation of our data, across respondents and data sources also shows that instruction in SFA and AC case sites changed primarily in ways that were consistent with only the clearest, most specified or well defined elements of each of the designs—delineated through scripts, through student lessons or material, through tools such as rubrics and clear routines for assessing student work or through routines for carrying out other instructional tasks. As we described earlier, these elements did not always support the more complex ideals of the instructional designs.

Data from interviews, classroom observations and case study teachers’ logging allow us to illustrate not only their views about using the designs’ resources to support a change in their instruction, but also to analyze their instruction in light of each design. We begin broadly with interview data from teachers and in-school coaches across cases. After describing patterns of change and design-related resource use within and across our cases, we use our logging data to extend the description of teachers’ instruction beyond what our classroom observations can illustrate. Finally we look more deeply at instruction on the particular days we actually observed these teachers’ classrooms.

First, our case study teachers did provide convincing change stories that were consistent with some features of the AC and SFA designs. After two-three

years in their respective models the majority of our AC case study teachers ⁵ reported changing their writing instruction in accordance with the AC's Writers Workshop design. Those that did not taught primarily math. But the reverse was true in the case of SFA where teachers more often reported changing, or at least "doing" the SFA reading comprehension or decoding routines. ⁶ While AC teachers more often reported a kind of instructional bricolage or eclecticism in their reading instruction; SFA teachers more often reported the same about their writing instruction. Likewise, teachers' satisfaction with, as well their capacity to make sense of and use their respective instructional designs, reflect this pattern.

Writing in AC

Our 3 AC cases include Westwood Elementary in Adderly, New York; Redmond Elementary, in Coverdale, a large urban district in Florida; and Bonds Elementary in Sunnyside, New Jersey. Interviews with principals, coaches and teachers suggest not only that some elements of instruction in our case sites changed due to the designs, but begin to show how and why such instructional changes were supported and persisted. When we interviewed AC teachers and school leaders in the spring of 2002, the schools had been working with AC for two to four years. Teachers across all our case sites gave consistently strong endorsements for the efficacy of Writers Workshop instructional design and their ability to use it in their classrooms. School leaders concurred with this view.

⁵ Five out of seven 1st grade AC teachers and all six 4th grade teachers reported changing their writing instruction in convincing detail.

⁶ Four out of seven 1st grade SFA teachers in our sample, and five out of seven, 4th grade teachers provided accounts of how their reading instruction had changed due to the SFA program.

Many of our respondents gave detailed reports about how the AC writing program—the materials, tools and routines--dramatically changed their practice and their students' work.⁷ For example, when we first interviewed teachers at Redmond Elementary, our case site in Florida at the end of its third year of implementation, one teacher told us:

I feel that I'm a much, much better writing teacher. . . .Before [AC]. . . I couldn't. . . I hated doing it. And, because of the Writers Workshop program and the things I learned. . . I feel I am a much, much, much better teacher. . . " (S02).

When asked about Writers Workshop, another Redmond teacher was at first skeptical, but changed her mind. She reported that : "Students have blown me away both years. They can and do very well. . . the children know what standard they're working on in every subject. They know what's expected from them under that standard. . . "(S02). Most teachers told us that their work and their students' performances had improved as a result of working with the AC writing design. These are examples of incentives internal to teachers' own instruction, reinforcing their new practice. As Black and William argue clear goals and support for reaching them can raise expectations for teachers and students alike. But in this school, as in our other AC cases, external incentives were at work as well. Another fourth grade teacher at Redmond told us: "Oh they've [teachers] bought into it [AC] 100%. Because they're seeing the results. I mean writing scores are out of the roof. Reading scores have improved too" [4th-Myer-S02: N411-453].

⁷ Respondents across schools identified some, but very few problems in putting the writing component into practice in their schools.

In the Spring of 2002, this general pattern of reported change and a sense of efficacy about the writing program held across contexts in our cases.

Moreover, our sample of case teachers in schools that had been implementing AC for at least 3 years—Redmond Elementary and Westwood Elementary--reported that in-school coaches had supported them as they first learned to use the AC content, routines, artifacts or curriculum. For example, at the end of Redmond Elementary's third year of implementation, Ms. Lyon, a first grade teacher reported: "I had tons of support!. . . [AC literacy coach] helped me with lesson planning. She helped me actually in the classroom. She modeled things for me and then she would watch me and give me ideas. . . ." (S02, N32).

Similarly, the teachers in our Westwood sample said that the two literacy coordinators had helped them first learn AC writing practices (or to refine them, in the context of classroom practice). Ms. Inge, a fourth grade teacher in New York said:

I spend more time [on writing] because I've been given more strategies to use to help students develop. Prior to America's Choice I really kind of had to learn things on my own by reading professional books, attending some workshops. But. . . you have to really see it in action. And when (AC Literacy Coordinator) came in here I could see her approach in action, and I could see it working. . . . The children blossomed. They really enjoy writing. (S02, Ms. Inge, Westwood Elementary)

Like the teachers at Redwood Elementary, not only do we hear that she changed and that her students' performances provided an internal incentive to continue her writing instruction, but also how she benefited from working with the AC literacy coach. A first grade teacher Ms. Lowe, reported that the AC coach, and the core assignments in the writing design had been a "huge and very

beneficial change” for her (S02). She too had the benefit of working with Ms. Sele, the Westwood AC literacy coach. Generally school leaders across our AC cases confirm these teacher reports.

In contrast many of our respondents gave the AC reading component-- Reader’s Workshop—mixed reviews at best, especially in terms of concrete guidance for implementing it, and their ability to use it in their classrooms. For example, a first grade teacher from Bonds Elementary in New Jersey said: “The positive things [about the AC design] are the rubric: the writing rubric is wonderful. I love that. it’s really good.” (p. 10 WU, S02). She reemphasized her point the following fall adding her objections to the reading component of AC:

Writing [instruction] has changed, way much for the better. It’s a great program. . . . But reading, they just pretty much gave us a book, like a . . . big manual; and said here read this and just do what it says. And that’s not my idea of being in-serviced. . . . we had nothing. . . . (Alma, 1st grade, F02).

Several of our AC case study teachers such as Ms. Alma above, complained about the lack of practical or “useable” guidance they received—from materials, scripted routines, or literacy coaches-- in AC reading. An AC literacy coordinator reported difficulty in understanding how to support teachers as they attempted to use the Reader Workshop routines. She said that even those teachers who were committed to implementing the reading program did not use the AC reading design because it was difficult to manage and difficult for her, the literacy coordinator, to teach to teachers. She explained it this way: “there’s no book that you can look at and say do this and this...It’s almost something that you can’t teach...If you can’t manage the class, you can’t do guided reading.” (Sele,

S02). This general pattern in teachers' reports about the clarity, "usability" and efficacy of the AC's writing design versus a less clear understanding or negative sense of the reading design held in all our case sites—across both the east and southern AC regions.

Reading in SFA

Our 5 SFA cases include Doris Elementary in Adderly, one of New York City's Community School Districts; Gladstone and Gladrock Elementary Schools in Sunnyside, a New Jersey district; and Nightingale Elementary in Freightville, New Jersey-- a more urban district than Sunnyside. We also collected data at Grapple Elementary in Markum, an urban district in Minnesota until the school dropped out of the study.

In these SFA case sites, respondents reported almost the reverse of AC teachers in terms of instructional change in reading and writing: In the spring of 2002, at the end of their third to fourth year working with SFA, only two in twenty-eight SFA respondents had a strong, positive view of the clarity or usefulness of the SFA writing components. Most case teachers and school leaders reported modifying SFA writing--either supplementing it, supplanting it, or otherwise revising it. Unlike AC respondents, SFA teachers attributed their writing instruction to multiple sources of guidance: from trial and error or personal experience, to district or school sponsored writing programs.

In contrast, SFA teacher consistently named the SFA instructional design and accompanying resources—scripts, routines, materials--as a primary source of their reading comprehension practice. These teachers reported changing their

reading instruction or the way they assess student performances--including reports that they do *more* reading comprehension instruction now than before using SFA. But SFA teachers talked less about dramatic changes to their instruction and more about following the SFA routines or scripts for reading instruction. This was especially so for less experienced teachers.

While most SFA teachers in our case studies adhered to the SFA routines, they were also ambivalent in terms of their satisfaction with it, and with their ability to be responsive to their students' when using it: On one hand, like AC teachers, SFA teachers reported incentives to continue following SFA routines because of improved test scores or observed, qualitative improvements in their students' reading ability. On the other hand, they clearly *did not* value some of the changes that the SFA program required of them--staying on a fast paced schedule for content coverage, for example.

On the first point, though a few experienced teachers admitted to dropping some elements of the SFA program, most of our SFA teachers reported following the prescribed routines. For example when asked why she selected the content of her morning lesson, a second year teacher at Gladrock Elementary in NJ said, "In SFA it is not what the teachers say. It's what they're deciding for the teacher to do. So, I'd like to take credit for it, but I can't. They prescribe a regimen. . . . day one you do this, day two, day three". A fourth grade teacher in the same school told us that since adopting SFA , "everything has changed for me. SFA is very scripted, before I could do it however I wanted to. Now I must follow the SFA script. We do a lot of small group or pairs work with SFA with the

teacher leading” (Duna, S02). Both of these teachers were relatively new to teaching.

But a more experienced fourth grade teacher in this school said that while SFA had brought about change in her reading comprehension instruction, in her view these were mostly surface adjustment—for example, modifications in how she organized student groups, or how she used time. Ms. Clay, another more experienced fourth grade teacher in Doris Elementary, New York reported that since adopting SFA she does “far more [comprehension instruction]. Far more”. But she also admitted to not using “think pair share” or story tests as often as she should (her logging reflects this pattern). Further below in our cross case comparison of SFA or AC teachers we illustrate how chunks of instructional time may be reconfigured, while teacher-student interactions may remain, to some extent “unchanged” or at least not consistent with what the design intended. On the other hand an experienced fourth grade colleague of Ms. Clay, Ms. Camp reported that SFA has increased the pacing of her instruction. She said of the SFA design, “It’s more scripted. So it’s hard to vary from it”.

Both of these teachers complained about the pace of the program and the lack of flexibility to respond to students, as did this first grade teacher in another SFA school, Gladstone Elementary, New Jersey: “every three days we have a new story, new letter,. . .new sound. Some students just aren’t able to grasp that new letter and sound that quickly. Teachers’ reservations about the design’s flexibility and pace carried over to the role of SFA facilitators and their

monitoring. For example, a teacher at Grapple Elementary in Markum, a fifth year SFA school in the SII sample, told us:

The time constraints that they [principal and SFA facilitator] have for each portion of the lesson, especially as you get up to some of the upper level lessons: it is not humanly possible. . . . But they don't acknowledge that. . . [Not] at any point do they acknowledge that the time constraints are not possible.

But as we noted earlier, SFA respondents were divided in their satisfaction with the design and in their sense of efficacy in using it. For example, the SFA facilitator at this same school—Grapple Elementary—gave the reading design a positive report: She said, “When we started SFA 11% of our kids were reading at grade level. Now we’re up to over 50%. So obviously there was a need there that wasn’t being met” (Ms. Tate, S02). Ms. Pyne, a new teacher at Grapple concurred: “I see progress with my kids. . . I think the students who are here for a while really increase in their level of reading and comprehension and they just keep going up” (S02 702-712). While a first grade teacher at Gladstone Elementary complained about the lack of flexibility in the SFA routines—

You have to stick with it. Day one, you’d better be on day one. At 10:12 you’d better be on your two-minute editing. . . . And if your kid is stuck on a question, you can’t stop. . . . So when your facilitator comes around checking her watch, you better be where you’re supposed to be (Vick, N257-278).

Ms. Zest, a fourth grade teacher at the same school said, “I’ve seen an improvement on our scores . . .” (S02, N450). Reading scores also went up at Doris Elementary according to the SFA Facilitator, Ms. Zann. Thus, despite their doubts and complaints, most teachers in our case study reported they had

changed their instruction or were adhering to the SFA routines, and would continue to do so in reading because of the improvement they observed in their students' reading performances.

From these interviews with teachers about change and constancy over their first few years of implementing novel instructional practices, we see that the AC design for writing and the SFA design for reading instruction, clearly shaped the views and, as we will show below, changed the instruction of many teachers in our case study sample. Incentives internal to teachers' work in the form of improved performances by students, external incentives in the form of pressure to improve test scores, and incentives from only the clearest, most "useable" design elements; all these influenced the way teachers thought about, planned and engaged with students and content. Likewise on-site facilitators or coaches played a role in how teachers made sense of the instructional designs, and how they learned to use them in their classrooms.

Resources for change across the cases

Both the SFA and AC designers expected that teacher-enactors would begin by simply "doing" the newly designed routines in a somewhat rote or mechanical manner. But both also wanted teacher-enactors to surpass their initial implementation and, with the help of coaches, go beyond a merely mechanical use of the resources the designs supplied (Personal communication, Don Peurach and Josh Glazer). Both designs invited teachers to use their judgment and both provided some discretion in order to ensure responsiveness to students in uncertain situations—AC more than SFA. Thus, the designers

were aiming for, eventually, a kind of “mindful”, knowledgeable, or “higher order” use of the routines in which teachers used content knowledge, planning and informed judgment to work on “situated problems” (Bereiter and Scardamalia 1987; Greeno 1998; Lampert 2001) in interaction with students. In this vision some features of teachers’ and students’ performances were not routine, and teachers’ understanding of content or of why they were using particular design features could enable, but also constrain their use of routines (Richardson 1994). To meet this imposing goal, teachers would need more than the experience of simply “doing” the new routines or “using” novel materials and tools; they would need opportunities to learn from them in the company of knowledgeable others.

The AC and the SFA design supplied this kind resource for teachers, in the form of new roles—in-school coaches--and new organizational routines for reshaping the “connections” or information exchange between teachers, leaders or knowledgeable colleagues. Based on the accounts from teachers across cases in the change section just above, and from interviews with coaches or facilitators, we found that teachers in both designs could connect with one another in work groups or “model classrooms, as well as with coaches/facilitators in their own classrooms. Here, we focus on the use of school-based facilitators, coaches, or even more knowledgeable colleagues as interpersonal resources for teachers’ professional learning—on instructional content in classrooms.

The patterns of interaction between school leaders and teachers differed by design as implemented in our case schools. But these interactions, if considered as resources for sustained learning for teachers, were too thinly

distributed across classrooms in schools implementing both designs. We found that AC leaders in our case sites, more often than SFA respondents reported spending a great deal of time in classrooms working with teachers, modeling instruction--though school leaders reported more of this activity than did teachers. While SFA facilitators said they would model lessons in a teacher's classroom if the teacher requested such a service, most also said, teachers did not often ask for this kind of help. But SFA leaders, more often than AC respondents, reported that they routinely "popped into" most classrooms and provided feedback to teachers—albeit briefly.

Resources for Change - AC

AC Literacy coordinators also reported spending time working with individual teachers to set up "model classrooms" where other teachers could observe a colleague putting the AC design into practice. Both of these modeling tasks tended to be very "time intensive"—i.e. such tasks required intensive work in classrooms on the part of literacy coaches who sometimes reported working with an individual teacher almost every day, for months at a time. The AC coaches in our cases generally tried to cover most teachers during the initial stages of a CSR grant, over an extended period of time; that is they would work with a few teachers, then move on to others. But in larger AC case sites, we heard repeatedly that the leadership was too thinly distributed across many classrooms to reach all teachers with the kind of intense, sustained relationship "teaching and learning" the instructional designs required (Nemser 1983).

As the AC change section just above demonstrated, teachers across our cases valued the coaches and to some extent, attributed their design related practices to them. But at the same time, in the first two years of implementation AC teachers also reported coaches were not able to support everyone who needed help, and AC leaders concurred. For example at the end of Bond's second implementation year Ms. Tait, a teacher there said: "we're all teaching reading and writing. The design coach and the literacy coordinator, just are stretched too thin. They can't reach all of us" (S02, N436). The literacy coach at Westwood elementary, Ms. Sele, reported modeling Writer's Workshop in most classrooms, by her account, "all K-2 or K-3 classrooms" the first year of Westwood's CSR grant—in the 1998-1999 school year. But in doing so she discovered that one literacy coach was not enough to cover all teachers, so the school principal sent another coach to be trained by AC. Moreover, Ms. Calm the design coach at Bonds was not unusual in saying: "We do that [model in classrooms] all the time" but "I have a teacher who doesn't know the program and she's having a difficult time. . . . I'm spending most of my time with her" (S02). Thus the school leaders in all of our cases tried to work their way through teachers' classrooms, but often employed a kind of triage(Lipsky 1980); that is working with teachers who were struggling and would use their help.

Capacity building in our AC case sites also took time: Even as teacher and coaches were "doing" the design's routines, they were learning to do them, in fact to construct them more knowledgeably. For example, Ms. Gall, the literacy coordinator at Bonds talked about the staged nature of her work: "Right

now I'm working with the model teacher. . . . I go in and model for her or. . . . we plan together. . . . So that's a stage. That can be several weeks at a time--up to six weeks." But Ms. Tait, a fourth grade teacher in that school said she did not find the model classroom helpful the second year of implementation, because as she explained: "The person that was modeling was at the same level as the person coming in to watch. So it wasn't like having a person who had a year under their belt modeling AC. So. . . how is this going to help me" (S02)? This "time lag" was obvious from reports across all of our AC cases—cases of schools implementing an instructional design that required developing leadership capacity and then teacher expertise, even as teachers and coaches were "doing" the design's routines.

Thus, while the first year or two of implementation were spent for the most part in learning new practices, and developing competence in them, often AC leadership resources were insufficient to cover all classrooms. Moreover, at the other end of the implementation timeline, in at least two of our cases, resources began waning--before Readers Workshop and in some cases even Writers Workshop had been implemented in classrooms consistently or deeply—that is in more than a mechanical way, or without classroom management problems. Both Redmond and Westwood lost one of their literacy coordinators by the 4th year of implementation. In Adderly, where Westwood was located, the district mandated a new program. Even the remaining literacy coordinator was shifted to the other program. But as we will show below, even some experienced teachers, practiced in the AC writing designs, needed continuing support in addressing problems.

Resources for Change - SFA

SFA leaders, more often than AC respondents, reported observing classrooms and providing feedback to teachers. Though they would model instruction at the request of teachers in two of our three cases, respondents told us that teachers didn't often ask for such help. SFA facilitators also distributed their time across classrooms differently than did the AC coaches. Instead of working intensively with particular teachers for hours and days at a time SFA leaders tended to spend a few minutes in a classroom while covering many of them in a week. Generally, much like the AC leaders, SFA facilitators were strategic with their time and expertise, focusing more often on inexperienced teachers, those who were having problems with implementation, or classrooms where students were taking external tests.

On the first point for example, though Ms. Zann, the SFA facilitator at Doris elementary in New York had served as a motivating factor to Doris's teachers, by the end of the third implementation year, some teachers in the school who continued to resist even trying to use SFA practices disheartened her. Ms. Zann said she would model "when asked": "Anybody that asks me, I'll be more than happy to come in. Most people don't ask, I don't know why". The following year, while she was using her time strategically as did other coaches and facilitators, she specifically talked about teachers who would not use her help or support. She said, "Some people need it but they're not open for it. I really am focusing on my . . . young teachers who are brand new. And I kind of know who my people are who really do their own thing but are successful at it.

So I'm not going to go in and show them my way, because their way is okay" (F02, N600-617).

She makes two points that apply across our cases. An inherited egalitarian norm among teachers influenced implementation of leadership roles: First facilitators in our cases filled their roles with caution. Ms. Zann in particular did not persist in changing teachers who resisted, and she worked in a school with a weak principal. Second, Ms. Zann and SFA facilitators practiced a kind of triage similar to AC coaches, allocating time to those teachers who would use and benefit from their time. Thus, they did not "bother" more experienced teachers.

On the second point related to how SFA facilitators tended to distribute their time across classrooms, Ms. Zafo, a facilitator in a New Jersey case described a routine called "popping in" to classrooms for short periods of time. When asked how long her classroom observations lasted she explained: "It can be anywhere from two minutes, just popping in, seeing what's going on. And it could be all the way up to five or ten minutes, depends"(F02, N504-519). SFA literacy facilitators often dropped by classrooms to check on teachers' needs, questions, concerns, and so on.

But, some SFA teachers reported that facilitators' observations and feedback were not especially helpful. Others said such activities did not occur very often. But many gave generally positive accounts of mentoring and feedback from SFA facilitators, and sometimes saw them as role models. Nevertheless, teachers across all of our cases complained that the facilitators or

other school leaders kept them on a fast paced schedule. In doing so, these teachers essentially confirmed school leaders accounts of “popping into the classroom” to check on the teachers content coverage in relation to that schedule.

Thus, using a triage strategy was likely effective in helping new or struggling teachers learn to use the basic SFA routines. Moreover, facilitators’ routine of covering many classrooms to offer support was effective in monitoring the content coverage and pace of SFA routines. But neither may have been as effective in building capacity for complex or non-routine work thus moving teachers beyond their initial level of implementation.

Nevertheless, the designs organizational routines linked to the classroom design focused teachers’ attention and time on instructional content and new knowledge about how to teach. Materials provided content to inform both classroom and school routines, and scripts sometimes showed teachers “what to do”, if not why they were doing it, or how to elaborate on routines to do them in a more “mindful” or complex manner.

Instruction by Design

Classroom observations and logging data collected over time on case study teachers complement these reports of change; that is teachers’ instruction was generally consistent with the two designs most well-defined and delineated features. Our case study logs show that SFA teachers taught comprehension more frequently and differently than comparison teachers, while AC teachers

taught writing more frequently and differently compared to their counterparts working in comparison schools.

SFA case teachers' logging

Recall that SFA's instructional design was well defined for teaching foundational reading skills. It provided elaborated guidance through scripts or student materials for explicit instruction of certain reading strategies; for students' cooperative discussions around text in small or whole group formats; and for engaging students in brief answers to questions--written or oral Treasure Hunt questions for example. The Treasure Hunts and other active, cooperative formats provided teachers and students with multiple well-specified activities for developing lower level comprehension skills and reading level specific skills--vocabulary, decoding skills and so on. More complex instructional tasks were meant to replace the structured comprehension strategies as students progressed.

Thus we looked primarily at 4 logging measures of reading instruction for our SFA case teachers, selecting those we thought would reflect the core practices in the SFA design for comprehension instruction.⁸ Along with measures of explicit strategy instruction, students' discussion of text, and students engaging in brief answers, we considered a measure we call

⁸ We used a close analysis of curriculum to identify items. But we also used Correnti's (2005) survey measures and considered his results to situate our case within the larger survey sample (see for example, Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks London New Delhi, Sage Publications. Datnow and Castellano 2000 also identified similar core SFA practices - Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. (2000a). Teachers' responses to Success For All: How beliefs, experiences and adaptations shape implementation. American Educational Research Journal, v. 37(3), 775-799.).

“comprehension practice”. By our interpretation this measure would show teachers and students in the 4th grade engaging in a somewhat more complex kind of discourse than the brief answers format—one in which students’ responses would be derived from and justified by the text; would require inferences from the text; or where students would need to explain how they arrived at an answer. The teacher-student work represented in such discourse begins to move toward higher levels of Blooms Taxonomy and represents the higher level questioning that Taylor, Pearson et al.(2003) found to be associated with students’ reading growth. Recall that while the design did not script this feature of instruction, it did provide some examples for fourth grade teachers and encouraged them to break the Treasure Hunt routines and to “fill in” the Listening Comprehension period, thus creating these non routine, cognitively demanding exchanges with students.

We found that SFA teachers’ instruction was generally consistent with many of the core elements in the SFA design for reading comprehension. On average, our cases are consistent with Correnti’s (2005) finding that teachers in SFA schools not only taught comprehension more frequently but were more likely than those in comparison schools to use explicit or direct instruction of reading strategies; to engage students in discussing text with peers; and to engage them in providing brief answers to questions. Our SFA case teachers logged a higher fraction of their lessons as “comprehension practice” than their counterparts in comparison schools--that is engaging students in the more complex discourse for

comprehension--even though the design only encouraged through examples, but did not script this kind of discourse.⁹

Our case teachers' instruction also differed by grade level in ways the design did not prescribe, or even encourage (at least by our close analysis and interpretation of it): For example, on average, our first grade SFA teachers spent more time on ELA instruction with their students than fourth grade teachers--81 minutes compared to 60 minutes. This was due at least in part to more frequent standardized test interruptions and absenteeism among both students and teachers in 4th grade. Our 1st grade SFA teachers also worked on reading comprehension in a greater proportion of their lessons than 4th grade teachers. But, the design tended to encourage SFA 4th grade teachers to focus at least as much or more of their instruction on comprehension as 1st grade teachers. On average, our 4th grade teachers had students provide brief answers to questions—written, oral or multiple choice--in about the same proportion of their lessons as 1st grade case study teachers. On the other hand, as we expected, 4th grade SFA case teachers devoted a larger proportion of their lessons to the more complex, comprehension discourse than did first grade teachers, just as the design encouraged.

Nevertheless our classroom observations show a great deal of variation

⁹ In Correnti's original work for grades 1, 3 and 4, there was no difference between SFA teachers and comparison school teachers on this measure. But in later work using all 5 grades, SFA teachers were more likely to do this kind of work in their comprehension instruction than comparison school teachers. Further, in the survey work when you factor in the fact that SFA teachers more frequently engaged in comprehension across days in the year, SFA teachers do more of this "comprehension practice". However, when they teach comprehension, they do the same amount of this as comparison teachers. Therefore, they accumulate more, but only by virtue of the difference in frequency of coverage.

among these 4th grade SFA teachers in terms of how they carried out this kind of comprehension practice. While the SFA cooperative learning formats, scripts, routines or materials could and did specify explicit strategy instruction, students' brief answers or even some level of student discussions with peers, it did not specify or script higher-level discourse. As we noted earlier the design encouraged 4th grade teachers to plan and use more cognitively demanding questions. But the verbal exchanges represented in the "comprehension practice" measure, along with text selection for productively orchestrating them in interaction with students, was a domain for which 4th grade teachers had discretion and limited guidance. This was non-routine work and would have required a break in the Treasure Hunt questioning routine –requiring brief answers from students--as well as an understanding of how to do it, or even why it would be desirable. Further below, we illustrate the differences in two 4th grade teachers that we rated as high versus moderate-low implementers of this "comprehension practice" during the listening comprehension segment of the SFA design based on an implementation rubric we developed.

AC case teachers' logging

Recall that while AC did not script its routines for teachers, it did specify some student tasks or performances and provided a blueprint for teachers' and students' work together. As our interview data with teachers show, this was especially so for Writers Workshop which included routines, artifacts and materials to guide teachers and students through a formative assessment process in writing. The design required teachers to use direct writing instruction

focused on literary techniques, as well as on how to identify text structures embedded in different genre. “Core assignments”, routines and teachers guided students through a process of drafting text, sharing their work for peer and teacher critique, then revising based on that, and examples of high quality writing. Students also responded to the literature they read through their writing.

Thus we considered six logging measures of our AC case teachers’ instruction again selecting those that we believed reflected these core practices in the AC design for writing instruction--based on our analysis of the instructional materials and Correnti’s (2005) results. Along with measures of explicit writing instruction, and studies in literary techniques or genre, we included measures of students writing extended paragraphs, sharing their writing, and revising it. Based on the design, we assumed that AC teachers would report integrating writing into their reading comprehension instruction—for example, when students respond to literature through their writing, examine authors’ style or identify text structures embedded in different genre. Thus, we included this measure in our descriptive data for the cases.

Again we found that our AC case study teachers’ logging reflects many of the core elements in the AC design, but also differs across grade level. Generally, AC teachers focused more on writing and they taught writing differently than teachers in comparison schools (Correnti 2005). Our cases demonstrate this emphasis and pattern. For example, on average AC case study teachers integrated writing into comprehension instruction—e.g. engaged

students in genre studies, literary technique or identifying text structure -- in a greater proportion of lessons than their counterparts in comparison schools.¹⁰

While on average our AC case teachers used explicit writing instruction in about 40% of their lessons, only our 4th grade teachers devoted a larger percentage of their lessons to this kind of instruction than their counterparts in comparison schools. Likewise our AC case teachers engaged students in writing connected paragraphs more than comparison teachers, though our 4th grade teachers differ from their counterparts in comparison schools more than our 1st grade cases.¹¹ Our 4th grade AC case study teachers had their students revise their original work more often than their counterparts in comparison schools, while our 1st grade teachers asked students to share writing more often than their counterparts in comparison schools--through such formats as Authors Chair, “writing buddies” or oral presentation.

These logging descriptions of our case teachers’ instruction complement the change stories they gave in their interviews. And they reflect the features of

¹⁰ The average teacher in an AC school focuses on integrating comprehension in 39% of their comprehension lessons, while the average teacher in a comparison schools does so less than half of that time (18%). These numbers are from Corenti 2005 which uses 1st 3rd and 4th grade data only. In more recent analyses, he and other SII researchers use all grades and the corresponding numbers are 37.5% (AC) and 16.7% (Comp). Our case teachers do this in about 29% of their lessons. First Grade AC teachers do genre studies in 21% of their lessons while their counterparts in comparison schools do this in only 9% of their lessons. In fourth grade the pattern is similar. Fourth grade AC teachers do genre studies in 20% of their lessons and 4th grade teachers in comparison schools do genre studies in 11% of their lessons. Our case study teachers logged genre studies in 16% of their lesson. The percentage is equal for 1st and 4th grade teachers.

¹¹ Fourth grade comparison school teachers engage students in writing connected paragraphs 18% of their lessons while our AC case study teachers do this 25% of their lessons. First grade comparison school teachers engage students in writing connected paragraphs 3% of their lessons while our first grade AC case study teachers do this 7% of their lessons. First and Fourth grade AC teachers in the entire sample do this work with their students 4% of lessons and 28% of lessons respectively. These are descriptive data and do not adjust for teacher or school characteristics.

the AC design that provide the clearest scaffolding for teachers and students. Though in general, our case teachers used these writing practices in a greater proportion of their lessons than their counterparts in comparison schools, further below our observations show that teachers varied in how they used the AC design, even as they carried out the same routines.

A Closer Look at Instruction by Design

We applied implementation rubrics to twenty-one case study SFA or AC teachers, twice each for a total of 42 observations. We developed the rubrics from a close analysis of design materials embedding the core elements of each as a lens for systematically analyzing the nature of instructional implementation in our cases.¹² Though we found that all of our teachers were "doing" the routines - at least some features of them - even in schools that were no longer officially working with a design due to district or city mandate - still, the teachers varied a great deal in how they were using and elaborating on the instructional routines. Thus while teachers across our cases changed their instruction or were using instructional practices that reflected their respective designs, our rubric data and the logging data also showed how instruction was different between teachers, even within the same school.

These data suggest that some of the strongest and the weakest implementers of the instructional designs were sometimes working in some of our weakest implementing schools. But this range of weak and strong implementers of instruction was also present in some of our stronger

¹² See the appendix for more details on our methods and our implementation rubrics.

implementing schools as well. Only in our AC case in its 3rd year of implementation - Bonds Elementary - did we see very little variation in the USE of design routines. But there, we found a somewhat surface level use of the routines. We take a closer look at practice in our case study schools in this next section. Here we look more deeply at the instructional implementation of these designs in a few teachers' classrooms to understand how and why they varied in their use of designs.

Success for All Cases

In these mini-cases of SFA teachers we focus on the locations in the design where 4th grade teachers were encouraged to “fill in”, elaborate and construct a more complex discourse with students than the Treasure Hunt scripts provided. Thus, they needed to break the Treasure Hunt routine to some extent and then “invent” instruction, or elaborate from samples, through careful planning, and in interaction with students. SFA encouraged 4th grade (Wings) teachers to do this kind of elaboration or invention in two segments. The first segment was expected to occur during the first twenty minutes of each Language Arts period in a lesson called Listening Comprehension. The other segment was during the discussion of a book that students were reading together. These books included a set of questions, called Treasure Hunts, but here again, teachers were encouraged to go beyond the scripted routines.

In these locations within the SFA instructional design, teachers were encouraged to ask questions that went beyond story elements, or text based recall. The teachers' materials asked for a “higher order” use of the SFA routines

based on Blooms Taxonomy, and encouraged teachers to ask questions that required students to make inferences, to explain their answers or to justify them with evidence in the text. Recall that as a fraction of their comprehension lesson, our 4th grade case teachers logged this kind of “comprehension practice” more than their counterparts in comparison schools, and more than the 1st grade case teachers.

We had six fourth grade SFA teachers in our case study, who we observed two times each during the 2002-03 school year. The twelve classroom observations of fourth grade Wings teachers show that a more “mindful”, knowledgeable, or “higher order” use of the SFA design occurred only once in our case study classrooms (on the days we observed). While we observed 4th grade teachers occasionally using scripted Treasure Hunt questions that required students to make connections—e.g. cause and effect—only one teacher reported using the samples in the design to elaborate beyond the scripted routines. And we observed only this one teacher successfully engaging her students in a somewhat cognitively demanding discourse. We found that the majority of our fourth grade case study teachers conducted basic comprehension lessons that remained at text level recall and required brief answers. In a study with similar findings Taylor, Pearson et al. (2003) called this lower-level questioning. The instructional exchanges we observed for the most part represented minimal invention or elaboration by the teacher. Most teachers reverted to the scripted lessons the design provided.

Below we compare 3 mini cases of SFA teachers to illustrate how their instruction varied: we begin with the one fourth grade teacher who conducted the more complex version of the SFA Listening Comprehension lesson that the design encouraged. This was a teacher who developed questions based on samples, careful planning and then adapted them in interaction with her students. The other two are more typical of the SFA teachers we observed—either inventing questions spontaneously; using them in ways that intervened on students too much; constructing a discourse that intervened on students too little; or simply reverting to scripts.

Ms. Camp

Ms. Camp is a 4th grade teacher at Doris Elementary, our case site in New York City. The excerpt below is from an observation in fall of 2002, the beginning of this school's 4th year with SFA:

9:20: Ms. C: "Okay, let's read some more: 'I'm just a plain boy. This school doesn't say I'm gifted and talented. I don't like soccer very much the way everybody else in the school is supposed to. And I'm not stupid either.'"

She stops. "So what else can we say about him from this?" Some kids wriggle in their seats, and a couple look away, turning from the reading group to look at the window or at the bulletin board. No one says anything. "Okay, let's read it again." She rereads the short passage. "What does that say about him? What interesting things do you learn about him?"

(There is a brief disruption by a boy with a sore finger.)

Ms. Camp turns back to the reading group. "Okay, back to the book. What does this tell you about Lee Botts? What does this tell you about him? Tyrone, teach me."

Tyr: "It tells me that Lee Botts, well, that he goes to his classes and, umm, you know, that he's a normal kid."

Ms. Camp points at Tyrone. "Excellent. It tells you that he's a normal kid. Okay what else?"

The same girl has raised her hand over and over and has already answered several questions. Ms. Camp sees her hand again. "Let's get with a partner and talk about this. Get with a partner and talk about what you can tell about Lee Botts"...

...After about half a minute, the pairs begin to report their findings. One boy says, "I think that he doesn't like to be called stupid."

T: "Okay that's probably right. What else?"

S2: "He doesn't think he's the smartest kid but he doesn't think he's dumb," says a girl.

T: "Good, what else?"

S3: A boy says, "He says he doesn't like soccer even though all the other kids do. He's okay with that."

"That's right. He's okay with himself. He doesn't have to be like other people," the teacher says. "Okay, what about you two back there," she says, pointing at another pair of students. The girl repeats what the boy before just said, that Lee Botts doesn't have to be like everyone else. The teacher agrees, and then asks, "What does it mean that he says that the school doesn't think he is gifted and talented? He says that the *school* says he's not gifted and talented. What does that tell you about him?"

S4: "I think it means that the school doesn't think he's gifted and talented," says a girl. "I think the school doesn't think so," says a boy.

"Okay, but what does that say about him, that he would say this?" Camp asks.

"That the school thinks this. That the school does," says a girl.

"Okay, then it's the school's opinion, right? But it doesn't tell you who he is," the teacher says.

“Maybe the school doesn’t think he’s gifted and talented but he thinks he is,” a boy suggests.

As this excerpt reveals, Ms. Camp’s questions were consistently beyond-the-text — for example when she asked students to use the protagonist’s actions or words to recognize and describe his character traits. Her questions pressed the students to think in multiple ways about what the character’s statements revealed about him. Ms. Camp supported her students with repeated opportunities to respond to her queries by rereading a passage, by providing “wait time”, and by allowing them to work with partners. Thus, she engaged students in reasoning from content, and while her students appeared to struggle, they responded as though this was part of the “routine” for class discussion. Importantly, the answers to Ms. Camp’s queries could not be found directly in the text, they required that students draw conclusions from the evidence in the text; that they make inferences: That was this teachers’ goal.

In her interview, following this observation, she explained:

“On the listening comprehension I was trying to get them to infer from the reading what kind of person, what kind of character Lee was, from my story today. Because inference is a difficult skill, in which it [the story] doesn't state exactly, but they give you hints to the character--whether it's the dialog or what he was doing. So I was trying to show the children, even though you don't say it directly, you can kind of infer. . . what kind of person he is”.

But Ms. Camp was our single case of a 4th grade SFA teacher who we observed using and who reported purposefully creating a sustained, higher order questioning routine that successfully engaged students in cognitively demanding discourse. She used think-pair-share in the service of promoting deeper thinking

and encouraged many students to participate in the discussion, thus applying SFA's cooperative learning standards.

Thus, Ms. Camp, used the SFA design as intended for 4th grade teaching— inventing or elaborating from examples to construct a complex discourse with students during the Listening Comprehension period. While we know that she was motivated to do so; not much in her interviews tells us why. On the former point, she explains below how she used the SFA materials as a springboard for invention:

I: What has been helping you learn to teach the way you do?

R: Well the fact that it's scripted does give you. . . more, you don't have to be searching for examples. They do provide that. Doesn't leave much for the imagination, but it is a springboard for other, for you to have your own examples. So if you're trying to figure out where exactly should this skill be pinpointed you say oh that's the example they're giving me. Oh I have other ideas on how to bring this forth. So it does help as far as knowing where they want to focus this particular skill.

Ms. Camp also worked with the SFA facilitator and literacy coordinator specifically on the design's expectations for using Bloom's Taxonomy. She explained, "they want you to use Bloom's Taxonomy to move further on higher order thinking with the children. . . By the end of the year they should be doing evaluating and analytical type of thinking. Higher order thinking, that's the goal." Thus, Ms. Camp made good use of both SFA materials and the in-school coaches to elaborate on the 4th grade routines and scripts—selecting high level text and pressing students with cognitively demanding discourse. Importantly, Ms. Camp was willing to use the design to develop her instruction. And she seemed able to recognize qualities in it that enabled her to learn.

Not only did we rank Ms. Camp highest among all of our 1st and 4th grade case study teachers using our SFA implementation rubric, but Ms. Camp's logging results show that she did "comprehension practice" in more than 75 % of her lessons. A team of SII researchers, and one of the authors coded the text of Listening Comprehension lesson presented above using ELA log item codes. All coders agreed with the teacher's logging for that day; that is, among other instructional practices Ms. Camp posed questions that had answers stated in the text, but also included questions that required students to use information in the text to draw conclusions or make inferences. ¹³

Ms. Clay

In contrast to Ms. Camp, another experienced 4th grade teacher at the same school adhered to some features of the SFA routines, but was openly resistant to others. For example, Clay did not want to prepare for the Listening Comprehension lessons by reading a text in advance or preparing questions in advance. Moreover, this teacher logged less time overall on ELA than her colleague Camp, reportedly due to preparing for standardized tests, her own, and student absences—on average 48 minutes a day versus 127 minutes for Ms Camp. In part this may be why Ms. Clay logged comprehension instruction on a

¹³ The SII coders and Khorsheed agreed that this entire section from which the segment above was excerpted involved the following log codes: A1j - Qs with answers in text; A1k - Inferences; A3a - Brief oral question. Camp also logged these items for the day of the observation. See our website <http://www.sii.soe.umich.edu/> for a copy of the ELA Instructional Log and the Glossary for definitions of these codes.

much smaller fraction of her lessons than Ms. Camp—29% versus 76% respectively.¹⁴

But these two teachers differed in terms of how they carried out their Listening Comprehension instruction as well. Recall that the Listening Comprehension portion of the period required teachers to design their own twenty minute lesson based on examples, the text they select and their own students. But Ms. Clay resisted planning for this more complex, higher level discourse the way the SFA manual and the school SFA facilitators intended. She explains in the interview segment below:

I find when I read, it's my own style, if I read the story prior to them hearing the story, my enthusiasm is not there. The question doesn't come to me as easily. I try to feed off them. . . Ms. Zann said, no, you don't just read it! You have questions prepared! So I tried that.... but that just didn't work for me.

Following is an excerpt from Clay's Listening Comprehension lesson.

Clay began reading Journey Home, by Yoshiko Uchida. According to Clay's interview, this was Clay's first time reading this story. She read a few sentences then stopped to ask questions to clarify the setting of the story. In the excerpt below we see Clay reading and spontaneously posing questions.

Clay resumes reading. In this part of the story, a woman, Ms. Henley, is telling the main character, Yuki, to come back to visit them again. "Deep in her heart, Yuki knew she didn't mean it."

T: Why didn't she mean it when she said that? She didn't really trust, who?

G: Ms. Henley.

T: Why?

G: She wasn't that nice to her.

¹⁴ This may also be why these two teachers differed by exactly the same amount—29% versus 76%-- in terms of the fraction of lessons they devoted to asking students to answer brief questions--either written or oral. Likewise, Camp engaged her student in discussing text with peers more often than Clay, and she logged explicit reading strategies about twice as often.

G: She was asking whether do people like her? Does she have friends and stuff?

T: Why was she asking these questions of Yuki?

G: Yuki said she got the book about Ken and all of a sudden she be nice to her.

T: Yeah. All of a sudden she turned around, Ms. Henley, and she's nice to her. At first Ms. Henley didn't trust Yuki because she was Japanese and now she's being...

G: She's not in a concentration camp

T: No, she's in the hospital. Okay, let's move on.

Interestingly, Ms. Clay, and the SII coders used the same codes for this comprehension lesson as they did for Ms. Camp's lesson: A1j - questions with answers in text; A1k - questions requiring inferences; A3a - brief oral questions. But these were qualitatively different enactments of these instructional practices. Based on the limited data that we have we can see that Clay begins with a question that required students to reason from textual evidence, to go beyond the text and derive some logical conclusions on their own. But before they could answer she immediately asked a leading question that narrowed students' response to a simple text level answer. Her next two questions pressed students to think more deeply and students offered a few responses. But, unlike Ms. Camp in the earlier example, Ms. Clay did not allow the students time to reflect on her question or to discuss cooperatively with a partner; rather than scaffold or support students' responses, she interjected her own thinking or responded for them. So, though Ms. Clay was attempting to engage students in more complex comprehension practice her efforts seem to fall short.

We found this to be the case among all the 4th grade SFA teachers we observed, with the exception of Ms. Camp. More often, our 4th grade SFA case

study teachers reverted to lower level, text based Treasure Hunt questions to shape discussions, such as those we see in the observation segment just below—at least on the days we observed.

Clay began the activity by allowing students about ten minutes to silently read a section of text on volcanoes. Then, Clay asked them to open their notebooks and reading questions from Treasure Hunt. She gave them about two minutes to discuss the question with teammates, and reminded them to “be sure you know how to locate.”

C: For 5 points, what happened, Diamonds, on May 18, 1980?

A boy, J., who is called upon from the Diamond table reads the answer directly from book, Mt St Helens erupted. A Diamond girl, Kristina, helped him by pointing to the text. He tries to read again from the passage but Clay interrupts and asks, “it erupted and what happened? How did it happen?” The students had a difficult time answering the how question.

J begins to read it again from the book, and Clay prompts him to say it in his own words. “we don’t just say here is the answer.”

J: What happened on May 18 was that MSH erupted.

C: How did it happen?

Girl K tries to help him by pointing to the book.

C: Its nice, Christina, that you know where the answers are, but I don’t believe your group discussed enough to be able to answer those questions. . . so I’ll give you 2 points.

C picks another group to try to get answer to “How did it happen?” Two boys from the Smarties table restate what happened, but not how it happened.

B: It happened the night MSH erupted.

C: That’s what happened but not how it happened.

B: it triggered an avalanche.

C: How did it erupt? What was the cause of its eruption? Was it the earthquake?

K: No

This is an example of a lesson that includes the kind brief questions and text based responses that we reviewed in the earlier reading research section; that is,

one kind of instruction that research suggests can support comprehension of text. This activity also involved students discussing text. Our SFA case teachers all reported doing this kind of instruction more often than their counterparts in comparison schools—1st grade and 4th grade alike. Ms. Clay's lesson also shows some attempt to generate "cause and effect" connections from students, something the Treasure Hunt scripts include occasionally (though we do not know if the "answer" to her "how" question was stated directly in the text). As Ms. Clay used her script and posed more text-based Treasure Hunt questions, the class remained motivated and engaged. Students searched for answers, and Ms. Clay awarded points, sometimes for answers read from the text and sometimes for answers put into students' own words.

But, Ms. Clay, who is more typical of our SFA 4th grade teachers differs from Ms. Camp on two fronts: first, unlike Ms. Camp, Ms. Clay tried, but did not successfully engage students in thinking about connections beyond the text. Her students did not react as though the "how" question was routine; the lesson was not set up for questions beyond text level, and they continued to hunt for "the answer" there. Second, Ms. Clay did not create a set of questions prompting students to draw conclusions; nor did she scaffold students in responding to them. And that is what the SFA design asked 4th grade teachers to do with students.

Ms. Fumo

Another fourth grade case study teacher, Ms. Fumo, reported that while SFA had brought about change in her reading comprehension instruction, in her

view these were mostly surface adjustment—for example, modifications in how she organized student groups, or how she configured time. From the interview, we interpreted these reports of change to be more significant than what this teacher claimed. But when we studied descriptions of her classroom instruction and applied the implementation rubric to her practice we changed our view. She was among the lowest scorers on our implementation rubric. Moreover, while Ms. Fumo's logging reports suggest she does the core elements of SFA comprehension instruction in only a slightly smaller proportion of her lessons than the average fourth grade SFA teacher (and more frequently than her counterparts in comparison schools) the nature of her practice, within those core elements diverges from what the design intended.

When we observed Ms. Fumo it was the first day of a new story. Students previewed the pictures in the story and then Ms. Fumo asked them to briefly confer with their partner to make predictions of what the story might be about. This was a design-based pre-reading activity, followed by twenty-five minutes for students to read two pages of text silently, then with partners, and then answer six Treasure Hunt questions with their partner. For the duration of the lesson Ms. Fumo sat at her desk, spoke with another teacher who came into the room, and made a brief round in which she redirected some students to stay on task.

One important point here, is that Ms. Fumo did not observe students' reading or discussions; nor did she assess and provide guidance on answering the Treasure Hunt questions. She did not intervene to guide students even though the design intended for her to do so; that is, to make use of this time to

observe students and thus based subsequent instructional decisions responding to student needs (Peurach 2005, Personal communication.) Lampert (2001) describes this as an opportunity for judging whether “some kind of teaching action was needed to move student work in more productive directions” (p.47). And, in her review of reading comprehension research, Snow (2002), concludes that “successful teachers of reading comprehension must respond flexibly and opportunistically to students’ needs for instructive feedback as they read”(p.34). But Ms. Fumo suggests that the SFA pacing and format preclude her from assessing her students’ performance in reading:

With SFA, we don’t always get time to check the Treasure Hunts that they’re working on. . . . it’s kind of like rush, rush. Day one you do this, day two you do this here. And it’s not often I get back and see if they’re really understanding what they’re reading.

But in her observations, Ms. Fumo does not seem to recognize opportunities for such assessment when they do occur—for example the one in the lesson described just above. Thus in contrast to Ms. Clay who intervened too often on students comments, thus shutting down their responses, Ms. Fumo is a case of a teacher who intervenes on students too little. She does not make use of a key SFA routine--cooperative learning teams. Both teachers complain about the fast paced schedule, but neither recognizes the opportunities the design affords for its more flexible use. Ms. Fumo may be at least partially correct in reporting to us that her teaching is in some respects unchanged. Her lessons illustrate how chunks of instructional time may be reconfigured, while teacher-student interactions can remain, to some extent unchanged.

America's Choice Cases

In the mini cases of AC we focus on the integration of genre studies or literary technique into reading and writing instruction. Likewise we consider the discourse between teachers and students within segments of the Writers Workshop related to a formative assessment or critique process. We look across different kinds of lesson segments because the AC design uses mostly examples of student work, guidelines for rubrics, and very brief excerpts of teaching interactions, but no scripts. Thus the AC program requires teachers to elaborate or construct much of the discourse linking students with one another and with content during the lesson routines: This includes selecting texts to highlight appropriate content for any given lesson. One AC manual explains: "In the literacy program, the emphasis is not on tightly scripted lessons but rather on developing teachers' ability to teach reading and writing most effectively." (NCEE 2000). Recall that a kind of "cognitive apprenticeship" with site-based coaches, among other development opportunities, supported teachers' as they learned to use the AC design elements.

As we described in our "change across contexts" section all of our case teachers valued and used the AC writing program. But they also all tended to recognize the reading-writing connection as a key characteristic of AC. For example, during our final round of interviews in Winter 2004 we presented all case teachers with a text and asked them to "think aloud" about how they would

use it for instruction. AC teachers, unlike any of our others, tended to describe the text in terms of its usefulness for teaching literary techniques or text structures in different genre. Even when pressed to discuss how the book might be used for reading, teachers tended to refer to the text's value as an aid in teaching writing.

Despite their similarities, in integrating writing and reading, and in their focus on writing, still, the nature of the discourse our AC case study teachers developed with students was qualitatively very different. For this paper, we used a total of eighteen AC 1st and 4th grade observations completed in the fall of 2002 and spring of 2003. Our mini cases are derived from five, 4th grade AC teachers who we observed in fall 2002 and again in spring 2003. Given the nature of the AC design, it is not surprising, that the ten classroom observations of fourth grade AC teachers show AC teachers' instructional exchanges with students varied a great deal even as they carried out the same or similar routines.

We found that earlier implementers of the AC design---even those in the beginning of their 3rd year of implementation--tended to use the Writers Workshop routines in a "surface" or rote manner: for example they would not elaborate much in terms of responding to students' work or in drawing out students' insights about their peers' writing. But even more practiced, informed and knowledgeable AC teachers sometimes encountered classroom behavior problems they had to solve, problems beyond those the design could manage for them.

Below we compare 3 mini cases of AC teachers to illustrate how their instruction varied based in part on time in the intervention; knowledge of the content underlying the design; classroom environment; and resources in the form of on-site coaches or other supports for developing capacity. We begin with the one fifth grade teacher at Westwood Elementary to illustrate how she put elements of the AC design into action—in this instance, segments of Writers Workshop--but also how the classroom context shaped implementation. ¹⁵

Ms. Inge, 5th grade, Westwood Elementary

Ms. Inge began her lesson by writing two of the writing standards on the green board at the front of the room: LO): compose a memoir as a response to literature (E2b) (E2c). She spent about 20 minutes reading a book—“When I Was Young in the Mountains”—stopping intermittently to interact with students and engage them in a discussion. She opened the lesson by discussing the authors’ technique: ‘I want you to listen to the way she writes, not only because of the story, but I want you to listen to her good beginnings. . . We’ve been working on beginnings. . . So I want you to listen to how she talks about being young in America...’ (Inge, November, 2002).

The excerpts above and below illustrate the content of her exchanges—literary technique and identification of text structure, embedded in a writing lesson. But the example below also shows the difficulty she had in maintaining such a discussion due to a few students’ disengagement:

Ms. Inge looked out from the book and asked the group: “Can anyone tell us as writers and authors ourselves, what we noticed about

¹⁵ When we first interviewed Ms. Inge, she was teaching 4th grade having “looped” or followed her 3rd grade students. By Fall 2002, she was teaching fifth grade and was very unhappy about it. She told us that very few of her original students were still with her and thus, she was still trying to teach many of the students the “rituals and routines” that came quite naturally to those students who had been with her last year. Many of her students were new to the school and had not been exposed to AC.

this authors craft or style of writing. What do you notice about Cynthia Rylants writing. K?"

S1/K": Most of the book started the same, uumm, when I was young in the mountains."

Ms. Inge: "good." Then she looks at a boy and says: "Did you hear what she said?" He shook his head no and Ms. Inge asked: "Why not? Will you please put away what you're doing so we can focus on what we're doing now." The boy shoved something in his desk.

Ms. Inge continued: "K noticed that most of the pages began with 'when I was young in the mountains'. She used a pattern when she was writing. How did she begin the story? What was her beginning." She called on a boy asking: "How did it begin T? Do you remember?"

He responded: "when I was young."

Ms I: "yes. It actually started with 'when I was young in the mountains.' Can anyone tell us....(she stopped mid sentence and said) I'll wait; the talking has to stop. You are not going to be able to have fun Friday if you continue to do this." She paused for a while. Then asks the group: "What else did you notice about her style of writing; Kit?"

A tall thin boy sitting at a small round table in the back of the room (a bit too tall for the chair as his long legs stretched out way beyond the table) said, "her style was interesting because she used rich language to describe the people and the place." Ms Inge asked if people had heard that and asked the boy to repeat it. There was some talking at this point. Inge asked: "What do you mean by rich language?" He began to say, "she used country words."

But two girls at the writing center were talking rather loudly [*Inge later sent these two to the office; they appeared much older than their classmates and were very disruptive*]. Inge looked at the boy: "They missed a really good opportunity to hear what you had to say."

This small segment of Ms. Inge's instruction on the day we observed is one of many examples among our classroom observations showing an AC teacher enacting one or more the instructional practices represented by the six measures we described earlier in the logging section. For example, Ms. Inge is reading a text that was specially selected to provide examples of a particular author's craft and to highlight aspects of a particular genre—in this case a memoir. Notice the lesson is juxtaposed to particular standards—public criteria for judging quality.

Later in this lesson the students shared their own writing and peers critiqued one another. This segment just above, not only provided concrete examples of quality writing, but based on our earlier review of reading research could have also served to help students to comprehend text of this genre. To do this lesson Ms. Inge had to select a text that would be fruitful for her objective and then use it to construct an oral exchange with students, connecting them to that text productively ¹⁶ (Snow 2002; Lampert 2005).

After the observation, when we asked Ms. Inge what she hoped students would learn from the lesson she told us she based it on knowledge of her students' work, and their "needs". Thus here and throughout her interview she described an understanding of the content underlying the design's routines. Below she notes aspects of the formative assessment cycle in her classroom and clearly makes the reading and writing connection:

So when I read the story to them . . . I want them to focus on what the author is doing as a writer. . . . And I build my mini-lessons on things that I see that my children need. [Good beginnings] was one area that they needed help in. . . .So basically she models that, Cynthia Rylant, her stories. She also does a pattern sequence for her stories, which is an interesting way of presenting the memoir....(Inge, fall '02)

Ms. Inge's instruction and interviews also demonstrate her knowledge of other core elements of a formative assessment system embedded in AC—e.g teacher, peer and self assessment based on clear criteria. She explained how students' work is judged:

¹⁶ See Snow 2002 for comments on the importance of quality text selection for teaching particular comprehension strategies. Lampert (2005) spoke of the important decision a foreign language teacher must make in selecting texts that will be fruitful for representing the language conventions under study.

I look at content, creativity, ideas, syntax--mechanics . . . I give them a rubric score of 1-4. And they give themselves a rubric score. If they've met all the pieces they get a 4. They don't know why they're getting the grades unless they're involved. I think it's really important to involve children in that part.. And, that has changed for me because of AC."

Here and in other parts of the interview Ms. Inge emphasized not only her own feedback to students, but getting them to make judgments about their own and others writing. Based on a review of research, Black and William(1998) argue that these can be critical to raising student-teacher expectations, and to improving achievement.

Ms. Inge attributes most of her instruction to resources from two sources: work on her masters degree in literacy and the AC literacy coaches at her school, who, due to CSR funds expiring, were no longer there when this observation took place. Just below she explains how the AC literacy coordinators worked with her, and gave her tools for documenting student results. She said:

[The AC literacy coaches] were teaching us how to actually work with the students. And I said you know what, I'm going to use this. Because this is just like a lesson plan book set-up. I'm just going to use that to jot down some notes when I talk to the kids. [Now] if I see a student is really having trouble with a good beginning, I'm going to document that, and use that little piece, as a mini-lesson for the next day. That's how I plan my lessons. I base it on what the students need. Not what I think...they need.
...

Thus there is evidence that when Ms. Inge logs "explicit writing instruction" her instruction is informed by her continual assessment of students' needs. Later in this lesson Ms. Inge circulated and talked to students one-on-one during the writing session. Then students shared their work and received comments from their classmates. When she and her students critiqued one another, they did so

based in part on commonly held criteria for quality, made more concrete through high quality literary techniques in texts from multiple genre.

This teacher was able to articulate a clear understanding of the AC tools, materials and routines she used as well as the literacy content underlying them. And she was motivated to use them: AC she said, complemented her masters work. Recall her exclamations in the change section, about learning from the literacy coaches—seeing the design practice in action.

But content knowledge and a more mindful use of these routines was not enough to ensure a strong implementation of them in interaction with her students. For whatever reason, she was unable to manage classroom discourse as a few—primarily two-- very disruptive students interrupted it continually. Though she was considered one of the practiced teachers and did not receive coaching after the first year of the grant, by now, in the fall of 2002, Westwood Elementary was in its fifth year of implementation. The district had mandated a new reading program in the lower grades, CSR funding was gone—2 years ago—and thus the school no longer had its two literacy coaches.

Thus Ms Inge could not receive help even if she wanted it; and she did. But this teacher clearly could have used a “knowledgeable other” to reflect back her practice and work on how she could manage behavior problems in her classroom of 32 fifth grade students—several of whom had been “held back” for two years or more. At the same time, the students in this classroom shaped the implementation of AC instruction, and to some extent, in interaction with Ms.

Inge, constrained it—despite the teachers more “mindful” use of AC routines and tools.

Ms. Nagy, 4th grade, Westwood Elementry

Another teacher in the same school, Ms Nagy also embraced AC. By fall 2002 when we asked if she was still doing Writer’s and Reader’s Workshops, she said “absolutely.” That fall we observed a lesson, in one sense similar to Ms. Inge’s because it included memoir.

Class is having a discussion comparing three different stories they have read. S says, “Also in every story there is a child.”

T says that’s another subtopic and writes on board, “main character is a young person.” As she writes, T reminds students that they will be writing an essay on this and that they should take notes on anything that is important. T repeats that the main character is a young person and says that means, how are they telling the story?

S replies, “from a child’s point of view.”

T agrees and writes “point of view” on board. T asks again for the main theme or common thread.

S says, “every child has had a problem.”

T says okay, writes “problem” on board.

Another S raises hand and says, “I might be wrong, but are they all a memoir?”

T thinks, says let’s take a look a minute. Students start to say something but teacher reminds them, “think before you speak – remember, think before you speak. Are they all memoirs in a way?” Students seem unsure.

S starts to say, “Well, I think that Just Plain and Fancy, that doesn’t seem like a memoir...”

T interrupts, “Why not? You have to back it up – why not?” S continues, “because it wasn’t a memory about something.”

A bit later T calls on girl, who says, “Just Plain Fancy” is not what [other student] was saying because that is something that is happening at the same moment as the book is being written.

This small segment of the lesson shows that in another classroom in the same school as Ms. Inge, the instructional discourse not only integrates genre and

knowledge of text structures into a lesson—this time a reading lesson-- but it also connects reading and writing across time.

But this lesson was also qualitatively different from Ms. Inge's instruction in large part because it was not interrupted by disengaged students or behavior problems--even once. Though this school ranks very high on a "community disadvantage index" and almost 90% of students in this school receive free or reduced lunch, Ms Nagy teaches a gifted and talented classroom. She also has fewer students than does Ms. Inge; only 19 students compared to Ms. Inge's 32. Like Ms. Inge, she had elaborated on the Readers and Writers Workshop routines to invent this lesson integrating aspects of both. But she did not stay within the AC formats to the extent that Ms Inge did; rather in her interview she told us she diverges from AC routines when she judges some elaboration or different course of action is needed. Unlike Ms. Inge, Ms. Nagy spent this entire lesson period orchestrating dialogue such as that above, and her students appeared to be familiar with the routine of such talk.

Ms. Nagy is newer to the school and reported working for a few months with the AC coaches—just before they left the school. But interestingly in the fall of 2002 among our four 4th grade AC teachers Nagy ranked low based on the implementation rubric because while she scored high on using the "principles" of AC she did not use any of the timed formats—a mini lesson, a work session, a closing and so on. But she clearly conducted a lesson that integrated writing into reading and had constructed a higher level discourse with her students, in part due to the way in which students shaped instruction in this classroom.

Ms. Nagy's also logs her instruction differently than Ms Inge's or Mr. Osar's, the teacher we take up just below. Though she logged writing instruction in a higher percentage of her lessons than her counterparts in comparison schools, Ms. Nagy used the AC practices we considered in our six measures in a smaller fraction of her lessons than did Ms. Inge or Mr. Osar. Though she used several practices—e.g. literacy techniques, genre studies and explicit writing instruction in slightly higher proportions than her counterparts in comparison schools,—this was not the case for several others.

Both Ms. Inge, and another 4th grade teacher in a New Jersey case site-- Mr. Osar-- logged writing in very high percentages of their lessons—100% and 70% respectively.¹⁷ While Ms. Inge ranked third out of four 4th grade teachers in fall 2002, Mr. Osar ranked first (based on our implementation rubric). Ms. Inge scored very high for implementing some elements of Writers Workshop, low on managing students' behavior. Her logging indicates that she devoted a higher fraction of her lessons to practices reflected by each of the six measures we considered—literary technique, explicit writing instruction, integrating writing into reading and so on—than her counterparts in comparison schools.

Mr. Osar, Bonds Elementary

¹⁷ We only have 10 logs for Ms. Inge so we read her logging data with caution. Nevertheless, her interview data does confirm that she integrated writing into her ELA lessons "everyday". Ms. Inge reports using literary techniques and genre studies in 90% of her lessons; her students revise or share their writing in 40% and 70% of her lessons respectively. She logs integrating writing and reading in 90% of her ELA lessons. These percentages are all higher than Ms. Inge's counterparts in comparison schools.

In terms of a basic implementation of Writers Workshop, Mr. Osar ranked high among our case study teachers in 1st and 4th grade for fall 2002 based on our implementation rubric. This was due in large part to his precision of enactment, and to the fact that his lesson was never interrupted by disengaged students. He adhered to almost the exact time frame and sequence for each component of the Writer’s Workshop design and included every element we expected to see—for example a mini-lesson, a work session during which students wrote while he conferred individually with them, and the Authors Chair in which students used established criteria to provide feedback. Mr. Osar’s logging percentages are consistent with high implementation of the design: He out-scores comparison teachers—in terms of proportion of lessons logged--on each of the six measures we use to assess the implementation of AC writing practices. ¹⁸

While Mr. Osar and Ms. Inge logged similarly, Mr. Osar’s lesson shows a qualitatively different enactment of similar AC routines and formats. And, the lesson shows quite a dramatic departure from Ms. Nagy’s instruction, even though both teachers scored quite high on using the “principles” of AC (based on our rubric).

Osar, Bonds, 4th grade, F02

Like Inge and Nagy, Mr. Osar opened his lesson by discussing a book: Back Home, by Gloria Jean Pinkney and Jerry Pinkney. The observer notes that students are very attentive.

¹⁸ For example Mr. Osar reports having students revise writing in 49% of his lessons vs. 14% for comparison teachers. He asks students to share their writing in 54% of his vs. 9% for his counterparts in comparison schools.

T: What did we do yesterday?
S: Look at setting.
T: Why we look at setting?
S: We make more details
T: What do we know about where this story takes place?
S: Train station.
T: We start at a train station. And then where did the story go?
S: We go to where the aunt and uncle live.
T: Where?
S: Down South.
T: Where down South?
S: On a farm.
T: What state?
S: North Carolina.
T: Yeah! Remember them talking about the swamp grass.
S: And rice.
T: And they have a different type of language. Do they sound like us?
Ss: No.
T: She is happy her cousin, what?
S: Likes her.
T: And he has just delivered a baby what?
S: Girl
T: No! A baby what?

A reader can easily notice that, rather than drawing out students' insights about the text, this teacher dominates the discourse in this discussion.¹⁹ Though he focuses on his objective—illustrating a text structure, especially a story setting—this enactment of the design is quite rote and mechanical. The excerpts below in which he provides students with feedback on their writing is similar.

Teacher circulates around room working with students. Sits down with individual students and listens to them read their stories. For each student Mr. Osar takes a sticky note and divides it into four sections. He makes plus or minus marks in the sections and at times writes comments. After listening to the student read, leaves the sticky note with the student.

T: Lets see what you got.

¹⁹ Geoff Phelps, Internal communication within observation write-up, 2002.

T reads and writes a few comments on the sticky note. The student waits quietly. There is little direction from the teacher about the specifics of what needs work and changing in the story.

T: When I went to... Where?

S: Georgia.

T: You went to Georgia !!

S: Yeah!

T: Put this on your paper. Check your spelling. Ok. Lets see. Engage reader. Did you engage the reader?

S: No.

T: Ok fix that too.

Mr. Osar met with and gave feedback to six students in this same manner, while the rest of the class wrote quietly at their seats. The subsequent dialogue during Author's Chair, enabled us to see that students could assess whether a story contained elements such as a setting and details to engage the reader. As AC intended, Osar relied heavily on standards to guide his instruction and his assessment of student work. Students were clearly "sharing" their work, but again, Mr. Osar's elaboration of the routine in interaction with students was rote-like, and did not make good use of students' thinking or comments. For example, after a student read his story Mr. Osar conducted this discussion:

T: Did he engage?

S: Yeah

T: Did he give a setting?

S: Yeah

T: What did you have? A Chucky Cheese? Did you have a pizza?

S: No

T: Nothing to drink?

S: No

T: I want to commend you on your writing? Now some of you got questions?

S: In 1998 play station wasn't out.

T: So, what is your point?

S: He is probably fibbing because it wasn't out.

T: Is this your story?

S: No

T: . . . We build him up and then we rip him down. We want constructive language. . . . We are going to build up our writers.

In this example Mr. Osar closed off a potential student-to-student discussion in which one student critiqued another with an insight about accuracy and timeline. This was typical of Osar's instruction. Nevertheless, the students were engaged throughout and virtually all the formats and routines of Writer's Workshop were in place in this classroom. Instructional time was configured to perfectly match the design.

Mr. Osar illustrates a less "mindful" or knowledgeable use of the design's routines than Ms. Inge or Ms. Nagy. This teacher's invention or elaboration of the design was thin in terms of drawing on students' insights or contributions (in part to stay on a pace he felt obliged to maintain). The discourse was rote-like and mechanical. In contrast to Ms. Nagy's lesson, or even Ms. Inge's, Mr. Osar's lessons have a very different quality as does his "talk" about instruction. For example, in discussing his use of the designs he remained almost content free and focused on the "motions" or ON the "surface" of the routines. Further, most teachers at Bonds Elementary implemented the AC routines in a rote-like manner, though Mr. Osar is the most extreme case.

Ironically, Mr. Osar was insightful about the nature of the help he needed to improve his instruction. In the spring 2003, the end of Bond's 3rd year of implementation, the literacy coaches were spending a lot of time in Mr. Osar's room. Though he grew frustrated with their critiques related to "timing" he valued their help. He recounted his confusion, "your timing, your timing; that was getting

on my nerves. I said well come in and show me. I'm open to that, show me." But he also complained, "This year [the literacy coordinators are] coming in and they're modeling but I just felt that it should've been going on all year long. A lot of teachers requested that too."

Recall that for all our cases, there was a time lag the first year as coaches themselves learned how to enact the AC routines, then worked to develop competent use among teachers. Recall also that coaching resources were thinly distributed at Bonds, given the nature of this time-intensive task. Moreover, Mr. Osar had missed several of the work group meetings in which the coaches met with teachers to instruct them about enacting the AC designs. He regretted not having more such resources for learning to put the AC routines into practice. He said:

All I know is that number one you have to stay well informed. You have to make it to those meetings. Modeling is very, very crucial you know especially for the teachers. . . . you can put it down in writing but not until they actually see it being implemented will they get a much clearer picture. . . at the same time. . . [others will] see things that maybe you're not really paying attention to. . . And they'll bring it to your attention. . . 'I think . . .we need to change this.' You know nothing is written in stone. . . . I read some of the information in some of the books and some of the things they left out and some of the things they left in.

Here Mr. Osar insightfully articulates the problem of using instructional designs:

No matter how specified within materials, "nothing is written in stone" and some important matters are left out. These depend upon teachers' invention.

On the matter of "timing", though Mr. Osar conformed his instruction to the time constraints for each routine with precision, it was the "timing" of his questions, his wait time, and the way in which he did or did not intervene with

particular students that mattered for coaches. It was the content of his feedback-- helping students understand how to “close the gap” between their current work, and where they need to be (Black and William 1998), that was weak. These are what Lampert (2001) and others argue are the “problems of practice”, the problems that cut across all kinds of instruction. Designing scripts for this kind of problem is difficult at best. Providing examples and guides mean that teachers such as Mr. Osar still need to elaborate or invent. Coaching was his choice of learning how to do that well.

Conclusion

While improving instruction and achievement has been a seemingly intractable problem in America—especially in high poverty schools-- Success for All and America’s Choice provided teachers with far more resources for this task than is typical in this country. The designs’ school and classroom routines, focused educators’ attention on “evidenced based” practices. At the same time, materials or tools provided teachers with new knowledge about how to teach and enabled them to use relevant knowledge about their students.

We found that teachers across all of our case sites did indeed change their instruction to more or less reflect design practices. But they did this for the most part, in ways that were consistent with only the clearest, and more well-defined elements of each of the designs. Based on interview data we found that the AC design for writing and the SFA design for reading instruction, clearly shaped the views of case study teachers—for example their beliefs about the nature of text, or their expectations about students. These interviews, together

with classroom observation and teachers' logging data show that designs also changed instruction in our case study sample. In general, our case teachers' instruction in these schools reflects versions of the "evidence-based" practices we described earlier; that is, practices that research suggest have a positive influence on students' learning.

But triangulation of interview data, classroom observation and teachers' logging data also showed how instruction varied among SFA and AC case teachers, even within the same school. The difference in instruction within and across schools was due in part to the gap between the designs' goals and the guidance each provided for teachers. It was also due to elements of the environment in and around of our case sites. Finally the variation in instruction was due to differences in teachers' motivation for using the designs and their understanding of content underlying the designs' routines. In what follows below we elaborate on these issues.

Designs and environments

While well-defined design materials or routines helped shape teachers' practice, some of the more complex instructional tasks that each design required of teachers and students were non-routine or unscripted. These had to be either created or elaborated by teacher-enactors. In the case of SFA's 4th grade reading comprehension instruction for example, teachers were encouraged to break from the structured questioning routines and use Bloom's Taxonomy to develop higher order questions--questions that required students to draw conclusions from text or other evidence and to justify responses using solid reasoning. Such activities

presented students with cognitively demanding work, but also presented teachers with multiple challenges: selecting texts; planning questions; productively responding to students', and so on. Thus, while the SFA model intended for teachers to develop questions that would connect students to text in quite complex ways, the design left much for teachers to "invent" to productively accomplish this work. Not only was the material support thin, but other objectives took precedence, and weekly "story tests" created an incentive for teachers to focus on the Treasure Hunt questions.

We found that where the SFA design was unscripted and pressed teachers to invent from examples, thus advancing to a higher level of work with students, teachers in our 4th grade classroom cases most often reverted to a scripted, somewhat mechanical level of enactment. For example, they continued to use only the Treasure Hunt questions to elicit students' brief oral responses, recalled from text. Only one of our teachers reported using the samples in the design to elaborate beyond the scripted routines. And we observed this one teacher successfully engaging her students in a somewhat cognitively demanding discourse, only once. Most SFA teachers' enactment of the same comprehension design routines was qualitatively different than this teacher's.

Similar to these segments of the 4th grade SFA design, the AC design created cognitively demanding work for students embedded in rich text. But like SFA, it also created challenges for teachers. The design left much for our AC case study teachers to "finish" or create in terms of planning, selecting text,

providing generative feedback to students' and more. The AC program required teachers to elaborate the discourse linking students with one another and with content during lesson routines—even more than SFA. In doing so, AC teachers had to productively connect literary technique in different genre to students writing or reading. During an AC mini-lesson for example, a teacher had to select and read a text to highlight aspects of a particular genre, to focus students' attention on certain elements of non-fiction writing, or to provide examples of a writing standard represented by an author. Recall also that the design supplied all the elements for engaging in a cycle of formative assessment, and even a blueprint for using them. Still, case study teachers had to make sense of the new rules, routines and materials as these were novel to many of them.

For our AC case teachers, learning to elaborate on these routines took time, as did learning to use them coherently and fluently in the interaction of classroom instruction. We found that teachers in the first years of implementing the AC design tended to use the Writers Workshop routines in a very surface level, rote or mechanical manner. They did not elaborate much in terms of responding to students' work or in drawing out students' insights about their peers' writing. At the same time, even more practiced, knowledgeable and fluent AC teachers varied across observations based on the students they were teaching and the classroom environment. These teachers encountered classroom behavior problems beyond those the design could manage for them. Ms. Inge's constantly disrupted lesson was a change from the year before when students were completely engaged. We observed several other cases where

competent teachers—Ms. Camp for example--faced multiple disruptions one year, but not another—in both SFA and AC, but more often in AC. These illustrate how students could shape instructional implementation (Kennedy 2005), and in interaction with teachers constrain it or enable the use of the designs' routines. Thus despite the many similarities in their instruction, the nature of the discourse our AC case study teachers developed with students was qualitatively very different--even as they used very similar routines; and even across grade level as the same teachers worked with different students.

Importantly, on-site facilitators or coaches played a key role in teaching both SFA and AC educators how to productively use the tools, routines, materials or other resources the designs provided for them. Teachers across contexts commented on learning from coaches—especially AC teachers. SFA teachers also reported that SFA materials and scripts could show them “what to do”, if not why they were doing it, or how to elaborate on routines to do them in a more “mindful” or complex manner. Here again, working with a facilitator was more valuable. But inherited norms, patterns of resource use, and the routines that our case study instructional leaders established in schools tended to create resource problems for supporting the more complex work that teachers had to do with students.

Three patterns emerged across the AC cases regarding coaches' routines and resource use among schools, or districts. All concern the nature of developing human resources as a key strategy for improving instruction: First, leadership was too thinly distributed across classrooms due to very intensive

work with teachers--work in which literacy and design coaches would spend months with a small group of teachers before moving on to others. They also tended to spread their time and expertise across teachers strategically, using a kind of “triage” strategy (Lipsky 1980) to identify the teachers who would benefit most. Second, the “lag time” for developing leadership and teachers’ “fluency” with the instructional designs was considerable taking two years or more of implementation. Third, once the schools had begun that development process, often, district mandates, scale up plans, or funding issues meant that the leadership resources were removed, before the job was complete—that is before all components of the model had become “institutionalized” and teachers were “fluent” in using design routines. Thus, teachers in their second and third year of implementation complained about not receiving enough coaching, and often enacted designs with fealty to timed formats, but not with fluency. Even more practiced teachers encountered problems and needed coaching help after four to five years in the program.

While SFA facilitators in our case sites also distributed their time “thinly” across classrooms, they did so differently than did the AC coaches. Instead of working intensively with particular teachers for days at a time SFA leaders tended to spend a few minutes in a classroom but covered many of them in a week. This routine of “dropping by” many classrooms to offer support was effective in monitoring the content coverage and pace of SFA routines, but not in building capacity for complex or non-routine work—as intended in the 4th grade Wings design for example. Moreover, like AC coaches, SFA facilitators were

strategic with their time and expertise, focusing more often on inexperienced teachers. Finally, an inherited egalitarian norm among teachers influenced implementation of these “teacher-leader” roles in both AC and SFA, but SFA facilitators in particular did not “bother” more experienced teachers. Thus, in our case sites, leaders did not often move teachers beyond their initial level of a “mechanical” implementation in the first several years of implementation.

Motivation and understanding

While we have argued that teachers’ “will” and “skill” in using these designs could be shaped by the environments that students brought into the classroom, or that episodic policy mandates produced, we are optimistic about the key role that coaches played in teachers’ motivation and understanding of the designs. Over an extended period of time, on-site coaches could help provide teachers with the opportunity to practice design routines in the company of a knowledgeable other, and thus to become more fluent. Even resistant Ms. Clay, by the fifth year of implementation understood the merits of planning listening comprehension questions for constructing a higher-level discourse (based on Blooms Taxonomy). Her SFA facilitator was beginning to pursue a deeper understanding of listening comprehension practice with the schools’ teachers: “Instead of going over the whole process we get more involved in maybe the theory, why? . . . If you know the purpose then maybe you’ll handle it differently. This kind of work was also occurring in our New Jersey case site by their fifth year of implementation. Complex change took time.

In terms of teacher autonomy this study has shown that routines can organize complex tasks for teachers, and improve instruction. Still we argue against automatons teaching students—going through the motions of a routine without understanding it. Our cases clearly illustrate that teachers must to some extent construct generative and complex work with students to meet the designs' expectations. That means they must make conscious decisions to use the routines or tools, and thus must find some value in them. Moreover teachers must understand how to use and elaborate on these resources in order to use them mindfully. In this study, incentives internal and external to teachers' work, as well as incentives from coaches, and clear, "useable" design elements; all influenced the way teachers planned, engaged with students or content and even the way they thought about instruction.

Thus, teachers could recognize the resources the designs provided, and use the designs to generate novel, productive interactions with students. Or teachers could misunderstand, reject, or fail to recognize the design's resources. The stance teachers took toward the designs could constrain how they used them, and reinforce a narrower, more scripted use of the design, or it could enable the teacher to use the design to fill in or invent in ways that actually improved instruction. As Mr. Osar, the most mechanical enactor among our case teachers finally noted in the midst of working for months with two of his schools' AC coaches: "nothing is written in stone" and some important matters are left out. Thus, instructional designs, no matter how scripted or scaffolded, depend upon teachers' flexible use and invention.

References

- Ball, D. L. (1990). "Reflections and deflections of policy: The case of Carol Turner." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis **12**(3): 263-275.
- Ball, D. L. and D. K. Cohen (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice. G. Sykes and L. Darling-Hammond. San Francisco, Jossey Bass: 3-32.
- Barnes, C. (2002). Standards Reform in High Poverty Schools. New York, Teachers College Press: 80-102.
- Bereiter, C. and M. Scardamalia (1987). "An attainable version of high literacy: Approaches to teaching higher-order skills in reading and writing." Curriculum Inquiry **17**(1): 9-30.
- Bereiter, C. and M. Scardamalia (1993). Surpassing Ourselves: An Inquiry into the Nature and Implications of Expertise. Chicago, Open Court.
- Berends, M., S. Bodilly, et al. (2002). Facing the challenge of whole-school reform: New American Schools after a decade. Santa Monica, RAND.
- Berman, P. and M. W. McLaughlin (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change. Santa Monica, CA, The Rand Corporation.
- Black, P. and D. William (1998). "Assessment and Classroom Learning." Assessment in Education(5(1)).
- Borko, H., S. Wollf, et al. (2003). "Schools in transition: Reform efforts and school capacity in Washington state." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis **25**(2): 171-203.
- Bransford, J., A. L. Brown, et al. (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.
- Camburn, E. and C. Barnes (2004). "Assessing the validity of a language arts instruction log through triangulation." Elementary School Journal **105**: 49-74.
- Cameron, K., J. Dutton, et al. (2003). "Positive Organizational Leadership: Meet the Movement." Journal of Management Inquiry **f12**(3): 266-271.
- Cohen, D. and D. Ball (1999). Instruction, Capacity and Improvement. CPRE Research Report Series RR-43.
- Cohen, D. and C. Barnes (1993). Pedagogy and policy. Teaching for Understanding: Challenges for Policy and Practice. D. Cohen, M. W. McLaughlin and J. Talbert. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc: 207-239.
- Cohen, D. and H. Hill (2001). Learning Policy: When State Education Reform Works, Yale University Press.
- Cohen, D., S. W. Raudenbush, et al. (2003). "Resources, Instruction, and Research." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.

- Cohen, D. K. and D. L. Ball (1991). "Policy and Practice: An overview." Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis(12(3)).
- Cohen, D. K., S. Raudenbush, et al. (2001). Educational resources, instruction, and research. Education, evaluation, and randomized trials. R. Boruch and F. Mosteller. New York, Brookings Institute.
- Correnti, R. (2005). Literacy instruction in CSR schools: Consequences of design specification on teacher practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Crandall, D., J. Eiseman, et al. (1986). "Strategic planning issues that bear on the success of school improvement efforts." Educational Administration Quarterly **22**(3): 21-53.
- Desimone, L., A. Porter, et al. (2002). "Does professional development change teachers' instruction? Results from a three-year study." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis **24**: 81-112.
- Dunkin, M. and B. Biddle (1974). The study of teaching. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1979). "Effective schools for the urban poor." Educational Leadership **37**: 17-23.
- Elmore, R. and M. McLaughlin (1981). Strategic Choice in Federal Policy: The Compliance-Assistance Trade-off. Policymaking in Education. A. Lieberman and M. McLaughlin. Chicago, Chicago University Press: 159-94.
- Elmore, R. F. and M. W. McLaughlin (1988). Steady work: Policy, practice and the reform of American education, Rand Corporation.
- Feldman, M. S. (2003). "A performative perspective on stability and change in organizational routines." Industrial and Corporate Change **12**(4): 727-752.
- Feldman, M. and A. Rafaeli (2002). "Organizational routines as sources of connections and understanding." Journal of Management Studies **39**(3): 309-331.
- Fennema, E., T. Carpenter, et al. (1996). "A longitudinal study of learning to use children's thinking in mathematics instruction." Journal for research in mathematics education **27**: 403-434.
- Garet, M., B. Birman, et al. (1999). Designing effective professional development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Education.
- Goldman, S. R. and J. John A. Rakestraw (2002). Structural aspects of constructing meaning from text. Handbook of Reading Research. M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson and R. Barr. Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. **II**.
- Greeno, J. G. (1998). "The situativity of knowing, learning and research." American Psychologist **53**(1): 5-26.
- Hawkins, D. (1974). The informed visions: Essays on learning and human nature. New York, Agathon Press.

- Kennedy, M. M. (1987). "Inexact sciences: Professional education and the development of expertise." Review of research in education **14**: 133-167.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2005). "From Teacher Quality to Quality Teaching." Educational Leadership(63(6)).
- Knapp, M. S. (1997). "Between systemic reforms and the mathematics and science classroom: The dynamics of innovation, implementation, and professional learning." Review of Educational Research **67**(2): 227-266.
- Lampert, M. (2001). Teaching Problems and the Problems of Teaching. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Lampert, M. (2005). Language and Teaching: What is There to Teach? Teaching the Disciplines and the Discipline of Teaching, University of Michigan.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York, NY, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Madden, N. (2000). Success for All: Reading Roots Teacher's Manual, Volume 1, Success for All Foundation, Inc.
- Madden, N. and N. Cummings (2000). Success for All: Principal's and Facilitator's Manual, Success for All Foundation, Inc.
- Mandler, J. M. and N. S. Johnson (1977). "Remembrance of things parsed: Story structure and recall." Cognitive Psychology **9**: 111-151.
- Meyer, J. J., D. M. Brandt, et al. (1980). "Use of top-level structure in text: Key for reading comprehension of ninth-grade students." Reading Research Quarterly **16**: 72-103.
- NCEE (2000). America's Choice: Comprehensive Reform Designs. Washington, D.C., National Center on Education and the Economy.
- NCEE, N. S. P. L. C. (1999). Reading and Writing Grade by Grade. University of Pittsburgh, National Center on Education and the Economy.
- Nemser, S. F. (1983). Learning to teach. Handbook of teaching and policy. L. S. Shulman and G. Sykes. New York, Longman.
- Newman, I. and C. R. Benz (1998). Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum. Carbondale and Edwardsville, Southern Illinois University Press.
- NRP (2000). Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction, National Reading Panel.
- Peterson, P. L. (1990). "Doing more in the same amount of time: Cathy Swift." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis **12**(3): 261-281.
- Peurach, D., J. Glazer, et al. (2004). Supporting instructional improvement: Teacher learning in comprehensive school reform. Washington, D.C., National Clearinghouse on Comprehensive School Reform.
- Purkey, S. C. and M. S. Smith (1983). "Effective schools: A review." The Elementary School Journal **83**(4): 427-452.

- Richardson, V. (1994). The consideration of teachers' beliefs. Teacher change and the staff development process: A case in reading instruction. V. Richardson. New York and London, Teachers College Press: 90-109.
- Richardson, V. and M. L. Hamilton (1994). The practical-argument staff development process. Teacher change and the staff development process. V. Richardson. New York and London, Teachers College Press: 109-135.
- Rowan, B., R. Correnti, et al. (2002). "What large-scale survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from The Prospects Study of Elementary Schools." Teachers College Record **104**(8): 1525-1567.
- Rowan, B. (1990). Applying conceptions of teaching to organizational reform. Restructuring Schools: The next generation of educational reform. R. F. E. A. Associates. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc.: 31-59.
- Rowan, B., S. W. Raudenbush, et al. (1993). "Teaching as a nonroutine task: Implications for the management of schools." Educational Administration Quarterly **29**(4): 479-500.
- Slavin, R. E. (1991). "Synthesis of research on cooperative learning." Educational Leadership **48**(February): 71-77.
- Snow, C. (2002). Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension, RAND Reading Study Group.
- Spillane, J. P. (2004). Standards deviation: How schools misunderstand education policy. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Spillane, J., B. Reiser, et al. (2002). "Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research." Review of Educational Research **72**(3): 387-431.
- Spillane, J. and J. Zeuli (1999). "Reform and teaching: Exploring patterns of practice in the context of national and state mathematics reform." Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis **21**(1): 1-27.
- Stake, R. and J. Easley (1978). Case studies in science education. Champaign, IL, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
- Stringfield, S. (1997). "Research on effective instruction for at-risk students: Implications for the St. Louis public schools." Journal of Negro Education **66**(3): 258-288.
- Sykes, G. (1999). Teacher and student learning: Strengthening their connection. Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Policy and Practice. L. Sykes, G., C. King, et al. (2002). Models of preparation for the professions: Implications for educational leadership. The principal challenge: Leading and managing schools in an era of accountability. M. S. Tucker and J. B. Coddling. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, SAGE Publications.

- Taylor, B., P. D. Pearson, et al. (2003). "Reading Growth in High-Poverty Classrooms: The Influence of Teacher Practices that Encourage Cognitive Engagement in Literacy Learning." The Elementary School Journal(104(1)).
- Tyack, D. and L. Cuban (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Wiemers, N. J. (1990). "Transformation and accommodation: a case study of Joe Scott." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis **12**(3): 281-293.

Appendix A

Data and Methods

Interviews with teachers, observations of classroom practice and the instructional logs were designed to provide a unique view into the dynamic, interactive, instructional process. For each classroom observation, we generated four kinds of evidence: 1) Language Arts logs completed by the teacher, 2) narrative descriptions of instruction from a trained observer, 3) post-observation interviews with teachers; and 4) interviews with school leaders. Both the observation guide and the *Language Arts Log*¹ were developed to focus on such questions as: What content did the teacher work on with students? What did the student do in particular content areas? What material did the student use? And, what practices did the teacher use? The interviews focused on why and how teachers did what we observed, as well as what resources supported them as they tried to implement the designs. Interviews with school leaders provide another, wider view on teachers' implementation of instructional designs. In preparation for analyses, the SII study team transcribed, cleaned, coded and entered all interview text into a NUD*ist database.

A team of SII researchers coded all observations using items from the ELA's log. In this way we could compare teachers' reports of ELA practices used, as reported on their logs, with our reports. Two coders reconciled

¹ See <http://www.sii.soe.umich.edu/> for these instruments.

disagreements and then we entered the “canonical” version into a NUD*ist data base.

Though we coded observations using all of the log items, for our analysis we looked primarily at 4 logging measures of reading instruction for our SFA case teachers, selecting those we thought would reflect the core practices in the SFA design for comprehension instruction² We mapped the logging measures to the SFA design for comprehension: first, explicit strategy instruction—for example, a teacher demonstrates or explains a strategy to students much as we would observe during the Listening Comprehension segment of the SFA design. Second, we considered students discussing text in small or whole group formats—for example, we might observe this as students discuss their Treasure Hunt questions in teams, or during think-pair-share. Third, we looked at students engaging in brief answers--written or oral—for example, a teacher asks students to answer brief Treasure Hunt questions during a classroom discussion or to fill in blanks for the Treasure Hunt written activity. We might also expect to observe this as a student demonstrates understanding of key vocabulary when writing “meaningful sentences”. Finally we considered a measure of “comprehension practice”—for example, teachers and students engaging in a more complex kind of discourse in which students’ responses would be derived from and justified by the text; would require inferences; or where students would need to explain how they arrived at an answer. The teacher-student work represented in such discourse is at the higher levels of Blooms Taxonomy, and

² We selected the measures through a close analysis of the SFA curriculum and in conjunction with Correnti’s (2005) survey measures, which we considered per Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie (1998).

while the design did not script this feature of instruction, it did provide some examples for fourth grade teachers and encouraged them to deviate from or fill in the Treasure Hunt routines, thus creating these non routine, cognitively demanding exchanges with students such as described by Taylor, Pearson, et al (2003) as teaching for cognitive engagement.

We considered six logging measures of our AC case teachers' instruction selecting those that reflected the core practices in the AC design for writing instruction (see footnote 2): 1) explicit instruction in writing—e.g. a teacher explains to students how to write or revise their writing using an author's technique, or comments on how a student might improve (something we would expect to find in the mini lesson segment, or the work session of Writers workshop); 2) literary techniques and genre studies—e.g. students work to identify text structures embedded in different genre or author's techniques (also something we would expect to observe students doing in writers workshop); 3) integrating writing into comprehension instruction--e.g. when students, respond to literature through their writing, examine authors style or identify text structures embedded in different genre—narrative, informational or poetry. We also considered measures that reflect the workshop elements of 4) revising and 5) sharing writing with others. Recall from our description that in AC classrooms the process of sharing and then revising one's writing meant students' work was critiqued by their peers and their teacher based on clear criteria, then revised based on these assessments and the students' self assessments. Finally, we assumed the writing workshop process would require students to do 6) extensive

writing. In our case study observation data, we observed this extended writing—on some occasions even in the lower elementary grades, where some students were writing narratives of up to two pages.

The excerpts of classroom observations that we use to illustrate the particular practices described above are segments in which there was agreement between the teacher’s reporting and our coding. For example, where we show an SFA teacher engaging students in answering questions with brief answers or discussing text with peers, that excerpt came from a lesson in which the teacher logged those practices and our researchers also coded those practices.

In order to systematically assess teachers’ implementation of the designs we developed two rubrics, based on the structures and expectations of the SFA and AC designs. We used various manuals and documents produced by SFA and AC to select and describe key elements of instruction. For each design we developed an extensive rubric specifying practices and the observable behaviors that we would expect teachers and students to do if these practices were enacted in the ideal manner, per the designers’ intent, or in ways that were less than the ideal. See Appendix B for the SFA rubric.

We systematically applied this rubric to forty-two, out of a total of forty-four SFA and AC observations conducted during the 2002-03 school year. We assessed twelve SFA teachers’ observations in the fall 2002 and again in the spring 2003. We did the same for nine AC teachers in the fall and spring of the 2002-03 school year. We selected these forty-two observations from the 2002-03 school year because there were more teachers observed in fall 02 who were also

observed in spring 03, than in the winter 04 data, thus allowing us more opportunities to track changes in instruction.

Applying the rubric to the set of observations provided yet another independent interpretation of how the log codes applied to the instruction described in the observations, with the added measure of how instruction reflected the designs' intent. The three authors served as raters. Two raters assessed each observation independently and then the three raters conferred to reconcile scores. We ranked these scores and compared them over time, within grade levels, schools, and designs. Teachers' rubric scores generally reflected teachers' logging patterns.

We generated descriptive statistics for all SFA and AC teachers using log data collected over the 2002-03 school year. A total of 7,174 logs for SFA first and fourth grade teachers and 9,575 for AC teachers of the same grades were collected during that time. In total 16,349 logs were collected between 2002 and 2003. From those 16,349 logs 7,262 correspond to first grade SFA and AC teachers and 9,087 correspond to fourth grade SFA and AC teachers.

We generated descriptive statistics on 24 case study teachers for the selected log items or measures we thought included the core elements of AC's writing design and SFA's reading comprehension design--based on our interpretation of the designs, and based on the results of Correnti's (2005) study. From those 24 case study teachers, we worked with 19 of them because they were teaching first or fourth grade students, which were our main interest group. The SFA and AC teachers included in our case study sample completed at least

8 logs, but an average of 25 logs, over the course of one year. In total, our SFA first and fourth grade case study teachers completed 240 logs, while our AC case study teachers completed a total of 481 logs (first and fourth grade only).

We triangulated these case data--from interviews with teachers and school leaders, with observational data of instruction by case study teachers, and with their instruction logging. We were thus able to describe teachers' implementation of instructional designs beyond what we could learn from interviews or observations alone. Though the number of logs we collected for our case teachers varies, the logs provide a broad descriptive view of these teachers' instruction, while observations and interviews offer a closer, more detailed view on the days we were in classrooms. For this paper we use:

- Observation data on twelve SFA teachers and nine AC teachers focusing on the F02-S03 school year
- A total of 16,349 logs for first and fourth grade teachers. From those, 7,262 correspond to first grade teachers and 9,087 correspond to fourth grade teachers
- Logging data on 10 SFA and 9 AC teachers for the F02-S03 school year [teachers with first and fourth grade students]
- Teacher and school leader interview data on thirty-three teachers—both upper and lower elementary grades--and thirty leaders who were interviewed in the spring of 2002, the fall of 2002, the spring of 2003 and winter 04. Respondents worked in one of five SFA schools or three AC schools, or comparison schools.

So, from our logging data we learned which practices teachers reported doing and how often. We were able to closely study those practices which were most

prevalent and which were specified by the design, by applying our rubric and using our understanding of each instructional design. Our interview data enabled us to inquire into the type of resources teachers used (or didn't use) to support learning the new practices. Our interviews with coaches and other school leaders contributed further to our understanding of the resources for learning available to teachers. These school level interviews also provided a broader view of implementation.

- Cohen, D., S. W. Raudenbush, et al. (2003). "Resources, Instruction, and Research." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.
- Correnti, R. (2005). Literacy instruction in CSR schools: Consequences of design specification on teacher practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Dunkin, M. and B. Biddle (1974). The study of teaching. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hawkins, D. (1974). The informed visions: Essays on learning and human nature. New York, Agathon Press.
- Rowan, B., R. Correnti, et al. (2002). "What large-scale survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from The Prospects Study of Elementary Schools." Teachers College Record **104**(8): 1525-1567.
- Taylor, B., P. D. Pearson, et al. (2003). "Reading Growth in High-Poverty Classrooms: The Influence of Teacher Practices that Encourage Cognitive Engagement in Literacy Learning." The Elementary School Journal(104(1)).

Appendix B

SFA Implementation Rubric

Teacher name/grade/school:	Day of lesson:	Books used for instruction; i.e. StaR story/Shared Story, Listening Comprehension read-aloud/Reading Together book:	Learning Objective, if stated or posted:	Special notes:	Date of obs.:
Expected instructional practices and student behaviors.	Cooperative Learning A3b Discussed text with peers A3c Did a think-aloud or explained how they applied a skill or strategy A3d Generated questions about text		Standards		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practice Active Listening • Help/encourage each other. • Everyone participates. • Explain your ideas/Tell why. • Complete tasks. 		
Fidelity or "use" of the design.	0 N= Not in Place, Not observed	1 D= In Development or Partial	2 P= In Place	3 R= Refined	

Teacher uses Cooperative Learning : -Think-Pair-Share, Buddy Buzz -Partner reading - Discuss w/peers, - Standards referred to and used. Team points awarded.		Used minimally, such as only asking for Active Listening or only for Partner Reading. Students are usually called on to answer one at a time w/o opportunities for partner interaction. (A3b, A3c, and A3d not observed.)	Used well as specified by design sometimes, but not at others. Opportunities for partner interaction are used occasionally, but some opportunities are not utilized. Points are awarded to teams. (A3b, A3c, or A3d observed at least 1x)	Used multiple times or for substantial chunks of time throughout Reading Block, particularly during discussions, frequently allowing students to confer with one another. Teacher observes students during group work. Teacher refers to standards, i.e. explain your ideas. (A3b, A3c, or A3d observed frequently.)
Students engage in cooperative learning practices: helping peers, completing tasks with partners, explaining ideas.	Students' score should be the same as the teacher's, or higher.	One or two examples of students demonstrating 1 standard or routine. See standards listed above. (A3b, A3c, and A3d not observed. See codes above.)	Three or more examples of students demonstrating one or more standards or routines. (A3b, A3c, or A3d observed at least once. See codes above.)	Students were highly interactive and collaborative in their work. Evidence of several standards being enacted and routines being in place. (A3b, A3c, or A3d observed frequently. See codes above.)

Students' behavior and classroom management.	Instruction repeatedly interrupted and modified because of behavior problems. (0)	Several disruptions by multiple students. Instruction gets accomplished, though interrupted often. (.5)	Minimal disruptive behavior – limited to a few students. Minimal disruption to instructional flow. (1.0)	No disruptive or uncooperative behavior noted in observation. Instruction is uninterrupted. (1.5)
Additional observations. -.5 = no 0 = unsure +.5 = yes	Was the class motivated and engaged?	Did the language arts period appear to be well-planned?	Did the period include multiple activities, including, writing, comprehension, word analysis, vocabulary?	Were the teacher's interactions with students positive and encouraging?

Comprehension-Roots SFA Manuals and Self-Assessment checklists were used as resources to devise this rubric.	1st grade Comprehension strategies			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding purpose for reading. • Previewing. (A1b) • Monitoring comprehension. (A1f) • Summarizing. (A1q) 			
Fidelity or "use" of the design. (N,D,P,R= SFA implementation levels)	0 N= Not in Place	1 D= In Development/Partial Indicate whether teacher appeared to fill in, invent, supplant, or over do certain activities, therefore, not doing all that was expected by the design.	2 P= In Place	3 R= Refined

<p>1st grade Comprehension Roots teachers spend the first 20 minutes doing StaR (Story telling and retelling). The goals for this time include nurturing a love of reading, helping students understand conventions of print, learn vocabulary, develop oral language and listening skills, and to teach comprehension strategies (Madden 2000). This is followed by 50 minutes of Shared Stories. There are four metacognitive strategies taught in Reading Roots Shared Stories: Understanding the purpose for reading, Previewing, Monitoring for meaning, and Summarizing. Teachers are expected to revisit each of these strategies throughout subsequent Shared Story lessons. Students answer Shared Treasure questions (comprehension) during this time.</p> <p>A1a Prior knowledge A1b Predictions, preview A1c Vocab/comp A1f Self-monitor A1j Text Qs A1l Explain A1p Compare/contrast A1q Summarize A3c Brief answers. A3f Fill-in blanks. A4a-c Explicit strategy instruction.</p>	<p>Did not conduct 20 minutes of StaR or did not conduct a discussion of the story or Shared Treasure questions.</p> <p>List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>Discussion of stories was limited to brief summaries, background Qs, and/or predictive Qs (A3a, A1a, A1b)</p> <p>Teacher’s interactions with students may be limited or weak.</p> <p>Instruction included reviewing vocabulary, but there was no explanation of connections to story.</p> <p>There was no evidence of a focus on a comprehension strategy, no connections made between the two stories (STaR and Shared Story).</p> <p>Teacher’s Think Aloud drew attention to the fact that she was thinking, but it did not demonstrate the use of a particular strategy.</p> <p>Did teacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill in? • Invent? • Supplant? • Over do? <p>Explain:</p>	<p>Discussion of stories and instruction involved more than a brief summary and background/predictive Qs. It would include 3-4 items listed under Refined. For example, explanation of how vocabulary is used in the text, but possibly no connections made between the two stories. Or, the teacher may have read with expression, but did not think aloud – or vice versa. Or, teachers asked probing questions, but did not encourage students to speak in complete sentences or justify their answers.</p> <p>Reference to the strategy or learning objective was made, but no direct instruction or modeling was done to teach or reinforce its use.</p>	<p>Evidence of teacher doing all or most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Made connections between the STaR story and the Shared Story. (A1p) • Teacher named the comprehension strategy to be used. • Asked background questions. (A1a) • Asked predictive Qs. (A1b) • Asked students to support their answers. (A1l) • Briefly reviewed previous story. (A1a) • Explained how vocabulary words are used in the story. (A1c) • Used thinking aloud to demonstrate a strategy. (A4a,b,c) • Encouraged students to speak in complete sentences. • Had students read each sentence twice. • Teacher read with expression.
---	--	---	---	--

<p>Comprehension- Wings SFA Manuals and Self-Assessment checklists were used as resources to devise this rubric.</p>	<p>4th grade Comprehension strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding purpose for reading. • Previewing, predicting, summarizing. • Self -monitoring comprehension, visualizing. • Rereading, using context clues. • Making connections, asking questions • Inferring, analyzing, evaluating. • Justifying answers. 			
<p>Fidelity or “use” of the design. (N,D,P,R= SFA implementation levels)</p>	<p>0 N= Not in Place</p>	<p>1 D= In Development/Partial Indicate whether teacher appeared to fill in, invent, supplant, or over do certain activities, therefore, not doing all that was expected by the design.</p>	<p>2 P= In Place</p>	<p>3 R= Refined</p>
<p>4th grade Comprehension</p> <p>Wings teachers spend the first 20 minutes doing Listening Comprehension, when they should be reading aloud from a more challenging text, demonstrating strategies, and asking higher order questions. During Reading Together teachers review vocabulary and Treasure Hunt questions. However, teachers are encouraged to “guide students beyond the Treasure Hunt questions to a deeper discussion of the principal story elements” and to utilize Bloom’s Taxonomy to help them develop higher level questions.</p> <p>[A1j, A1k, A1l]- Questioning [A3b, A3c, A3d]- Coop. learning [A4a-c] - Explicit strategy instruction A1d Students’ Qs A1f Self-monitor A1g Visualizing A1r Analyzing A1p Compare/contrast A3h Wrote brief A3i Wrote long A4d Practice skill</p>	<p>No comp. discussion observed.</p> <p>List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>Minimal discussion of story, all Qs ask for recall of text level details, such as story structure. Discussion primarily focused on going over Treasure Hunt Qs. Teacher directed, teacher talk dominates, student responses are lifted from the text. Teacher’s interactions with students may be limited or weak.</p> <p>A1a Prior know. A1b Predictions A1j Text Qs A1m Sequencing A1i Story maps A1n Story structure A3a Brief oral Qs</p> <p>Did teacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill in? • Invent? • Supplant? • Over do? <p>Explain:</p>	<p>Discussion involved mostly recall and Treasure Hunt questions, but also included some comprehension strategies, i.e. identifying purpose for reading, using context clues and/or higher level questions, i.e. summarizing or inferring. Discussion dominated by teacher talk.</p> <p>Any level 1 codes and A1q (Summarizing), thereby elaborating on text elements with discussion, or <i>some</i> codes from level 3 column.</p>	<p>Teacher led a discussion that went beyond the Treasure Hunt questions or text level questions. Questions and instruction involved such skills/strategies as making inferences, justifying answers, students asking questions, visualizing, making connections, identifying purpose for reading, predicting. Questions required higher level thinking – Bloom’s taxonomy. Teacher’s questions were in response to students’ comments, not just pre-planned questions. Discussion involved more student input than teacher input. Any level 1 and 2 codes +[A1k, A1l], A1d, A1f, A1g, [A1r, A1p], [A3b, A3c, A3d], A3h, A3i, [A4a-c], A4d</p>

<p>Word Analysis Activities</p>				
<p>Fidelity or “use” of the design. (N,D,P,R= SFA implementation levels)</p>	<p>0 N= Not in Place</p>	<p>1 D= In Development Indicate whether teacher appeared to fill in, invent, supplant, or over do certain activities, therefore, not doing all that was expected by the design.</p>	<p>2 P= In Place</p>	<p>3 R= Refined</p>

<p>1st grade Word Analysis</p> <p>Multiple activities: There are more than a dozen letter sound and word activities that a teacher can utilize throughout the week. Some of these activities include songs and tongue twisters, games with pictures that correspond to sounds, games that teach letter shapes, activities that train students to hear blends and to repeat them quickly, and activities that help students break down words into chunks. There are activities that introduce phonetically regular words and irregular words, and words that are specific to the story. After a series of word analysis activities the teacher and students return to the Shared Story.</p>	<p>No word analysis activities recorded.</p> <p>List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>Only 1-2 letter or word analysis activities from the refined list are observed</p> <p><u>and</u></p> <p>Word wall words are reviewed, possibly only once, with no connections made to story. (C1k)</p> <p>Did teacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill in? • Invent? • Supplant? • Over do? <p>Explain:</p>	<p>At least 3 letter or word activities from the refined list are observed</p> <p><u>and</u></p> <p>Word wall words may only be reviewed once or twice, but connections are made to the story. (C1k and/or A1c)</p>	<p>5 or more letter or word analysis activities are observed such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how to make the sound with their mouths. (c1a, c2a) • Demonstrate how the shape of the letter is written. • Say-it-Fast (blending) (c1f-c1j) • Break-it-Down (segmenting) (c1b-c1e) • Using a picture cue to identify sounds (c2b) • Using a word cue to identify sounds (c2c) • Matching sounds with a written letter (c1a, c2c) • Stretch and Read vocabulary words (c1g, c1i, c1k) • Quick Erase - erase and insert new letters to form new words (c1a, c1d, c1j) • Say-Spell-Say important sight words (c1k, c2c) • Written spelling practice. • Review Word Wall words, 3-4 times during 90 minutes
--	--	--	---	---

Word Analysis Activities				
Fidelity or "use" of the design. (N,D,P,R= SFA implementation levels)	0 N= Not in Place	1 D= In Development Indicate whether teacher appeared to fill in, invent, supplant, or over do certain activities, therefore, not doing all that was expected by the design.	2 P= In Place	3 R= Refined
<p>4th grade Word Analysis The Reading Wings program is used with students who have successfully completed Reading Roots and, thus, have a firm handle on decoding words. "The focus of Reading Wings is primarily on building comprehension, thinking skills, fluency, and pleasure in reading" (p.2.13) (Madden and Cummings 2000)</p> <p>The activities that would fall under 4th g word analysis include: Vocabulary (A1c), Spelling (C11), Meaningful sentences (A1c), Words Out Loud (C4a), 2 Minute Edit.</p>	<p>Vocabulary, Meaningful Sentences, and Words Out Loud not observed. List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>Only one activity was observed. For example, vocabulary was introduced without any meaningful sentences or any opportunities for students to practice their words out loud with a partner.</p> <p>Or, Meaningful Sentences were read, but lacked in-depth discussion of vocabulary or explanations for why they were meaningful.</p> <p>Did teacher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill in? • Invent? • Supplant? • Over do? <p>Explain:</p>	<p>Vocabulary was presented with definitions, as used in the story. (A1c)</p> <p>Teacher provided explanations for why a sentence was meaningful.</p> <p>Students either practiced words chorally with teacher or out loud with a partner.</p> <p>Two minute edit.</p>	<p>All of these practices were observed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary instruction involved making connections to text. (A1c) • Meaningful sentence instruction included <i>students'</i> explanations for why a sentence was meaningful and they shared their meaningful sentences. • Teacher used choral response to monitor pronunciation. (C4a) • Students practice Words out Loud. • Two minute edit.

Teacher name/grade/school:	Books used for instruction:	Learning Standard, if stated or posted:	Special notes:	Date of obs.:
Expected instructional practices and student behaviors.	<p>Applying the Principles of Learning</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effort-based education 2. Clear expectations 3. Academic rigor in the thinking curriculum 4. Student as knowledge producer 5. Accountable talk and writing 6. Learnable intelligence 7. Learning as apprenticeship 			

Fidelity or “use” of the design. AC implement. levels from class observation sheet. Items here come from an NCEE description of characteristics of S-b schools.	0 N= Not in Place, Not observed	1 Getting started or partial implementation	2 Got the Mechanics Down	3 Appears Effective for Students
Teacher behaviors: The teacher’s interactions with students promote effort and accountability, express clear expectations, support the construction of deep knowledge, and promote collective work.	No evidence of standards, criteria, or rubrics used. What activities occurred instead? Did teacher fill-in or invent?	One of these criteria observed with a cooperative classroom arrangement: Standards, criteria, rubrics, and student work posted or made available. or Teacher may remind students to use accountable talk, but use is limited by teachers and students. or Teacher asks students to think creatively, to select own topic for writing or to offer their own perspective about the meaning of a text. and The classroom is arranged to promote collaborative work, i.e. tables, desks in clusters, spot for conferencing, etc.	Two of these criteria observed at least once: Standards, criteria, or rubrics referred to. And/or Examples of teacher and students using accountable talk are observed. And/or Teacher asks students to think creatively, to select own topic for writing or to offer their own perspective about the meaning of a text. And/or The classroom is arranged to promote collaborative work, i.e. tables, desks in clusters, spot for conferencing, etc.	Any one of these criteria observed multiple times. Or multiple criteria observed two or more times. Standards, criteria, or rubrics referred to, explained and actively used during instruction. and Accountable talk is promoted and required, i.e. teacher asks student to restate, elaborate, or justify their response. It is used with teacher and among students. and Teachers ask questions or shape activities that require students to think creatively, select own topics, or to think about a topic differently or deeply. and The classroom is arranged to promote collaborative work, i.e. tables, desks in clusters, spot for conferencing, etc.
Students’ behavior and classroom management.	Instruction repeatedly interrupted and modified because of behavior problems. (0)	Several disruptions by multiple students. Instruction gets accomplished, though interrupted often. (.5)	Minimal disruptive behavior – limited to a few students. Minimal disruption to instructional flow. (1.0)	No disruptive or uncooperative behavior noted in observation. Instruction is uninterrupted. (1.5)

Additional observations. -.5 = no 0 = unsure +.5 = yes	Was the class motivated and engaged?	Did the language arts period appear to be well-planned?	Did the period include multiple activities, including, writing, comprehension, word analysis, vocabulary?	Were the teacher's interactions with students positive and encouraging?
Additional notes from responses to these interview questions:	F02 IA3, W04 IA2 Did teacher indicate that this was a typical day of instruction? If SP03 obs.: Do you find AC to be sufficient to help your students read and understand text, and to write, this year?	F02 IA4. Were there things that this teacher would like to change or improve in this segment of instruction?	F02 IA5b How did the teacher describe how they figure out what the student knows when it comes to reading comprehension?	W04 Did teacher indicate that his/her assessment practices had changed?

<p>Comment on the quality of the observation.</p>
<p>Share any noteworthy observations of this instruction or class: test prep, no reading instruction/all writing, high number of student absences, poor behavior/exceptionally good behavior, school is no longer using AC, etc.</p>

Implementation checklist.

Gross Level		Fine Level	
Mini-lessons Y or N	Y or N	Accountable Talk	
Readers Workshop Y or N	Y or N	Integration of reading & writing	
Celebration or N	Y or N	Use of rubrics	Y
Writers Workshop or N	Y or N	Use of standards	Y
Authors' Chair Y or N	Y or N	Time for sustained reading	
Teacher conferencing Y or N		Time for sustained writing	
w/ students	Y or N		

<p>Readers Workshop 1st/4th grade</p>	<p>30 minute Skill Block -1st grade Phonemic Awareness Phonic Spelling Punctuation and Capitalization Grammar, syntax, and usage Vocabulary</p>		<p>60 minute Readers Workshop- 1st-4th g Mini lesson: Comprehension strategy Work Session: Indep/partner reading Guided Reading Conferencing Running Records Author studies Book Clubs Closing: Teacher Read Aloud Celebration</p>	
<p>Fidelity or “use” of the design. AC implementation levels</p>	<p>0 N= Not in Place</p>	<p>1 Getting Started or partial implementation</p>	<p>2 Got the Mechanics Down</p>	<p>3 Appears Effective for Students</p>
<p>Skill Block – 30 minutes – 1st grade Word Analysis 1st Grade Reading Standard 1: Print-Sound Code Only score this for 1st grade classes.</p>	<p>List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>One of these tasks are observed, Instructional tasks focus on segmenting and blending. Instructional tasks focus on memorizing common words and/or letter sound combinations. And either of these are noted, but not used: The room includes posters listing common onset/ rimes or word families. The room includes lists of common words, letter sound combinations, common endings.</p>	<p>Two of these are observed, but students may not be fully engaged and teacher may lack motivation or organization: Instructional tasks focus on segmenting and blending. Instructional tasks focus on memorizing common words and/or letter sound combinations. The room includes posters listing common onset/ rimes or word families, and the teache/students use them. The room includes lists of common words, letter sound combinations, common endings, and the teacher or students use them.</p>	<p>Two or more of these are observed and students are engaged and teacher is motivating and moves through activities efficiently: Instructional tasks focus on segmenting and blending. Instructional tasks focus on memorizing common words and/or letter sound combinations. The room includes posters listing common onset/ rimes or word families, and the teache/students use them. The room includes lists of common words, letter sound combinations, common endings, and the teacher or students use them.</p>

<p>Mini-Lesson - 15-20 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Features of print • Punctuation • Sequence of events • Word attack, spelling • Rituals and Routines • Comprehension strategy • Teacher reads aloud 	<p>List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>Students are not fully engaged during mini-lesson.</p> <p>Teacher does not appear motivating or organized.</p> <p>Mini-lesson occurs, but there is no evidence that the topic is referred to during the workshop.</p>	<p>Most students are engaged in mini-lesson.</p> <p>Teacher is organized, but not particularly motivating.</p> <p>Mini-lesson topic is referred to at least once at another time in the workshop period.</p>	<p>All students are engaged throughout mini-lesson.</p> <p>Teacher is motivating and moves mini-lesson along efficiently.</p> <p>Mini-lesson topic is threaded throughout workshop – in conferences and closing.</p>
<p>Work Session - 40 minutes - Teacher activities</p> <p>Guided Reading</p> <p>Running records, conference logs</p> <p>Conferencing</p> <p>Author, genre studies</p>		<p>Teacher listens to students read, but there is no evidence that she records data, asks questions, or offers strategies. The conferences are disrupted by other students more than twice.</p>	<p>Teacher records notes about students during guided reading, during conferencing, or at other times.</p> <p>Teacher collects other forms or data; i.e. conducts a running record, administers an assessment.</p> <p>Teacher responds to students' reading with comments or questions.</p> <p>Teacher refers to mini-lesson topic.</p> <p>Teacher is able to work with individuals or small groups with limited interruption by other students.</p>	<p>Teacher records notes about students during guided reading, during conferencing, or at other times.</p> <p>Teacher collects other forms or data; i.e. conducts a running record, administers an assessment.</p> <p>Teacher responds to students' reading with comments or questions <i>that promote deeper thinking.</i></p> <p><i>Teacher suggests a strategy for the student to practice.</i></p> <p>Teacher refers to mini-lesson topic.</p> <p>Teacher is able to work with individuals or small groups <i>uninterrupted.</i></p>

<p>Work Session - 40 minutes - Student activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ind/partner reading • Book clubs • Reading a variety of genres, multiple books by the same author. • 25 book campaign • Keeping a reading log 		<p>Some students may be reading, discussing, or writing about reading – other students may require teacher assistance to engage in these tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students read leveled books. • Students read with partners. • Students discuss books with classmates. • Students participate in Guided Reading or conferencing with teacher. <p>If students are doing generic language arts activities at centers, then do not award more than 1 point.</p>	<p>Most students should be reading, discussing, or writing about reading during the work session. A few students may require teacher assistance to engage in these tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students read leveled books. • Students read with partners. • Students discuss books with classmates. • Students participate in Guided Reading or conferencing with teacher. 	<p>All students should be quietly engaged in reading for the majority of the session or engaged in discussing books using accountable talk or writing about their reading. They record their reading in a log.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students read leveled books. • Students read with partners. • Students discuss books with classmates. • Students participate in Guided Reading or conferencing with teacher.
<p>Closing - 10 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher reads aloud • Celebration 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher reads aloud, if not done earlier in workshop, <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 students demonstrate their reading skills or discuss books they read, but no positive comments or references to mini-lesson/strategies are made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher reads aloud, if not done earlier in workshop, <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 students demonstrate their reading skills or discuss books they read, but no positive comments or references to mini-lesson/strategies are made. 	<p>Teacher reads aloud, if not done earlier in workshop, and all of these occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 students demonstrate their reading skills or discuss books they read. • Students are praised for their efforts. • Reference to mini-lesson topic or strategies is made.

<p>Writers Workshop 1st or 4th grade Some items came from the AC Lit Institute Classroom Observation Sheet.</p>	<p>60 minutes Writers Workshop Mini-Lesson: <i>Writer's craft, skills</i> Work Session: Conferencing <i>1-4 students</i> <i>Independent writing</i> <i>Response groups</i> Closure: Author's chair</p>	<p>B1a Generate ideas B1b Organize ideas B1c Lit techniques B1d Genres B1e Practice B1f Revise-elabor B1g Revise-refine B1h Edit-punc B1i Edit-grammar B1j Sharing B2b-d Sentences-paragraphs</p>	<p>B3a Think aloud w/ own writing B3b Used student writing B3c Used published work B3f Feedback on content B3g What was done well B3h How to improve B3i Rubric</p>	
<p>Fidelity or "use" of the design. (AC implementation levels)</p>	<p>0 N= Not in Place</p>	<p>1 Getting Started or partial implementation Indicate whether teacher appeared to fill in, invent, supplant, or over do certain activities, therefore, not doing all that was expected by the design.</p>	<p>2 Got the Mechanics Down</p>	<p>3 Appears Effective for Students</p>

<p>Mini-Lesson may be focused on one or more of these topics – 7-10 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer’s craft B1a-B1i (see list above) • Skills (grammar, punctuation, etc.) • Rituals and Routines of the workshop • Reading/writing connections • Common writing problems • Author studies B1c <p>The mini-lesson is typically conducted at the beginning of the workshop, however if a teacher conducts one at another time, possibly in response to an observed learning need, this is acceptable and desirable.</p>	<p>List the activities that occurred instead.</p>	<p>Mini-lesson is too brief (5 minutes or less) or</p> <p>Mini-lesson is too long and students seem not to be engaged</p> <p>Mini-lesson doesn’t address topics that appear relevant or applicable to students’ subsequent work.</p> <p>Mini-lesson is conducted, but the topic is not addressed at any other time in the workshop.</p>	<p>Mini-lesson stays within the 7-10 minute range.</p> <p>Topic appears like it may be connected to students’ subsequent writing activities, though it may not be readily observed.</p> <p>Teacher presents an example of text, but it may not be a very productive example.</p> <p>Objective of lesson is mentioned, but it may not be clear or there may be too many objectives addressed.</p>	<p>Objective of the mini-lesson is clearly stated. Lit tech/Genre measure B1c, B1d.</p> <p>If mini-lesson is extended beyond 10 minutes and students remain engaged and their subsequent work is directly related to the mini-lesson, then this is viewed as an effective deviation from the typical design.</p> <p>Teacher models the skill she wants students to use, possibly with her own writing. B3a</p> <p>Mini-lesson may include examples from authors, which students are directed to model B1c, B3c.</p> <p>Mini-lesson may include examples of student writing B3b.</p> <p>Mini-lesson topic is threaded throughout workshop – in conferences and closing.</p> <p>Evidence of these measures would be present: Integrate Writing measure: A1s Examine lit tech A1t Lit extension project B1c Lit tech, Author’s style B3c Use published work for inst. Teacher Directed Instruction measure: B3a Think aloud w/own writing B3b Used student writing B3c Used published work B3e Led a group composition B3h Commented how to improve</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>Work Session – 45 minutes – Observable</p> <p>Teacher activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conferencing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback ○ Collect data 		<p>One of these criteria observed:</p> <p>Teacher circulates around the classroom while students are working.</p> <p>Teacher conferences with students.</p> <p>Teacher gives written feedback to students, i.e. on Post-it notes.</p> <p>Teacher takes notes during conferences.</p> <p>Teacher reinforces the mini-lesson aloud for the whole class.</p>	<p>Two of these criteria observed at least once:</p> <p>Teacher circulates around the classroom while students are working.</p> <p>Teacher conferences with students.</p> <p>Teacher gives written feedback to students, i.e. on Post-it notes.</p> <p>Teacher takes notes during conferences.</p> <p>Teacher reinforces the mini-lesson aloud for the whole class.</p>	<p>A teacher must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circulate around the classroom while students are working. <p>And there must be evidence that the teacher did at least two of these more than once:</p> <p>Teacher conferences with students.</p> <p>Teacher gives oral or written feedback to students, i.e. on Post-it notes.</p> <p>Teacher takes notes during conferences or while circulating.</p> <p>Teacher reinforces the mini-lesson aloud for the whole class.</p>
<p>Closure - 5 minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author’s chair, B1j • “What did you learn today as a writer?” 	<p>No sharing of student writing.</p> <p>List what occurred instead.</p>	<p>1-3 writers share, but there is no feedback or discussion noted or the feedback is not related to the criteria, objective or mini-lesson.</p>	<p>1-3 writers share.</p> <p>And the related discussion includes some examples of the following, though they may not be ideal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writers’ work is celebrated. • Feedback from teacher and classmates is given. B1f-h • Students refer to a rubric or standard in their discussion. • Students refer to text when speaking. • Students extend discussion by adding comments that relate to others’ comments. • Students share what they have learned. • Reference to the mini-lesson is made. 	<p>3 writers must share B1j. Share Writing measure.</p> <p>And the related discussion must included multiple examples of any of these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writers’ work is celebrated. • Feedback from teacher and classmates is given. B1f-h • Students refer to a rubric or standard in their discussion. • Students refer to text when speaking. • Students extend discussion by adding comments that relate to others’ comments. • Students share what they have learned. • Reference to the mini-lesson is made.

