Using Literacy Stations to Manage Small Group Instruction

Carrie Kracl, PhD
University of Nebraska - Kearney
COE B161

Mary is a kindergarten teacher with thirteen years of experience in the classroom. Her twenty-five students keep her busy, and she works hard to be an effective literacy teacher. During whole group instruction, Mary models fluency through read-alouds, engages students in higher level conversations, and provides activities that allow students to work at the appropriate level, but as the schedule transitions to small group instruction, the classroom environment changes. The "three ring circus" as it is often called begins as Mary invites a small group of students to work on a guided reading lesson while the other students are to be actively involved in a center activity. The four students at the block center can't decide what to build and an argument begins. Mary walks over to the blocks to help the students try to solve the problem then returns to the small group. She barely sits down when the two students working on the computer are not able to find the right program. Mary leaves the guided reading group again to get the correct games selected. Several students are sitting at their desks gazing around the room or out the window, but Mary ignores it since they are at least quiet and not disrupting her instruction. A few minutes pass and now the art center is out of tape and Mary is again interrupted to find more tape for one student's project. By this time, the small group is off task and Mary must work to regroup and get their eyes back on the text. Time to switch groups and start all over again.

Across the hall, Christine, a first grade teacher with 2 years of classroom experience, is also starting her small group instruction block. While each group of five meets with her, the remaining students stay at their desks and complete a packet of worksheets stapled together that must be finished by Friday. The worksheets are the same for all students and are considered easy by some, but extremely difficult for others. Many of the students race through the packet while others visit with their "neighbors", doodle on a piece of scratch paper, or gaze at their surroundings. Christine feels she has started to excel at whole group reading instruction, but she dreads the small group time. Struggling for a better management system, Christine feels less than effective.

Management during Small Group Instruction

When teachers determine to differentiate literacy instruction, and add some type of small group instruction to their daily schedule, they add to the complexity of managing the classroom environment while at the same time providing necessary accommodations to meet diverse student needs. Meeting the diverse needs of students requires a more complex management system and becomes a balancing act for the teacher (Tomlinson, 2001).

When initiating any type of small group instruction, the first challenge for the teacher is to manage the classroom and to be able to work in a focused, uninterrupted way with small clusters of students. Students must be able to work without teacher assistance and be able to maintain and manage their own learning (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). Research does not support children doing "seat work" or "busy work" like coloring or fill in the blank worksheets (Allington, 2002; Schmoker, 2001). Student achievement does not increase due to completing worksheets and in many classrooms almost two-thirds of the reading instructional time is spent on activities that likely will not increase their reading and writing abilities (Allington, 1983).

Centers and stations. According to Gregory and Chapman (2007) a center is a collection of materials designed purposely with a goal in mind. Students are responsible for their learning during center time and work with the materials to develop, discover, create, and learn a task at their own pace. The hands-on experiences in centers provide opportunities for learners to:

- Remediate, enhance, or extend knowledge on a skill, concept, standard or topic
- Pursue interests and explore the world of knowledge
- Work at the level of need and be challenged

- Be creative and critical problem solvers
- Make choices, establish their own pace, and build persistence
- Manipulate a variety of different types of materials
- Facilitate complex thinking and dendritic growth (p.133)

Centers can be set up in a variety of different ways including: (a) topic or theme based, (b) interest centers for further investigation of a topic, (c) resource centers that contain a wide variety of reading materials, (d) role-playing centers to demonstrate characters and sequence of events, (e) manipulative centers for hands-on learning, (f) skill centers for adjustable assignments, (g) writing centers, and (h) listening centers for music or fictional and factual reading (Gregory & Chapman, 2007).

Tomlinson (1999) distinguishes centers and stations. Centers are flexible enough to address variable learning needs, but they are distinct and students don't need to move to all of them to achieve proficiency with a topic or set of skills. Stations work together with one another and students rotate among all of them to become competent in a concept or skill. Stations allow different students to work with different tasks, providing for differentiated instruction. Tomlinson (1999) notes that different teachers use centers in different ways, and they define them differently as well. These varied explanations often increase the confusion of the practice taking place in the classroom. Dramatic play centers, such as the "house center", or the "block center" typically used in preschools and kindergartens are often recognized as traditional centers but centers and stations can take place in any grade level, in any subject area, and with all levels of student ability (Mendoza & Katz, 2008; Tomlinson, 1999).

Literacy work stations. Literacy work stations are one way to provide students a classroom environment that meets the characteristics of effective literacy classrooms, allows the teacher to work with small groups and keeps students engaged in literacy throughout the day. Diller (2003) defines it as "…an area within the classroom where students work alone or interact with one another, using instructional materials to explore and expand their literacy. It is a place where a variety of activities reinforce and/or extend learning, often without the assistance of the classroom teacher. It is a time for children to practice reading, writing, speaking, listening, and working with letters and words" (Diller, 2003, p.3)

The teacher is stationed in the reading area of the classroom prepared to offer differentiated reading instruction to reading groups. The small group is a homogenous group that comes from the larger mixed ability group of students that are working at stations. Literacy work stations are teacher selected, - designed, and - provisioned; they focus on follow-up activities and tasks drawn from previously taught word work, fluency, comprehension strategies, and writing lessons. For example, in the Pocket Chart Work Station students may put the lines of poems in the correct order and practice reading for fluency; in the ABC/Word Study Work Station students may practice spelling high-frequency words correctly with magnetic letters or use a stamp pad to make and read word wall words. Student practice in the stations is directly tied to instruction. Management of literacy work stations is a central concern for all teachers. The stations must be designed so that the activities and tasks are clearly understood, they are independent of teacher supervision, and able to be completed within the time allowed. It is also important that tasks completed in literacy work stations have a component of accountability and performance (Reutzel, 2007; Diller, 2003).

Managing the small-group differentiated reading instruction time block is a complex effort for most teachers. In the early part of the year, fewer stations or centers are easier for both teachers and students to handle. Then, as the year progresses, adding a few new stations, especially optional stations, can add variety to the reading block time. Very little flexibility is desirable in the group rotation schedule early in the year, but as time progresses and children acquire more experience with the rotation between literacy work stations, teachers may decide to assign children specific tasks to be completed during this time period rather than a time-controlled rotation through various stations (Reutzel, 2007).

Diller (2003) encourages teachers to incorporate literacy work stations during small group instruction as a management tool with hands on learning that engages students. The emphasis in literacy work stations is on initial teacher modeling and students taking responsibility for their own learning. All students get to participate for equal amounts of time at the literacy work stations with materials that are differentiated for students with different needs and reading levels. The materials are taught with and used for instruction first.

The stations remain all year long with changes made to reflect children's reading levels, strategies currently being taught and topics being studied. Through (a) modeling, (b) a gradual release of responsibility, (c) creating a risk free environment, (d) independent work levels and (3) clear, explicit expectations, students can successfully engage in literacy work stations and allow the teacher to work with students in small group instruction without interruptions.

The difference between literacy work stations and traditional learning centers. The emphasis in literacy work stations is on teacher modeling and students taking responsibility for their own learning. In traditional learning centers, teachers often do too much of the work involved including thinking up ideas for the materials, making the materials, laminating them, cutting them out, explaining them, explaining them again, and cleaning up after the materials were used (Diller, 2003; Tomlinson, 1999). In addition, teachers decide when to change the materials, often Friday afternoon, storing them away until the following year. In literacy work stations, students share in the decision making. They help decide when to change materials, and they negotiate ideas for what they would like to practice at each station. All students have equal access to the engagement that literacy work stations provide (Diller, 2003).

Differentiation is also a key difference in literacy stations as compared to learning centers. Instead of assigning the same tasks to all children, the teacher can suggest different activities or materials for particular children to better meet their needs at a particular station. Through Diller's (2003) observations, improved student behavior is an additional plus. When students, usually two to a station, are involved in hands-on activities, such as making words with magnetic letters rather than filling out spelling worksheets, they generally behave better and interrupt the teacher less. Discipline problems arise during independent time when students are asked to do things that they do not find interesting or useful to their learning.   Work stations internalize what is taught because students have a direct opportunity to practice a task just as the teacher modeled it and they are continually reading and writing (Diller, 2003).

The implementation of literacy work stations

Classroom management and student engagement during small group reading instruction was my biggest concern while teaching the primary grades. After taking a new position at a local university and starting on my Ph.D. I had the opportunity to attend Debbie Diller's presentation on literacy work stations at a state reading conference. I immediately became interested in learning more about a possible solution to my largest classroom headache. Since I was no longer in the classroom, my dissertation study focused on four first grade teachers that implemented Diller's (2003) literacy work stations. Each teacher read Diller's (2003) book and watched the instructional video (2006). Using observation (including time on task) and interviews I tracked their experiences for 10 weeks. Four themes emerged that teachers can put into practice.

The "I Can…" List. The findings of this study indicated all four teachers overwhelmingly supported the "I can…" list as the most influential piece of Diller's (2003, 2006) literacy work stations and noticed an increase in engagement and student motivation due to the choices the students were able to make. Teachers believed that small group instruction improved because students outside of the small groups were more engaged and therefore interrupted the small group instruction less. Student involvement in the creation of the list and the subsequent participation in their chosen activities are the primary reasons for increased motivation to engage in literacy work stations (See Table 1 for an example of I Can…lists).

The Big Book Work Station is an easy station to introduce if shared reading has taken place in the classroom and it is usually one of the most successful stations in the classroom according to Diller (2003). A mini-lesson is used to create the "I Can" list with students. A possible list might include: read a big book with my partner; find words I know and put highlighter tape on them; read the words with highlighter tape on them; point to the words (or lines) as I read; write my connections on sticky notes. Teachers in this study were surprised with the ideas students came up with when giving them the opportunity to help create the list.

The mini-lesson is also the time to explicitly model what is expected of students. For the Big Book Work Station, modeling should include: how to turn the pages; how to use a pointer; how to use highlighter tape; how to use sticky notes; how to choose a big book and read it together; how to put a big book on the easel before reading it; how to return books to the big book container; how to use props for retelling; how to write at the big book station. The more explicit the modeling, the more successful students will be in the Big Book word station.

The four teachers in the study all had some type of centers in their classroom prior to the professional development in literacy stations. Baseline data showed that, despite the presence of the centers, students still struggled with engagement and problem solving. Teachers were often interrupted from the small group instruction to redirect students or assist them in a problem. The inclusion of the "I can…" lists made notable differences in their classrooms.

These differences can be explained by reviewing findings in achievement motivation. Following the initial professional development, all four teachers created classroom contexts that allowed students to have control over their own learning by providing them with choices, which in turn can foster intrinsic motivation (Wigfield, 2000). Teachers who are overly controlling and do not provide students with opportunities to be autonomous and self-regulated over their own learning can undermine their students' intrinsic motivation and engagement (Ryan & Stiller, 1991). As students learn to value learning, they become intrinsically motivated and self-directed (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Ryan & Stiller, 1991). When using the "I Can …" List students are self-directed learners; they choose to be involved in learning. Building choice into the reading curriculum is a good way to facilitate children's intrinsic motivation in reading and sense of ownership over their reading (Wigfield, 2000).

Turner (1995, 1997) determined that classroom contexts during literacy activities, including closed and open activities, influence the motivation of young students. Open literacy activities are ones that allow students choice, require strategy use, and facilitate student involvement. Students are interested in these types of activities, because they choose which ones to participate in. Closed activities are more constrained, both in terms of students' choices about whether and how to engage in them and the cognitive demands required to complete the task. Turner (1995) found that in classrooms where more tasks were open, students were more engaged in literacy activities, used more elaborative strategies, and were much more interested in literacy activities compared to the students in classrooms where closed tasks were used more frequently. Similar findings were evident in the present study's classrooms that continued to use some closed activities. Two teachers required seatwork to be completed before students could transition to centers. Student engagement was higher for students involved in the centers with open activities, compared to the level of engagement when seatwork and closed activities were required.

Although seatwork was required of all students in two of the classrooms from this study, most students were able to participate in some center time. However, struggling students required more time to finish the seatwork and were often pulled out of the classroom for reading interventions as well, leaving limited time for them to participate in centers. Brophy (1998) found that high achievers are often provided more opportunities for choice and self-direction within classrooms, whereas lower achievers are often micromanaged by their teachers. Research supports the use of choice for *all* students as a way to increase their motivation to learn (Brophy, 1998).

Schedule Issues. The four teachers in this study viewed Diller's (2006) video, which demonstrated two systems of small group instruction. In Diller's example of the first grade room, students spent 30 minutes in two different stations; in the second grade classroom students spent the entire one hour block in one station. After viewing the video and reading the book, but prior to implementing the stations, I met with the teachers. The literacy stations framework that Diller demonstrated was an immediate area of concern. One teacher was skeptical that her students could spend 30 minutes in one station productively. I encouraged the teachers to use the video as a reference only and adapt the system to fit their individual needs. The videos demonstrated self-contained classrooms with all students present for the entire block of time. Not all of the teachers in the study had extended blocks for reading instruction. Additionally, they had students leaving and re-entering the classroom for reading interventions. Because Diller's (2003, 2006) system did not acknowledge children leaving the classroom, the teachers had some initial doubts about how to accommodate the schedule.

Long blocks of uninterrupted learning time are generally required for students to engage in meaningful learning (Byrnes, 2000). For example, Shanahan (2004) recommends that a minimum of 120 minutes of the available daily instructional time in the elementary classroom be allocated to the literacy block with the goal of that time being a single uninterrupted block. Shanahan suggests dedicating 60 minutes of the 120 minute block to small group, differentiated, reading instruction. These recommended blocks were not the reality for the teachers in the study. The schedules ranged from two 30-minutes blocks in one classroom to an uninterrupted 75 minute block with the teacher and an additional paraprofessional in another.

All four classrooms had approximately 25 students in a room, but at times the number of students present in the room was in the single digits. Knapp and associates (1995) discovered in their study of classrooms in high-poverty communities that "programmatic connections between pullout services and regular classroom instruction were often weak or nonexistent" (p. 164). Not even the most highly skilled and dedicated classroom teachers can make a difference when special programs constantly pull students out of the room, making coherent classroom instruction impossible to achieve. Because "pull-out" students still spend 90% of their time in regular classrooms, supplementary programs cannot substitute or compensate for classroom reading instruction (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998).

The schedule also seemed to interfere with the opening and closing components of literacy stations. Diller (2003) suggests a brief mini-lesson before work stations begin and a sharing time following stations. The sharing time provides an opportunity for students to participate in a short, focused discussion about what they did and learned in the work stations. The sharing time was absent almost all of the time in all four classrooms. Teachers felt that there was not enough time to gather together on the floor again before transitioning to lunch, PE or recess. I encouraged teachers to still spend a few minutes bringing closure to work stations by turning to their neighbor to answer the possible question, "What did I do to help myself become a better reader today?" or share at their tables, "What do I think we should change at the work stations?"

Group Numbers. Deciding the appropriate number of students working together in a literacy station was a particular interest of the teachers in the study and emerged as a theme from the beginning of the study. Prior to the study, one teacher in the study, Mrs. Vanek, did not have students work in groups at the centers but rather, the students in her classroom transitioned independently to the stations. Occasionally, two students in Mrs. Vanek's classroom would be in a center at the same time. The remaining three teachers in the study, Mrs. Bailey, Mrs. Soper, and Mrs. Jergens, designed their small group instruction blocks to have students working in centers while small groups of homogenous students worked with the teacher on specific reading skills and strategies. Three to four students were assigned to each center. Four students "working" in each center often caused a considerable level of noise.

Diller (2003, 2006) suggested that no more than two students work together in a station and that the two students be comparable in ability. Working independently is also an option and may be less distracting for many students. In the initial meeting following the professional development, reducing the number of students in a center was a major concern for Mrs. Soper. Not only did she not have enough stations to break her classroom down to just two students – she did not believe that students at the same ability level should work together. Mrs. Soper relied on the higher ability students to help the lower ability students succeed at the stations. Four weeks following implementation of the literacy stations, Mrs. Soper still had her original six stations in her classroom, but just two weeks later, after reviewing the Diller (2003, 2006) text and DVD as well as observing Mrs. Bailey's success in reducing group numbers, Mrs. Soper added several additional stations to change the number of students per station to two or three. Mrs. Soper also moved away from matching high students with low students to more of a "team" approach with an emphasis on problem solving. "I was grouping kids of high, medium, and low, thinking that that way the higher students could sort of help, but after watching the DVD and going through the book, it makes sense then that that student is going to take over. So now, I'm trying to group so they are more of a team, helping each other. And another phrase I use a lot with my kids is problem solver, and so they're helping one another become better problem solvers."

Shell, Brooks, Trainin, et al.,(2010) suggest that teachers "consider the range of abilities within each group to avoid making the spread too wide. Some variability is good, but too much of a range can often lead to inequities, with the high performing students doing much of the actual thinking while the low performing students are assigned to the artwork" (p. 166).

Mrs. Bailey, Mrs. Soper, and Mrs. Jergens all allowed students their choice of partners every few weeks on a given day, and reported that the students really enjoyed the opportunity. The students knew if they did not work well together, they would not be able to continue as partners. Providing choice in the classroom is a central feature in supporting a child's autonomy. It creates willingness and encourages students to fully endorse what they are doing (Deci, 1995).

While there is some debate over cooperative learning and the make-up of groups; providing students the opportunity through the school week to work in both homogeneous and heterogeneous ability groups should be considered by the teacher. It should also be noted that working in literacy work stations during small group instruction is not the same as a traditional center time in many kindergarten and first grade classrooms. Cunningham and Allington (2003) describe "Assigned Centers" as a time when students rotate in 15-minute blocks through four centers. The children are assigned to groups, each of which contains "the whole range of children –from those most experienced with print to those least experienced, and from the most agreeable to the most difficult" (216). As the children work, the teacher circulates with a clipboard, making observations, taking notes, and giving help as needed. Literacy work stations take place when the teacher is involved in providing small group instruction and is not able to closely monitor and observe the students working independently or with a partner.

The number of students working together in literacy work stations, as well as their ability level, seemed to impact the quality of the small group instruction block based on student engagement data during observations. The participants in this study believed that the productivity of the small group instruction block of time increased due to smaller numbers of students working together and that engagement increased for students when similar ability levels worked together.

Professional Development: Teachers Seeking Feedback.   All four teachers volunteered to participate in the professional development because they felt that managing small group instruction was a weakness in their classroom. After the initial professional development, teachers continued to seek my feedback during observation times and through email. The professional development did not end after viewing the videos and reading the book. All four teachers wanted confirmation on what was going well, what could be improved on, and asked questions about concerns they still had. Whether they viewed me as a peer or an expert in the field, teachers wanted coaching feedback on the implementation process.

In a 2009 study conducted by Quick, Holtzman, and Chaney teachers and leadership team members reported that opportunities to observe models of instructional strategies, practice new techniques, and receive feedback were important features of effective professional development. Teachers noted that they appreciate when they can observe a demonstration of a lesson, a new technique, or instructional strategy, and then have the opportunity to "try it on" in their own classroom. As part of this cycle, teachers indicated the importance of immediate feedback on what they are attempting or time to reflect and debrief with their grade level colleagues on what they have learned. Opportunities for teachers to practice new skills before being evaluated on them were also cited as important by leadership team members. Teachers indicated that opportunities for modeling, practice, and feedback did not occur as often as they would have liked.

"Coaching" from a more highly trained professional may help provide the teachers with the modeling, practice, and feedback they desire. The primary focus of a coach, in this case a reading or literacy coach, is to "support teachers in professional development, helping them reflect on their own knowledge and implementation of evidence-based instruction practice in order to improve student learning" (Vogt & Shearer, 2011, 36). Literacy coaching is becoming more prevalent in school districts and a variety of coaching models can be used, but according to The International Reading Association's 2004 position statement on reading coaches there are several key points that most educators agree on: a)The coach does not serve in an evaluative role; rather, the coach is there to support the work of the teacher in a collaborative manner; b) The role of the literacy coach is to provide the job-embedded professional development that will enhance literacy instruction in the school and ultimately improve student achievement. The belief is that the presence of a coach will enable teachers to apply more successfully "best" practices in their classroom; c) coaches must have the interpersonal and communication skills that enable them to work effectively with other adults. They must have an understanding of adult learning and its relevance to their work.

Literacy coaches are instrumental in providing the professional development needed by teachers to continue to expand their repertoire of teaching strategies, gain new knowledge about the reading process, and examine their beliefs about at-risk readers. The professional development must be carefully designed and must continue on a long-term basis (Borko & Putnam, 1995; Hodges, 1996; Richardson, 1998). The National Research Council reminds teachers and administrators that it is an unreal expectation that everything that must be learned about teaching reading can be learned in formal preservice teaching education.

Opportunities for professional development must be provided throughout the career continuum so that teachers are able to sustain "a deep and principled understanding of the reading process and its implications for instruction" (Snow et al., 1998, p. 258).   Joyce and Showers (2002) indicate that, in addition to teachers becoming more knowledgeable about a specific educational endeavor and understanding the rationale or theory for it, the following types of support strengthen teacher learning and the potential for transfer of what is learned during the professional development into classroom practice. These components include: a) Demonstration - teachers get to see the strategies, appropriately implemented ether by watching videotapes or actual teaching in classrooms; b) Practice – Teachers practice what they are learning, with their peers or with small groups of students. These opportunities enable teachers to experience what it means to use specific strategies or approaches and become aware of problems that may arise. The practice events should be accompanied with feedback that enables teachers to get answers to their questions about actual implementation and assistance in how to implement a specific skill or strategy; and c) Coaching – Teachers receive in-classroom support from their peers that enables them to solve problems or answer questions that arise when they are teaching in their own classrooms.

Joyce and Showers (2002) estimate that, when a combination of components (demonstration, practice, and coaching) is employed, especially peer coaching, there is likely to be a real and strong transfer of the professional development to classroom practice by 95% of the participants. Literacy coaches need to spend time with teachers engaged in activities such as observing, modeling, conferencing, co-teaching, and leading book study groups (Casey, 2006; Froelich & Puig, 2010). However, research synthesized by L'Allier, Elish-Piper, and Bean (2010) revealed that the focus of coaching is often lost to organizing book rooms, administering assessments, and participating in district-level meetings (Bean, et al., 2007; Bean & Zigmond, 2007; Knight, 2009). In a study of 190 coaches working in school districts funded by Reading First grants (Deussen et al., 2007) coaches spent, on average, only 28% of their time working with teachers. Additional studies (L'Allier & Elish-Piper, 2006; Bean et al., 2008) have determined that classrooms supported by a literacy coach who engaged in the most interactions with teachers had the highest average student reading gains compared to the lowest average student gains in classrooms with literacy coaches that spent the lowest percentage of time with teachers. L'Allier et al., (2010) have determined that literacy coaches must spend at least half of their time working directly with teachers in order to produce positive growth in teacher practice and student learning. This study, on literacy work stations, confirms that many teachers want professional development but desire feedback and support in order to fully implement the instructional practices.

A Final Note

So, what are students doing while the teacher is working with a small group? How can a teacher be effective during the small group instructional time? This study explored those questions. Pressley's (2006) list of research-based characteristics of high performing classrooms supports small group instruction, but Lanning (2002) found classroom management to be one of the most common reasons that teachers are intimidated by implementing small group instruction as part of their language arts instruction. Management during any form of small group instruction is crucial in order to deliver quality instruction.

Diller (2003) encourages teachers to incorporate literacy work stations into the small group instruction or guided reading block as a management tool and hands-on learning that engages students. The emphasis in literacy work stations is on initial teacher modeling and students taking responsibility for their own learning. All students get to participate in literacy work stations for equal amounts of time with materials that are differentiated for students with varying needs and reading levels. The materials are taught with and used for instruction first, and then the stations remain all year long with changes made to reflect children's reading levels, strategies currently being taught and topics being studied. Through modeling, a gradual release of responsibility, creating a risk free environment, independent work levels, materials, and clear, explicit expectations, students are more likely to successfully engage in literacy work stations and allow the teacher to work with students in small group instruction without interruptions.

References

Allington, Richard. (1983). Fluency: The neglected reading goal. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 556-561.

Allington, Richard. (2002). What I've learned about effective reading instruction from a decade of studying exemplary elementary classroom teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 740-747.

Bean, Rita M., Belcastro, Elizabeth; Draper, Jason; Jackson, Milanda; Jenkins,   Kellee,;Vandermolen, Jill, et al. (2008). *Literacy coaching in Reading First schools: The blind men and the elephant.* Paper presented at the National Reading conference,   Orlando, FL.

Bean, Rita M., Jenkins, Kellee; Belcastro, Elizabeth; Wilson, R., Turner, G., & Zigmond, Naomi. (2007, December). *What reading coaches do and why they do it: A diary study*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX.

Bean, Rita M., & Zigmond, Naomi. (2007, March). *The work of coaches in Reading First schools and their roles in professional development.* Presentation at American   Educational Research   Association Conference, Chicago, IL.

Borko, Hilda, & Putnam,R.T. (1995). Expanding a teacher's knowledge base: A cognitive psychological perspective on professional development. In Thomas R. Guskey &   Michael Huberman (Eds*.), Professional development in education: New paradigms and   practices* (pp. 35-66). New York: Teachers College Press.

Brophy, Jere E. (1998). *Motivating students to learn.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Byrnes, James P. (2000). Using instructional time effectively. In Linda Baker, Mariam Jean Dreher, John T. Guthrie (Eds.) *Engaging young readers: Promoting achievement and motivation.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Casey, Katherine. (2006). *Literacy coaching: The essentials*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cunningham, Patricia M., & Allington, Richard L. (2003). *Classrooms that work: They can all   read and write*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Deci, Edward L. (1995). *Why do we do what we do: The dynamics of personal autonomy*. New York: Penguin Group.

Deci, Edward L., & Ryan, Richard M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum Press.

Deussen, Theresa; Coskie, Tracy; Robinson, LeAnne; & Autio, Elizabeth. (2007). "Coach" can   mean many things: Five categories of literacy coaches in Reading First (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 005). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education   Sciences, National Centers for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest. Retrieved February 14, 2010, from ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/northwest/pdf/REL_2007005.pdf

Diller, Debbie. (2003). *Literacy work stations:Making centers work.* Portland, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Diller, Debbie. (2006). *Launching literacy stations:Mini lessons for managing and sustaining independent work, K-3.* Portland, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Ford, Michael. & Opitz, Michael. (2002). Using centers to engage children during guided reading time: Intensifying learning experiences away from the teacher. *The Reading   Teacher*, 55, 8, 710-717.

Fountas, Irene C. & Pinnell, Gay Su. (1996). *Guided reading:Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Froelich, Kathy S., & Puig, Enrique A. (2010). *The literacy leadership team: Sustaining and expanding success*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Gregory, Gayle H., & Chapman, Carolyn M. (2007*). Differentiated instructional strategies: one   size doesn't fit all.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hodges, Helene L. B. (1996). Using research to inform practice in urban schools: 10 key strategies for success. *Educational Policy, 10, 223-252.*

International Reading Association. (2004). *The role and qualifications of the reading coach in the United States* [brochure]. Newark, DE: Author.

Joyce, Bruce, & Showers, Beverly. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Knapp, Michael & Associates. (Eds.). (1995). *Teaching for meaning in high poverty classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Knight, Jim. (2009). What can we do about teacher resistance? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90, 508-513.

L'Allier, Susan K, & Elish-Piper, Laurie. (2006, December). *An initial examination of the effect   of literacy coaching on student achievement in reading in grades K-3.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Reading Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

L'Allier, Susan K., Elish-Piper, Laurie., Bean, Rita. (2010). What matters for elementary literacy coaching? Guiding principles for instructional improvement and student achievement. *The Reading Teacher*, 63, 544-544.

Lanning, L. (2002). Managing and monitoring the rest of the class during guided reading: three literacy educators share their stories. *The New England Reading Association Journal*, 38, 20-24.

Mendoza, Jean. & Katz, Lilian G. (2008). Introduction to the special section on dramatic play. *Early Childhood Research & Practice*, 10, 1-6.

Pressley, Michael. (2006). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching.* (3rd   Ed.). New York: Guildford Press.

Quick, Heather E., Holtzman, Deborah J., & Chaney, Kassandra R. (2009). Professional   development and instructional practice: Conceptions and evidence of effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14, 45-71.

Reutzel, D. Ray. (2007). Organizing effective literacy instruction: Differentiating instruction to   meet the needs of all children. In L. Gambrell, L. Morrow, & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Best   practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed.) (pp. 11-29). New   York,   NY: Guilford Press.

Richardson, Virgina. (1998). Professional development in the instruction of reading. In Jean Osborn & Fran. Lehr (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning* (pp. 303- 318). New York: Guilford Press.

Ryan, Richard M., & Stiller, Jerome. (1991). The social contexts of internalization: Parent and   teacher influences on autonomy, motivation, and learning. In Martin L. Maehr & Paul R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ryan, Richard M., & Deci, Edward. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55,* 68-78.

Schmoker, Mike. (2001). The crayola curriculum. *Education Week*, 21, 42.

Shanahan, Timothy. (2004). *How do you raise reading achievement?* Paper presented at the Utah Council of the International Reading Association Meeting, Salt Lake City.

Shell, Duane F., Brooks, David W., Trainin, Guy, Wilson, Kathleen M., Kauffman, Douglas F.,   & Herr, Lynne M.(2010). *The unified learning model: How motivational, cognitive, and neurobiological sciences inform best teaching practices.* New York: Springer.

Snow, Catherine E., Burns, M.Susan., & Griffin Peg. (Eds.), (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Tomlinson, Carol A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: responding to the needs of all learners.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, Carol A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and curriculum Development.

Turner, Julianne C. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation   for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 410-441.

Turner, Julianne C. (1997). Starting right: Strategies for engaging young literacy learners. In John T. Guthrie & Allen Wigfield (Eds.), *Reading engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Vogt, Mary Ellen & Shearer, Brenda A. (2011). *Reading specialists and literacy coaches in the   real world.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Wigfield , Allen. (2000). Facilitating children's reading motivation. In Linda Baker, Marian Jean Dreher, John T. Guthrie (Eds.) *Engaging young readers: Promoting achievement and motivation.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Table 1
Mrs. Jergens' "I Can…" Lists

Big Book	Writing
I Can… • Read the book with my partner • Take turns reading the story with my partner • Look at the story and find sight words from our word wall • Make connections and write them on a sticky note.	I Can • Write a friendly letter • Make a birthday card • Write a story • Write in my journal • Make a thank you card • Write about a picture in a magazine • Share my writing with my partner • Make a card • Write a poem
Handwriting	**Listening**
I Can… • Practice writing letters with a pencil • Practice writing letters with a pen • Circle my best letter • Use a vis a vis and complete a handwriting page	I Can… • Turn the page with the beep • Read along with the book • Talk to my partner about the tape when we're finished listening • Retell the story I heard today • Complete a listening log after listening to the story
Overhead	**Games and Puzzles**
I can… • Read a poem on a transparency • Circle and read sight words in a poem • Make words with magnetic letters • Complete a phonics activity transparency	I Can… • Cooperate with my partner • Take turns • Put a puzzle together • Play the game
Library	**ABC/Word Study**
I can… • Read a book with my buddy • Read a story backwards • I read a page then you read a page • I read the whole book then you read the whole book • I read a sentence then you read a sentence • I could read a book then talk about it -illustrator, characters, authors, favorite part, like or dislike, setting, problem, solution	I can… • Use magnetic letters and spell sight words • Use magnetic letters and spell spelling words • Spell names of students • Put names in ABC order • Do a word sort • Use wiki sticks to spell sight words or spelling words • Write words in salt
Poetry	**Drama**
I can…. • Read so it sounds like talking • Find rhyming words • Find words I know • Read poems with good expression • Read poems with my partner • Copy a poem I really like in my best handwriting • Put a poem in my poetry notebook and illustrate it	I can… • Read and retell a book • Use puppets to retell a story • Read a play with a friend • Write a play