TE 846 Online
Syllabus
2011 Summer

Instructor: Laurel Disney
E-mail: disneyla@msu.edu
Home: 269-629-5984 (9:00 am - 5:00 pm EST)
Dates: June 27, 2011 to August 5, 2011
Location: Online sessions
Credit: 3 hours

Catalog Description:

TE 846 Accommodating Differences in Literacy Learners
Developmental processes, instructional practices, and assessment principles that contribute to effective learning of reading and writing. Teaching methods for accommodating the different needs of individual literacy learners.

Requirement: Access to two K-12 level students for course requirement to conduct tutoring and two case studies.

This course has been designed to comply with Michigan Public Act (PA) 118 which mandates a 3-credit course in literacy covering principles and practices related to "interest inventories; English language learning screening; visual and auditory discrimination tools; language expression and processing screening; phonemics; phonics; vocabulary; fluency; comprehension; spelling and writing assessment tools and instructional strategies" (Michigan PA 118). Participation in this course will satisfy the requirements of PA 118 for applying for Professional Certification in the state of Michigan.

At Michigan State University, we have interpreted this mandate to mean understanding and practicing reading and writing assessment and instruction that is responsive to the varied needs of individual learners.

Course Overview

Topics: Literacy instruction and assessment practices include, but are not limited to, the following:

a) *Cultural and linguistic differences*: second language acquisition and characteristics of English Language Learners (ELLs), education programs for ELLs, English language proficiency screening, and reading and writing instruction for second language learners;

(b) *Individual motivation differences*: ways in which motivation affects student literacy learning, tactics for increasing motivation (e.g., goal setting, choice, learner-centered materials), tools for assessing motivational attributes (e.g., interest inventories);

(c) *Neuropsychological differences*: characteristics of students with language and learning problems, literacy instruction for students with language and learning problems; tools for screening language and learning limitations;

(d) *Instructional arrangements to accommodate learning differences*: adaptations to the environment, materials, teaching strategies, task requirement, and learning tasks, including cooperative learning arrangements, peer-mediated instruction, strategy instruction, and responsiveness to intervention; and

(e) *Core components of effective literacy instruction***:** phonological awareness for decoding and spelling, phonics and structural analysis for decoding and spelling, vocabulary knowledge, reading and writing fluency, reading comprehension and written expression, reading and writing connections, literacy across the disciplines.

Course Objectives

The student will demonstrate knowledge of:
- the principles of instruction and remediation in reading and writing
- classroom assessment techniques for reading and writing
- materials and adaptations (accommodations/modifications) for reading and writing instruction

The student will demonstrate the ability to:
- critically evaluate materials, curricula, programs, and practices used in literacy instruction
- select, modify, and design literacy materials, task, and teaching techniques to meet the specific needs of learners from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds
- identify and discuss (online) advanced literacy instruction practices

Course Format

Since this is an online course you will be using ANGEL to communicate and submit assignments. Course related information (readings, assignments, drop boxes) can be found under the Course Topics tab, and the syllabus is linked under the Resources tab.

There are no scheduled class meeting times or scheduled online chats. Due dates are based on the time at MSU's main campus in East Lansing, MI which is on Eastern Standard Time (EST):

7/3	Post Get-Acquainted Assignment (ungraded)
7/3	Identify 2 Case Study Students and Obtain Parental Consent
7/10	Discussion Forum Postings for Units 1-3
7/24	Discussion Forum Postings for Units 4-6
7/31	Project Analysis Paper
8/5	Case Study

Except for the above deadlines you may self-pace your course work but I recommend that you complete the unit readings and discussion forum postings in order. You may submit your case study and project early, if you wish.

Electronic Mail

I will be using email to correspond with you. If you use an email account other than your MSU account, please have your MSU account forward your messages to your alternate account, since **I will use your MSU address for all class correspondence**. Please read your course email frequently, at least three times per week. Also, check our ANGEL site frequently for announcements that appear on the opening Course page. I will respond to your email within 48 hours of receipt, Monday-Friday, 6:30 p.m. – 10:30 p.m. EST, barring any unforeseen emergencies.

Readings

Readings, listed by author(s) and other bibliographic information, are posted on ANGEL within the folder for each unit. For each of the broad course topics and subtopics, I have identified core and extended learning materials (web-based resources, books, articles, etc.), and recommended/optional reading. I will add extended materials as the course unfolds and I get to know your needs and learning goals. All students are expected to read the introduction for each unit and core materials then select extended learning materials for in-depth study on selected topics based on needs (i.e., crafting the case study). Recommended reading lists include books or other references that may be checked out of the library or purchased as valuable resources related to course topics. A course bibliography is listed at the end of the syllabus.

Course Requirements

Opportunities to learn in this course will come from a variety of sources including your readings, your work with students, videos, a project, case studies, course participation, and written discussions with each other as a community of learners. Please contact me if you do not have access to students with whom you can work.

Here's a brief explanation:

Case Studies of Diverse Learners

You should identify two students with whom to work. Please contact me immediately if you do not have access to students with whom you can work. It is strongly recommended that they not be your own children unless you homeschool them. To maximize your experience your students should have different needs reflecting variability in culture, language, motivation, and/or literacy abilities. They must need instruction on the *K-12 level* but can be of any age, including adults with low literacy, and require either *intervention or enrichment* to maximize their literacy potential.

As a culminating project, you will write a case study on one of your students (your choice of student) that will include assessment data, behavioral observations, instructional lessons, conclusions, and recommendations. A template and sample reports will be available on our ANGEL site.

Please refer to the Case Study information sheet under the Lessons tab in the Case Study folder for more detailed guidelines. Your case study is 35% of your grade.

Project

You will be conducting, analyzing and reporting on a teaching project with one of your students (more details on our ANGEL site). Your project report is 35% of your grade.

Course Participation

Your course participation is worth 30% of your grade and includes reading the course material and contributing to the discussion forum on ANGEL. You will be prompted for a response for each unit. You should post your responses on ANGEL under the Communicate tab, Discussion Forums heading. You can also access this by clicking on the Lessons tab, a certain unit folder, and then the unit discussion forum folder (at the bottom of the list of folders). You may type your responses on the Discussion Forum page or you may cut and paste your responses from Word (or other word processing) documents. However, please do not submit your responses as attachments, since it interrupts the flow of our virtual conversations and may be annoying to some of your colleagues.

Read the postings of your classmates and respond to two classmates. Again, the rule of thumb is to *post once, respond twice*. I will follow your discussions and will add comments periodically as well as post additional optional resources you may find helpful.

The quality of your postings and responses is very important to the level of conversation we achieve. Graduate level analysis and writing are expected. Each unit's postings will be graded on a 5-point scale:
- 5 = Thorough and thoughtful responses evidencing (include citations) integration and synthesis of course readings with teaching experience.
- 3 = Answers questions satisfactorily and demonstrates that material has been read; references teaching experiences
- 1 = Shallow responses which focus mostly on opinion and teaching experiences; no evidence of course readings

You should post and respond to Units 1-3 by July XX. Post and respond to Units 4-6 by July XX.

We are a community of adult learners co-constructing knowledge. We will learn a great deal from each other as well as from our readings. I encourage you to ask questions, present alternative perspectives, share ideas, question assumptions, and encourage one another. Your posts do not have to be long but should reflect a level of reflection and analysis consistent with graduate level study. Before you get started with responding in the discussion forum, carefully read *Conversational Elaboration Strategies* in the Lessons tab.

Late Work
Unless arrangements are made in advance of the due date, I reserve the right to reduce the grade on late work, depending on the circumstances.

Course Grading
Case Study	35%
Project	35%
Course Participation	30%

General grading expectations for the quality of your work are as follows:

Course Grade	GPA Scale	General Description of Quality
95-100 pts.	4.0	**Outstanding, exemplary work**. Uses and integrates readings and teaching experiences (where appropriate) to inform the writing/activity. Meets all the requirements of the assignment, is deeply thoughtful, and provides many details and examples to support the assignment. No errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling.
90-94 pts.	3.5	**High quality work.** Uses many readings and teaching experiences (where appropriate) to inform the writing/activity. Meets all the requirements of the assignment, is thoughtful, and provides some details and examples to support ideas. Very few errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling.
85-89 pts.	3.0	**Good quality work** performing at expected level for this course. Uses some readings and teaching experiences (where appropriate) to inform the writing/activity. Meets all the requirements of the assignment, shows attempt to engage with purposes of assignment, provides some details and examples to support ideas. Few errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling.
80-84 pts.	2.5	**Work below expected level of quality**. Makes vague references or inappropriate references to relevant readings and teaching experiences (where appropriate) to inform writing/assignment. Does not meet all requirements of assignment. Limited attempt to engage with purposes of assignment, few details and examples to support ideas. Many errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling.
75-79 pts.	2.0	**Significantly below expected level of quality**. Shows little evidence of having read course readings and using teaching experiences (where appropriate). Meets few of the requirements of the assignment. Shallow attempt to engage with purposes of assignment, no details or examples to support ideas. Many errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling.

The instructor reserves the right to adjust the grading scale, course requirements, due dates, or readings as necessary.

Please Note: Required core readings and assignments will remain the same throughout the course but the instructor may add additional optional readings, resources, or videos as student needs and requests arise.

Accessibility

If you are a student with a disability in need of special assistance or an accommodation in order to meet any of the course requirements, as outlined in the syllabus, please notify me immediately. Confidentiality will be maintained regarding your special needs. The Office of Programs for Handicapped Students can be reached at 517-353-9642.

MSU policy information:
http://www.rcpd.msu.edu/forms/Reasonable%20Accommodations%20Policy%20for%20University%20Applicants%20and%20Employees.pdf

Academic Honesty and Integrity

The MSU faculty consider academic integrity a serious matter. All work you submit must be prepared exclusively by you **for this course this semester**. For further information please see http://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/plagiarism.html and Spartan Life (the MSU student handbook).

Technology Support

ANGEL Help Desk**:** If you have problems with ANGEL, support is available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Contact the ANGEL Help Desk, http://help.angel.msu.edu The local help line is 517-355-2345 or you may call toll free, 1-800-500-1554 (North America and Hawaii). You may email the help desk at https://contact.cl.msu.edu/contact.php?service=angel

The MSU Library can help you with the procedure for accessing resources online.

Writing Center

Writing assistance is available at the Writing Center at 300 Bessey Hall, 517-432-3610. Grammar Hotline: 517-432-1370.

Bibliography (Required & Optional)

Units 1 and 2 Core Components of Effective Literacy Instruction: Reading
Adams, M. J., Foorman, B. R., Lundberg, I., & Beeler, T. (1998). The elusive phoneme: Why phonemic awareness is so important and how to help children develop it. *American Educator, 22,* 18-29.

Allen, L. (1998). An integrated strategies approach: Making word identification instruction work for beginning readers. *The Reading Teacher, 52,* 254-268.

Blachowocz, C.L.Z., & Fisher, P. (2007). In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp. 178-203). New York: Guilford.

Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (2007). Best practices in teaching comprehension. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.).(2007). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp. 220-242). New York: Guilford.

Brown, R. (2002). Straddling two worlds: Self-directed comprehension instruction for middle schoolers. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (337-350). New York: Guilford.

Carlisle, J. F. & Rice, M. S. Assessment of Reading Comprehension. (2004). In C. A. Stone, E.R. Silliman, B.J., Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds), *Handbook of Language and Literacy* (pp. 521-540). New York: Guilford.

Carlisle, J.F., Schiling, S.G., Scott, S.E., & Zeng, J. (2004). Do fluency measures predict reading achievement? Results from the 2002-2003 school year in Michigan's Reading First schools. Technical Report #1, *Evaluation of Reading First in Michigan*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Carlo, M.S. (2007). Best practices for literacy instruction for English-language learners. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp. 159-177). New York: Guilford.

Chard, D. J., & Dickson, S. V. (1999). Phonological awareness: Instructional and assessment guidelines. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 34,* 261-270.

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator, 22*, 1-8.

Cunningham, P.M. (2007). Best practices in teaching phonological awareness and phonics. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp. 159-177). New York: Guilford.

Fisher, J. B., Schumaker, J. B., & Deshler, D. D. (2002). Improving the reading comprehension of at-risk adolescents. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 351-364). New York: Guilford.

Gambrell, L.B., Malloy, J.A., & Mazzoni, S.A. (2007). Evidence-based best practives for comprehensive literacy instruction. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp.11-29). New York: Guilford.

Ivey, G. (2002). Building comprehension when they're still learning to read the words. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (234-246). New York: Guilford.

Kuhn, M.R., & Rasinski, T., (2007). Best practices in fluency instruction. . In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed.) (pp.204-219). New York: Guilford.

Kuhn, M. R., & Stahl, S. A. (2003). Fluency: A review of developmental and remedial practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 3-21.

Mastropieri, M.A., Scruggs, T.E., & Graetz, J.E. (2003). Reading comprehension instruction for secondary students: Challenges for struggling students. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 26*, 103-116.

McGlinchey , M.T., & Hixson, M.D. (2004). Using curriculum-based measurement to predict performance on state assessments in reading. *School Psychology Review, 33* (2), 193-203.

Moats, L. C. (1998). Teaching decoding. *American Educator, 22,* 42-29.

Ogle, D. & Lang, L. (2007). Best practices in adolescent literacy instruction. . In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp.127-156). New York: Guilford.

Pearson, P. D., & Duke, N. (2002). Comprehension instruction in the primary grades. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (247-258). New York: Guilford.

Pressley, M., Hilden, K., & Shankland, R. (in press). An evaluation of end-grade-3. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS): Speed reading without comprehension, predicting little.

Reid, R., & Lienemann, T. O. (2006). Mnemonics. In *Strategy instruction for students with learning disabilities* (pp. 213-230). New York: Guilford Press.

Ruetzel, D. R., & Cooter, R. B. (2007). Classroom reading assessment. In *Strategies for reading assessment and instruction.* Columbus, OH: Pearson.

Snider, V. E. (1995). Primer on phonemic awareness: What is it, why it's important, and how to teach it. *School Psychology Review, 34,* 443-455.

Stanovich, P. J., & Stanovich, K. E. *Using research and reason in education.* http://www.nifl.gov/partnershipforreading/publications/pdf/Stanovich_Color.pdf.

Torgesen, J. K. (1998). Catch them before they fall. Identification and assessment to prevent reading failure in young children. *American Educator, 22*, 32.39.

Troia, G. A. (2004). Phonological awareness acquisition and intervention. Current Practice Alerts, 9, 1-4. Reston, VA: Division of Learning Disabilities and Division of Research of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Unit 3 Core Components of Effective Literacy Instruction: Writing

Apel, K., & Masterson, J.J. (2001). Theory-guided spelling assessment and intervention: A case study. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 32*, 182-195.

Baker, S., Gersten, R., & Graham, S. (2003). Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10,* 109-123.

Bear, D. & Templeton, S. (1998). Explorations in Developmental Spelling: Foundations for Learning and Teaching Phonics, Spelling, and Vocabulary. *Reading Teacher*, v52, n3 p222-42.

Berninger, V. W., & Amtmann, D. (2003). Preventing written expression disabilities through early and continuing assessment and intervention for handwriting and/or spelling problems: Research into Practice. (pp. 345-363). In L. Swanson, K. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds). *Handbook of Learning Disabilities.* New York: Guilford. (pp. 357-358 relate to spelling assessment)

Bromley, K. (2007). Best practices in teaching writing. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp.243-263). New York: Guilford.

Calfee, R. C. (2000). Writing portfolios: Activity, assessment, authenticity. In R. Indrisano & J. R. Squire (Eds), *Perspectives on writing: Research, theory, and practice* (pp.278-304). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Calfee, R. C., & Wilson, K. M. (2004). A classroom-based assessment framework. In C. A. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 583-599). New York: Guilford.

Cooper, C. R. (1999). What we know about genres and how it can help us assign and
     evaluate writing. In Cooper, C. R. & Odell, L., (Eds.), *Evaluating writing: The role of teachers' knowledge about text, learning, and culture* (pp. 23-52). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English

Espin, C. A., Weissenburger, J. W., & Benson, B. J. (2004). Assessing the writing performance of students in special education. *Exceptionality, 12,* 55-66.

Goodman, Y. M. (2003). Informal methods of evaluation. In J. Flood, D. Lap, J. R. Squire, & J. M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English Language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 600-607). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2005). *Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Company.

Graham, S., MacArthur, C.A., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.) (2007). *Best practices in writing instruction*. New York: Guilford.

Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. New York: Alliance for Excellent Education. Available on-line: www.all4ed.org/publications/WritingNext/index

Harris, K.R., Graham, S., & Mason, L.H. (2003). Self-regulated strategy development in the classroom: Part of a balanced approach to writing instruction for students with disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 35*, 1-6.

Hayes, J. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Masterson, J. J., & Apel, K. (2000). Spelling assessment: Charting a path to optimal intervention. *Topics in Language Disorders, 20 (3),* 50-65.

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (2003). The neglected R: The need for a writing revolution. New York: College Entrance Examination Board. Available on-line:

http://www.writingcommission.org/prod_downloads/writingcom/neglectedr.pdf

Nystrand, M. (Ed.). (1982). *What writers know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse*. New York: Academic.

Reid, R., & Lienemann, T. O. (2006). Strategies in written language. In *Strategy instruction for students with learning disabilities* (pp. 125-146)*.* New York: Guilford Press.

Templeton, S., & Morris, D. (1999). Questions teachers ask about spelling. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*, 102-112.

Weaver, C. (1996). Teaching grammar in the context of writing. In *Teaching grammar in context* (pp.18-38). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Wong, B.Y.L. & Berninger, V.W. (2004). Cognitive processes of teachers in implementing composition research in elementary, middle, and high school classrooms. In C.A. Stone, E.R. Silliman, B.J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 600-624). New York: Guilford.

Zinsser, W. (1998). *On writing well*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Zinsser, W. (1988). *Writing to learn*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Before assessing your case study students, read these:

Afflerbach, P. (2007) Best practices in literacy assessment. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp.264-282). New York: Guilford.

Buros Institute of Mental Measurements. Available online: http://www.unl.edu/buros/bimm/html/article1.html

Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2002). Classroom assessment for learning. *Educational Leadership, 60,* 40-43.

McGlinchey , M.T., & Hixson, M.D. (2004). Using curriculum-based measurement to predict performance on state assessments in reading. *School Psychology Review, 33* (2), 193-203.

Stiggins, R., & Chappuis, S. (2005). Putting assessment in perspective: It's for learning. *Principle Leadership, 6 (2),* 16-2

Unit 4 Instructional Arrangements to Accommodate Learning Differences
Bell, L. I. (2003). Strategies that close the gap. *Educational Leadership, 60,* 32-34.

Foorman, B. R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical elements of classrooms and small-group instruction promote reading success in all children. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 16,* 203-212.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2005). Peer assisted learning strategies: Promoting word recognition, fluency, and reading comprehension in young children. *Journal of Special Education, 39*, 34-44.

Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P. L., & Young, C. L. (2003). Responsiveness-to-intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disability construct. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18,* 151-171.

Maheady, L., Mallette, B., & Harper, G. F. (2006). Four classwide peer tutoring models: Similarities, differences, and implications for research and practice. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 22*, 65-89.

Munk, D. D., & Bursuck, W. D. (1998). Report card grading adaptations for students with disabilities: Types and acceptability. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 33*, 306-308.

Schumm, J. S., Vaughn, S., & Harris, J. (1997). Pyramid power for collaborative planning. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 29*(6), 62-66.

Vaughn, S., Klinger, J. K., & Bryant, D. P. (2001). Collaborative strategic reading as a means to enhance peer-mediated instruction for reading comprehension and content-area learning. *Remedial and Special Education, 22*, 66-74.

Unit 5 Cultural and Language Differences

Aeborsold, J. & Field, M.L. (1997). Factors that influence reading in an L2/FL. *In From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms* (pp. 21-34). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Carlo, M.S. (2005). Best practices for literacy instruction for English-language learners. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp. 104-126). New York: Guilford

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2003). Teaching English-language learners with diverse abilities. In J. Echevarria and A, Graves (Eds.), *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English-language learners with diverse abilities (pp. 2-33).* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Genesee, F., & Upshur, J.A. (1996). The context of second language evaluation. In F. Genesee and J.A. Upshur (Eds.), *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education* (pp14-34). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gunderson, L. (2007). Reading, language, and immigrant achievement. In *English-only instruction and immigrant students in secondary schools: A critical examination* (pp.10-62)*.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writers. In K. Hyland (Ed.), *Second language writing (pp.31-53)*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Li, G. (2004). Family literacy: Learning from an Asian immigrant family. In F.B. Boyd, C. H. Brock, and M. Rozendal (Eds.), *Multicultural and multilingual literacy and language: Contexts and practices* (pp. 304-321*)*. New York: Guilford Press.

Li, G. (2003). Literacy, culture, and politics of schooling counter narratives of a Chinese Canadian family. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly 34*(2), pp.182-204. American Anthropological Association.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). Theoretical approaches to explaining second language learning. In P. M. Lighbown and N. Spada (Eds.), *How languages are learned* (pp.31-38). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). Learner language. In P. M. Lightbown and N. Spada (Eds.), *How languages are learned*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L. (1993). The plurality of literacies. In *Agendas for second language literacy* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). Reading assessment. In J. M. O'Malley and L. V. Pierce (Eds.), *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers* (pp.93-133). White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Group.

O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). Writing assessment. In J. M. O'Malley and L. V. Pierce (Eds.), *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers* (pp. 135-161). White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Group.

Richard-Amato, P. A. (1996). The classroom as an environment for language acquisition. In P. A. Richard-Amato (Ed.), *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom from theory to practice* (2nd ed. pp. 21-60). White Plains, NY: Addison- Wesley Publishing Group.

ESL assessment batteries:
http://harcourtassessment.com/HaiWeb/Cultures/en-us/harcourt/Community/Education/results.htm?Community=EnglishLanguageLearners

Elementary websites for English language learners
http://www.everythingesl.net/inservices/elementary_sites_ells_71638.php

Position statement concerning the screening and assessment of young English language learners. http://www.naeyc.org

Unit 6 Motivation and Neuropsychological Differences

Guthrie, J. (2005). Concept-oriented reading instruction. College Park, MD: University of Maryland. Available on-line: http://www.cori.umd.edu/overview/ (Click on Program Goals, then Motivation to learn more about motivation and student engagement in CORI)

Klinger, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1999) Students' perceptions of instruction in inclusion classrooms: Implications for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 66*, 23-37.

Linnenbrink, E.A*., & Pintrich, P.R. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 313-327.

Pressley, M. (2006). Motivation and literacy. In *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced literacy*. New York: Guilford.

Reutzel, D.R. (2007). Effective literacy instruction: Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all children. In Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed) (pp. 313-343). New York: Guilford.

Swan, E. (2003). Beyond gold stars and candy bars. In *Concept-oriented reading instruction* (pp. 101-118).New York: Guilford.

Tomlinson, C. (2004). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed ability classrooms.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Additional (mentioned in several units)
Gambrell, L., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.).(2007). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed). New York: Guilford