

How *Jamestown Reading Navigator*[™]
Supports Research-Based Instruction
for Struggling Adolescent Readers

English Language Learners

Prepared for

Glencoe/McGraw-Hill

by

Interactive Educational Systems Design, Inc.

New York, NY

About This Paper

This paper presents research-supported best practices related to instruction of struggling adolescent readers—that is, students in grades 6–12 who are reading at least two levels below grade level—and describes how *Jamestown Reading Navigator*™ supports those practices.

What Is *Jamestown Reading Navigator*?

Jamestown Reading Navigator is a reading intervention program designed specifically for students in grades 6–12 who are reading two or more reading levels below their grade in school. The program provides direct, explicit instruction and modeling of good reading practices, together with opportunities for students to practice and apply these reading strategies.

Jamestown Reading Navigator combines online activities featuring interactive multimedia for students to complete; engaging and appropriate online and print texts for students to read; an audio component for further guided or independent study; student writing in response to reading; student recording of fluency passages; an assessment program to monitor students' progress; an independent measure of progress monitoring; and teacher support materials, including professional development, lesson plans, instructional recommendations, and reteaching skills support. Major areas of focus for *Jamestown Reading Navigator* include

- Comprehension skills and strategies, designed for application to content-area reading
- Vocabulary
- Writing
- Fluency
- Decoding/phonics (for students with a particular need in this area)

The *Jamestown Reading Navigator* Learner Management System helps teachers manage individual student learning and provides ongoing, up-to-the-minute information on how students are performing. Online professional development modules and on-site professional development sessions offered by Jamestown Education help educators—teachers, administrators, literacy specialists, and others—learn how to implement *Jamestown Reading Navigator* more effectively. These sessions also provide information and suggestions to help educators develop effective strategies for working with struggling adolescent readers.

Jamestown Reading Navigator has been developed based on the most up-to-date research and expert thinking in adolescent literacy, drawing on more than 30 years of experience in reaching adolescent readers with the popular Jamestown Education print series. This paper describes the match between *Jamestown Reading Navigator* and the best available instructional thinking in a variety of specific areas that are important to the success of struggling adolescent readers, as described below.

Introduction

A Critical Need to Support Struggling Adolescent Readers

Problems with literacy have serious and long-lasting consequences. A lack of literacy skills is “one of the most commonly cited reasons” for students to drop out of school (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 7). A resource guide on adolescent literacy prepared for the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory described the problem as follows:

For secondary-level students . . . the social and economic consequences of not reading well can be cumulative and profound: the failure to attain a high school diploma, a barrier to higher education, underemployment or unemployment, and difficulty in managing personal and family life. Years of failing at what is deemed a hallmark of intelligence and worth can also leave struggling readers with emotional consequences, such as anxiety and low self-esteem, that affect personality and interpersonal relationships. These effects within and beyond the classroom walls show that by the secondary grades educators can no longer defer solutions to future development or instruction. (Peterson et al., 2000, p. 6)¹

¹ Peterson et al. (2000) is laid out in a paginated PDF format, but the format does not include page numbers. Page references for quotes from Peterson et al. (2000) that are given in this paper have therefore been calculated on the basis of page numbers shown in the document table of contents.

Numerous sources attest to the scope of the challenge. *Reading Next* cited both results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the opinions of experts in adolescent literacy that “as many as 70 percent of students struggle with reading in some manner” that requires instruction differentiated for their specific needs (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 8, citing Loomis & Bourque, 2001; NCES, 1999, 2006; Olson, 2006).

Adolescents struggle with literacy for a variety of reasons. For some, English may not be their first language. Others may have mild learning disabilities. In many cases, students may simply lack experience and skill with reading. Unfortunately, difficulties in reading don’t cure themselves, but instead tend to get worse as students get older—a phenomenon reading experts refer to as the “Matthew Effect” (Stanovich, 1986). These students need literacy instruction that addresses the specific challenges they face, using the best available research-based methods and principles, in order to improve their chances of succeeding both during school and afterward.

The State of Research on Struggling Adolescent Readers

Over the last two decades, attempts to improve student literacy on the national level have focused largely on elementary instruction, and particularly on early literacy—that is, literacy at the primary grades. For example, the focus of the Reading First initiative was on improving literacy at the primary levels. Recently, however, a number of efforts—including research summaries for a variety of sources, publication of the *Reading Next* report and other documents from the Alliance for Excellent Education, and position statements from organizations such as the National Reading Conference and the International Reading Association—have helped create a higher profile for instructional issues related to adolescent readers, and particularly the large proportion of adolescents who struggle with reading.

Initiatives such as the No Child Left Behind Act have raised expectations for instruction. Instruction is expected to be backed with solid research that concludes it is likely to result in the desired impact on student learning. Unfortunately, research on what constitutes effective literacy instruction for adolescents is still limited. According to the editors of a volume intended to “compile from the best researchers in the field a summary and synthesis of adolescent literacy research and practice,”

As of 2003, there is not a body of research to tell us appropriate interventions that will help struggling middle and secondary school readers who can barely read. As of 2003, we still do not have a body of research to provide us with appropriate interventions to help high school readers who can read fluently but remain 3 or 4 years below grade level in reading. (Jetton & Dole, 2004, p. 6)

Although research on what constitutes effective literacy instruction for adolescents is limited in significant ways, there is substantial support in research and expert opinion for a variety of specific instructional recommendations. The state of knowledge with regard to effective instruction for struggling adolescent readers fits the description of *best available evidence* as characterized by U.S. Department of Education Assistant Secretary Grover J. Whitehurst: that is, “the integration of professional wisdom with the best available empirical evidence in making decisions about how to deliver instruction” (Whitehurst, 2002).

The Reading Next Report

A critical milestone in recent efforts to highlight the challenges related to adolescent literacy was the publication of *Reading Next*, a report to Carnegie Corporation of New York focusing on the needs of adolescent readers (defined in the report as those in grades 4–12), with a special emphasis on the needs of struggling readers. Preparation of this report included the following steps.

- A panel of five nationally known and respected educational researchers was convened in spring 2004, together with representatives of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Alliance for Excellent Education.
- These panelists drew up a set of recommendations for how to meet the needs of struggling readers, including 15 specific elements of effective adolescent literacy programs that had “a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12). These included both elements with an instructional focus and recommended infrastructure elements to improve adolescent literacy.

- The resulting paper was reviewed and augmented at the 2004 meeting of the Adolescent Literacy Funders Forum (ALFF).
- An Appendix was compiled of literature supporting each of the report’s main recommendations.
- In 2006, a second edition of the report was published.

The *Reading Next* recommendations thus represented a synthesis of research-informed expert opinion that serves as an important touchstone for much of what is known about effective adolescent literacy instruction. Several caveats, however, are in order with regard to using the recommendations as a yardstick for measuring instructional programs in general, and *Jamestown Reading Navigator* in particular.

- While all 15 elements identified by *Reading Next* are characterized as having “a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12), the report nonetheless cautions that “the optimal mix of these factors has yet to be determined. . . . Nor does the remediation of adolescent literacy difficulties involve indiscriminately layering on all fifteen key elements. Choices should be matched to school and student needs” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 29). The expectation is not that each literacy program should necessarily include all 15 elements, but that developers and adopters of such programs should select those elements that seem best matched to their specific circumstances.
- The focus of *Reading Next* is explicitly on “the large population of struggling students who already decode accurately but still struggle with reading and writing after third grade” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 11). The report thus does not include recommendations related to areas such as decoding and fluency that may be important for readers who are struggling at a more basic level.
- Several of the elements of *Reading Next* relate to how infrastructure impacts adolescent literacy learning. The most that any purchased instructional program can do in these areas is to provide support to schools and districts as they implement these elements.

Development of This Paper

Development of this research-based white paper included the following steps.

- A top-level review of *Reading Next* was conducted to identify claims and recommended practices, including both those that are associated with the 15 key elements of adolescent literacy identified in the report and those that appear elsewhere in the report. As part of this review, information was collected about the sources in the Appendix to *Reading Next*, which listed literature supporting each of the 15 key elements.
- Well-known experts in the field of adolescent literacy were consulted to identify key, current, and reputable sources related to instruction for struggling adolescent readers. These included both experts who had been consulted during the development of *Jamestown Reading Navigator* and an independent expert not previously associated with the program.²
- Key documents were identified for review, with priority given to two types of documents:
 - *Broad policy-oriented research reviews and surveys of expert opinion, developed by reputable institutions and authors, with a goal of identifying key elements in effective adolescent literacy programs*
 - *More focused research syntheses and meta-analyses from reputable sources, describing the state of research and/or theory related to a specific relevant topic in adolescent literacy (e.g., comprehension, writing, formative assessment)*

² Key contributors included Dr. Thomas W. Bean, professor in literacy/reading and coordinator of doctoral studies in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Nevada at Las Vegas; Dr. William G. Brozo, professor of literacy, Graduate School of Education, George Mason University; and Dr. Douglas Fisher, professor of language and literacy education, San Diego State University. Drs. Brozo and Fisher had previously consulted with the development team for *Jamestown Reading Navigator*. These experts provided input into interpretation of the research literature, as well as recommendations of sources to review, but are not responsible for writing the summaries of the literature or for developing the correlations of the instructional recommendations to *Jamestown Reading Navigator*.

In addition to these two types of documents, some specific research reports were also identified for review, in the case of studies that were particularly germane to topics under investigation.

- Sources were reviewed and summarized, with special reference to
 - *Specific instructional recommendations*
 - *The nature of the evidence supporting each recommendation*
- Instructional recommendations were consolidated from multiple sources.
- Cross-comparison of the research-based recommendations and *Jamestown Reading Navigator* verified that *Jamestown Reading Navigator* supports each research-based recommendation listed in this paper.

In the final paper as presented here, each section spells out specific instructional recommendations that are supported by a mix of research and expert opinion. A table then provides information on how *Jamestown Reading Navigator* aligns with each recommendation.

Key policy-oriented documents and research syntheses that were reviewed for this paper are listed in the References section of the complete White Paper.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

“Although many strategies for supporting literacy in native English speakers are applicable to adolescent ELLs, there are significant differences in the way that successful literacy interventions for the latter group should be designed and implemented.”—*Double the Work: Challenges and Solutions to Acquiring Language and Academic Literacy for Adolescent English Language Learners* (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 1)

The Need to Support Adolescent English Language Learners

Adolescent English language learners (ELLs)—defined as “second language learners who are still developing their proficiency in academic English” (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 1)—represent an expanding segment of the population of struggling adolescent readers and one whose needs are typically not well met in many existing programs. According to a report issued by The Education Alliance at Brown University and the Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory,

In October 2002, the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) estimated that 1,146,154 limited-English-proficient students were attending grades 7–12 in U.S. public schools (excluding Puerto Rico and other outlying jurisdictions) (Kindler, 2002). Despite these numbers, ELLs at the secondary level are not being served as well by their school experience as are other student populations (Abedi, 2005; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory [NWREL], 2004), as measured by secondary school completion rates (August & Hakuta, 1997; National Center for Education Statistics, 1997), participation in advanced classes (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Harklau, 1994a, 1994b), or postsecondary educational pursuits and success (Callahan & Gándara, 2004; Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999; Santos, 2002). (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 3)

Increasingly, the specific challenges associated with teaching English language learners are not confined to only a few geographical areas or specialized classes. Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited statistics to the effect that “In 2001–02, 43% of all teachers had at least one ELL in their classes, three and a half times as many as in 1991–92” (p. 4, citing Zehler et al., 2003, pp. 69–73).

Characteristics of English Language Learners

Part of the challenge of providing effective instruction for English language learners lies in the broad diversity of needs and backgrounds encompassed within the ELL label. As Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) noted,

[B]ecause adolescent ELLs are a diverse group of learners in terms of their educational backgrounds, native language literacy, socioeconomic status, and more, some strategies will work for certain ELLs but not for others. (p. 1)

Areas of difference among adolescent ELLs include differing levels of language proficiency, both in English and in their native language; knowledge of academic subject matter; immigrant status; age of entry into U.S. schools; socioeconomic status; parents' educational levels; and much more (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 10). These various factors all have an important potential impact on how well students do in schools and what kinds of instruction will be most effective in helping them improve their literacy and content-area knowledge and skills.

Identifying Specific Needs of English Language Learners

Although there is a broad overlap between principles of effective instruction for struggling adolescent readers in general and those of English language learners, there are also some important differences, arising from the distinct language backgrounds and often different experiences of ELLs. Some of the differences between adolescent ELLs and native English-speaking struggling readers (as described by Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007) include the following:

- Typically, native English speakers “have proficient command of the spoken language, at least of conversational English,” whereas “[m]any [ELLs] have weak or no oral English skills.” As a result, decoding a word is typically “not sufficient to access its meaning” for ELLs. Similarly for ELLs, “Providing an oral preview of a text or assignment may not unlock its meaning unless it is accompanied by sheltered instruction techniques” (p. 9).³
- While native English speakers can often (with teacher guidance) “tap into prior knowledge to aid comprehension or interpretation of new text,” in the case of ELLs, “Often teachers must build the background; they can’t just activate prior knowledge” (p. 9).
- Native English speakers are “[m]ore likely to recognize multiple meanings” of words, although they “may still need to be taught appropriate academic terminology.” In contrast, ELLs “[m]ay know one meaning of a word (*power* means strength; *Cherokee* is a large car) but not other meanings, including the one needed for a particular subject (political power; Cherokee tribe)” (p. 9).
- For many ELLs, knowledge of cognates (words with a common ancestor) is an important strategy for developing knowledge of English vocabulary (p. 9).
- Because of the unique linguistic needs of ELLs, content-area teachers may be particularly poorly prepared to offer them the support they need to “develop subject-specific vocabulary and literacy skills” (p. 9; see also Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000, p. vii).
- Native English speakers often “have weak intrinsic motivation,” while ELLs “[m]ay have strong intrinsic and extrinsic motivation” (p. 9).

Even these broad generalities vary greatly among ELLs depending on the specific experiences they have had, including prior academic preparation and the specific nature of their first-language knowledge.

Unfortunately, research on “the educational experiences and learning needs of adolescent ELLs” has been characterized as “relatively new and under-developed, with a particular scarcity of longitudinal studies, studies using experimental designs, and research reviews” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 13, citing NWREL, 2004). Nonetheless, literacy researchers have analyzed the available data and identified a variety of instructional practices that are supported by research and expert opinion for helping adolescent ELL struggling readers.

3 “Sheltered instruction . . . refer[s] to an instructional approach for content-area teachers to teach academic subjects using English as the language of instruction. The teachers highlight key language features and incorporate ESL techniques that make the content comprehensible to students while at the same time promoting their English language development” (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 28).

Instructional Recommendations

This section describes recommendations, based in research and expert opinion, for effective instruction of adolescent English language learners in areas related to⁴

- Decoding
- Fluency
- Vocabulary
- Developing key background knowledge
- Comprehension and content-area literacy
- Integrating language modalities
- Collaborative learning strategies
- Motivation and engagement
- Diverse texts
- Writing
- Assessment
- Differentiated instruction
- Technology
- Professional development
- Support for infrastructure improvement

Decoding

- **Phonemic awareness and phonics instruction.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) described a need for phonemic awareness and phonics instruction, specifically for those adolescent ELL students who may not already have this knowledge: “For adolescent ELL students who do not read or write in any language, it is important to teach them the components of reading: beginning with phonemic awareness and phonics (the sounds of a language and how to put sounds together to form words)” (p. 34, citing August & Shanahan, 2006). Similarly, Meltzer and Hamann (2005, p. 29) quoted Au (2002, p. 409) on the need for “intensive instruction, as needed, in areas such as decoding” to supplement a more literature-based approach for students of diverse backgrounds.
 - *According to Short and Fitzsimmons, phonemic awareness and phonics instruction can take place either “in the native language or in English,” since “knowledge and usage of these components will transfer to English. However, it is then useful to pay attention to differences between that language and English. For example, English has some phonemes (the smallest units of spoken language that have meaning) that do not exist in other languages, such as the phoneme ‘sh,’ which does not occur in Spanish. So students may benefit from targeted work in those phonemes” (p. 34). This suggests a value to providing focused work with specific sounds that may not exist in the students’ first language.*
 - *Short and Fitzsimmons also cautioned, “Instruction in these components of reading must . . . be appropriate for teens. Materials for primary grades are not suitable” (p. 34).*

⁴ The categories listed here reflect many of the categories used to organize this entire white paper, with a few exceptions (e.g., categories that relate especially to English language learners such as developing key background knowledge and integrating language modalities). As a result, there is a substantial overlap between instructional recommendations in this section on English language learners and recommendations that appear in the other white paper sections.

Within this section, specific recommendations could be interpreted as relevant to more than one of the subsections. In order to avoid overlap and repetition, these recommendations have typically been listed only once, in the subsection to which they relate most directly. For example, recommendations related to grouping strategies for students appear in the subsection on Collaborative Learning Strategies but are not repeated in the subsection on Differentiated Instruction.

Fluency

Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) identified fluency as one of the “components of reading” that were important to teach to “adolescent ELL students who do not read or write in any language” (p. 34).

Vocabulary

Several sources affirmed the key importance of vocabulary instruction for English language learners. For example,

- According to Klingner and Vaughn (2004), “Vocabulary knowledge is strongly related to effective text comprehension and appears to be a highly significant variable in second-language readers’ success” (p. 191, citing Fitzgerald, 1995a; NICHHD, 2000).
- Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), describing the “overwhelming” challenge faced by ELLs in learning academic vocabulary, stated, “Consider that high school students are expected to have a vocabulary of approximately 50,000 words to be able to master the increasingly complex coursework of high school . . . and the average student learns 3,000 new words each year. In 4 years, then, the average beginning ELL might learn 12,000 to 15,000 words without targeted interventions, falling far short of the 50,000-word goal” (pp. 26–27, citing Graves, 2006; Nagy & Anderson, 1984).

Specific strategies and areas of focus related to vocabulary instruction that have been endorsed for use with ELLs include the following:

- **Use of audio with written texts.** According to Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), “The use of audio books can . . . support students’ literacy development, especially if students follow along with a written text; the recordings provide students with models for pronunciation and read-aloud fluency. For students whose spoken English is better than their reading skills, hearing the words read aloud can aid in vocabulary comprehension” (p. 37).
- **Use of L1 (first language) resources.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) recommended using students’ native languages strategically to “[help] students understand difficult academic and content-specific concepts” by using resources such as “bilingual dictionaries, glossaries, or websites” (pp. 36–37).
- **Cognates.** Multiple sources attest the value of helping students learn vocabulary by identifying cognates (i.e., “words in English that are similar and related to those in the student’s native language [such as] tradition/tradición; university/universidad,” Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 35). For example:
 - “As Cummins (2001) has highlighted, many low-incidence English language words, like the technical vocabulary students encounter across the content areas, come from Greek and Latin roots. Once native Spanish, Portuguese, French, Italian, and Haitian Creole speakers recognize that science and math words in their first language have cognates in English, rapid acquisition of important vocabulary can more easily follow” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 29).⁵
 - “[R]esearchers . . . have reported that Spanish-speaking English language learners in fifth and sixth grade sometimes make use of cognates in their English reading to enhance their English reading comprehension. For example, Nagy, García, Durgumo_lu, and Hancin (1993) reported that fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade Spanish-speaking English language learners’ knowledge of specific Spanish cognates and their recognition of cognate relationships significantly predicted their comprehension of unknown English cognates while reading in English, after their knowledge of English vocabulary had been controlled. . . . Because none of the students made full use of the Spanish cognates that appeared in the English readings (García & Nagy, 1993), Nagy and his colleagues (1993) thought that the students, especially those in fifth and sixth grade, could benefit from instruction on how to use cognates in their English reading” (García & Godina, 2004, p. 308; also cited by Klingner & Vaughn, 2004, p. 192).
 - “Rodriguez (2001) successfully taught 20 bilingual middle school students how to use cognates to facilitate their second-language reading” (Klingner & Vaughn, 2004, p. 192).

⁵ The References list for Meltzer & Hamann (2004) does not include a source by Cummins dated 2001. However, the References list for Meltzer & Hamann (2005) does include a source by Cummins dated 2001, which has been incorporated into the References list for this section.

- **Contextual and morphemic analysis.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) identified “developing clues to meaning of a word based on context clues and structural analysis” as among the helpful methods for students to develop knowledge of new words (p. 35, citing August, 2003; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004). Similarly, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) reported positive results from a vocabulary enhancement intervention for fifth-grade Anglo and Latino students that incorporated a mix of direct instruction of selected words with “strategies for using information from context [and] morphology” (p. 57, citing Carlo et al., 2004).
- **Direct instruction in content-area vocabulary.** Summarizing research on effective classroom teaching and learning strategies for ELLs, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) concluded, “According to the literature, both L1 English students whose literacy skills are on or below grade level and their ELL peers benefit from explicit instruction in the vocabulary . . . of the various content areas” (p. 62).
- **Multiple-meaning words.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) advised, “Teachers must teach multiple meanings of words” (p. 35). Knowledge about multiple meanings was also one of the strategies incorporated in the successful fifth-grade vocabulary intervention reported by Carlo et al. (2004) (cited in Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 57).
- **Authentic contexts for vocabulary learning.** According to Meltzer and Hamann (2004), “In a study of four high school classes where ELLs fared well academically, Henze and Lucas (1993) note that explicit vocabulary instruction consciously emphasized the meaning of language rather than the structure. That is, rather than having students memorize lists of vocabulary while doing little to practice their use, teachers had ELLs (and other students) participate in activities where new vocabulary was used in authentic ways, making new words not only more intelligible, but more memorable as well” (p. 57).

Along similar lines, Klingner and Vaughn (2004) stated, “Providing contexts from which words or concepts are taught, as well as enabling students to use words and concepts framed within their own experiences, is useful. For example, when students are learning about canyons, teachers can frame the word around the context in which students will be learning about canyons within their reading. They can also integrate students’ background and related experiences about canyons. These expanding contexts need to be considered within the multiple teachings of the text the students are reading and learning” (p. 196).

- **Instructional aids.** Describing potentially helpful strategies for helping ELL students with vocabulary development, Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) stated, “Visuals, graphic organizers, demonstrations, and other instructional aids and devices can help students better understand and remember words and their meanings” (p. 35).
- **Expressive vocabulary.** According to Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), “Teachers must . . . help students incorporate words into their expressive vocabularies” (p. 35). Similarly, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) described a “virtuous loop” for ELLs in which “their explicit reflection on comprehension and production tasks motivates them to identify the appropriate vocabulary, text strategies, and even discourse features that will authentically convey their thoughts and understandings in a contextually appropriate manner” (p. 39). This suggests a value to having students engage in writing and speaking tasks in which they are prompted to use appropriate vocabulary words.

Developing Key Background Knowledge

Lack of key background knowledge is a critical problem for English language learners. As Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) wrote,

Many adolescent ELLs lack background knowledge of the topics taught in middle and high school content classes or have gaps in information learned. Teachers must activate what prior knowledge exists and apply it to the lessons or explicitly build background schema. Students who have been in U.S. schools since the early grades generally have some of the background knowledge that is expected by teachers, textbooks, and curricula in the secondary grades if they understood the lessons, but students who are new to the United States may not. Although they often have a great deal of background knowledge, not all of it applies to the academic context of their courses. (p. 35)

The problem is illustrated by a study of fifth and sixth graders described by García and Godina (2004), who “reported that the Latino students, regardless of English reading level, were less familiar with the range of topics on the standardized test passages and knew much less of the vocabulary in the passages and test items

compared to their Anglo classmates” (p. 309, citing García, 1991). Helping these students both develop relevant background knowledge and learn strategies that will help them connect more effectively to their own background knowledge and experiences is thus a priority for ELL instruction.

- **Activating prior knowledge.** A key strategy for both ELLs and mainstream learners is to activate their prior knowledge of the topics that will be addressed in texts.
 - “According to the literature we reviewed, if ELLs are going to be successful at using reading and writing in U.S. schools to learn in supported (ESL or bilingual) and/or mainstream classrooms, their teachers must consciously activate learners’ background knowledge to support the comprehension of challenging texts” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 17).
 - “Connecting instruction to what the learners know and then explicitly discussing how that knowledge applies to the topic at hand is a technique teachers should use with ELLs” (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 35).
- **Directly building background knowledge.** In cases where prior knowledge is lacking, background knowledge can be built directly through instruction.
 - According to Peregoy and Boyle (2000), “Building background knowledge on a text topic, through firsthand experiences such as science experiments, museum visits, and manipulatives can facilitate success in reading” (p. 239, as quoted in Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 17).
 - Similarly, Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) indicated that “ways to build background [include] introducing students to new academic topics through short video clips, demonstrations, or field experiences” (p. 36).
- **Time required.** Several sources mentioned the importance of allowing time for ELLs to activate and/or develop adequate background knowledge:
 - According to Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), “[A]dolescent ELLs generally need much more time focused on developing vocabulary and background schema than native English speakers do” (p. 8).
 - Klingner and Vaughn (2004) wrote, “It is important not to assume that students have (or should have) the same shared, common knowledge set, and to ensure that adequate time is spent pre-viewing critical information and concepts from text and tapping related background knowledge” (p. 190).

Taken together, these suggest the importance of allowing ample time for activating prior knowledge and building background information, and providing extra time and opportunities in cases where students lack prior knowledge or where concepts are particularly difficult.

Comprehension and Content-Area Literacy

Comprehension remains a major goal of instruction for ELLs, as for native English speakers. Similarly, helping adolescent ELLs develop content-area literacy is a central concern. Researchers in literacy for adolescent ELLs have identified a variety of specific strategies related to comprehension and/or content-area literacy that are supported by research and expert opinion, many of which overlap with effective practices for adolescent struggling readers in general.

- **Content- or theme-based focus.** Several sources noted the value of a content- or theme-based curriculum for ELLs.
 - Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) explained, “Adolescents thrive in situations in which they recognize the relevance of what they are learning. By helping them understand how the acquisition of language and academic literacy skills will allow them to achieve at higher levels in other classes, they may become more motivated. In a learning environment that incorporates language development with content or themes, students can see for themselves the importance of literacy skills in understanding the way material is presented and how texts are organized. The literacy skills needed to ‘do’ science, for example, can be made clear and explicitly taught while students are engaged in ‘doing’ science for a real purpose. . . . Thus, providing content- or theme-based instruction gives ELLs an important framework for assimilating new information and applying

language skills learned across the curriculum” (p. 36, citing Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006; García & Godina, 2004; Moje et al., 2004; Schleppegrell, Achugar, & Orteiza, 2004; Short, 1999).

- Klingner and Vaughn (2004) described research on “six exemplary high schools” that found that in those schools, “Students [learning English] benefited from . . . a theme-based curriculum” (p. 192, citing Lucas, 1996; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990).
- **Teaching skills in context.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) endorsed research on the importance of teaching comprehension skills in context as particularly applicable to ELLs: “The research recommends that literacy skills and strategies be taught and used in the context of reading, writing, and learning rather than solely or primarily practiced in isolation. . . . The research does not show strong results for ELL or other students who learn skills in isolation and then are expected to apply or transfer those skills appropriately on their own. However, there is ample evidence that a number of particular literacy strategies, when explicitly taught, modeled, and practiced in context, enhance the ability of secondary school students to use reading and writing skills to learn throughout the content areas” (p. 23, citing Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Rosenshine, 1997; Rosenshine & Meister, 1994; Rosenshine et al., 1996; Schoenbach et al., 1999).
- **Cycle of modeling, explicit teaching, and formative assessment.** Describing practices of effective literacy instruction supported by research both on mainstream adolescents and on ELLs, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) stated, “Teachers need to model, explicitly teach, and regularly assess students’ literacy habits and skills in order to determine what to further model and teach. . . . If the cycle is implemented as described, the research suggests that it can help teachers meet the academic literacy development needs of diverse learners, including ELLs” (p. 20).
- **Explicit instruction in comprehension strategies.** As with native English speakers, effective comprehension instruction for ELLs utilizes explicit instruction in comprehension strategies as a key approach.
 - Citing research on the differences between successful and less successful ELLs, García and Godina (2004) proposed the following high-level guideline for effective ELL literacy instruction: “Within the ESL language arts classroom, we recommend strategy instruction, in which the teacher models and gives students guided practice in using cognitive strategies to monitor and repair their comprehension in English” (p. 317, citing Jiménez et al., 1995, 1996; Nagy et al., 1993).
 - Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) endorsed this recommendation, stating, “Besides learning the basics of reading, ELLs need to receive explicit instruction about reading comprehension strategies. . . . If the students already apply these strategies when reading in their native language, then the strategies may transfer to English. . . . Some students, however, need explicit instruction in strategy use in order to make the transfer. For adolescent ELLs who lack reading strategies in their native language, second language strategies instruction can provide them with skills they can apply to all texts” (p. 35, citing August, 2002; Bernhardt, 2005; Denti & Guerin, 2004; García & Godina, 2004; Riches & Genesee, 2006).
 - Meltzer and Hamann (2005) described the success of the CAPE (Content Area Program Enhancement) program, which “required teachers to explicitly teach at least one CALLA [Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach] strategy as applicable at each class session, ‘either cognitive (resourcing, grouping, note taking, elaboration of prior knowledge, summarizing, deduction, induction, imaginary or making inferences) or metacognitive (organization, planning selective attention, self-management, self-assessment)’” (pp. 23–24, quoting from Montes, 2002, p. 699; emphasis as reproduced from Meltzer & Hamann).
- **Modeling.** As noted above, modeling of specific literacy skills and strategies is part of the cycle advocated by Meltzer and Hamann (2005, p. 20). Describing research on mainstream literacy instruction, these researchers clarified this component as follows: “Modeling and explicitly teaching desired literacy skills and behaviors provides students, who say they read but do not always understand, with important strategies to employ when comprehension breaks down” (p. 37, citing Greenleaf & Mueller, 1997; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997). They concluded by identifying “[m]odeling viable literacy habits” among “important practices for teachers” in teaching both ELLs and native English speakers (p. 62).

- **Active student involvement; process-based approach.** Describing research-supported practices for helping adolescents develop academic literacy, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) stated, “[A] common theme that underlies these promising practices is the importance of interacting with and actively processing text in order to improve reading comprehension and learning. That is, students are required to do something with the text, not just pass their eyes over the words, unsure of where to focus” (p. 19).
 - Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) reached a similar conclusion with regard to adolescent ELLs in particular, stating, “After adolescent ELLs acquire the basic skills, they need to become active readers and writers who use reading and writing processes, such as previewing, making predictions, paraphrasing, and inferring (for reading) and brainstorming, drafting, editing, and publishing (for writing)” (p. 34).
 - Continuing their discussion of this point, they stated further, “Skilled readers and writers engage in these processes in academic settings and in ‘real life,’ and researchers have found that adolescent ELL literacy is enhanced when teens are taught using a process-based approach. . . Using these processes, learners can examine a text, make conclusions about it, articulate and incorporate those conclusions, and then evaluate the effectiveness of the incorporation. The process creates awareness about the functions of language, and the reflection inherent in the process helps students practice the kinds of highly abstract thinking that [are] essential to succeeding in high school and beyond into college or the world of work” (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, p. 34, citing García & Godina, 2004; Valdés, 1999; Villasenor, 2003).
 - Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited comments by Perego and Boyle (2000) to the effect that “with intermediate ELL readers, the deliberate and purposeful uses of before (e.g., purpose for reading, activating background knowledge, introduction of vocabulary), during (e.g., teacher and student co-reading, prediction, paired reading, student response logs, use of graphic organizers such as story maps), and after strategies (e.g., mapping, dramatization, creating a mural, writing reader’s theatre scripts) are critical for supporting comprehension and content recall” (p. 29, citing Perego & Boyle, 2000, pp. 245–246; emphasis in original).

Taken together, these statements suggest a general value for ELLs in practices that involve them in actively processing texts and in using a process-based approach to reading texts that incorporates before-reading, during-reading, and after-reading activities.

- **Critical thinking and reasoning.** In their discussion of eight literacy-related instructional practices that were supported by research for both mainstream adolescents and ELLs, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) identified thinking and reasoning as a common element: “The centrality of *thinking* emerges in conjunction with all of these. For example, strategic reading, writing to learn, Socratic discussion, debate preparation, concept development, questioning the author, question and answer relationships, think alouds, and reciprocal teaching are cited throughout the literature as strategies to improve reading comprehension, and all involve critical thinking. Thus, literacy and thinking cannot be separated” (p. 11, citing van den Broek & Kremer, 2000; Verhoeven & Snow, 2001; emphasis in original). This suggests an importance to teaching critical thinking and reasoning as part of text comprehension.
- **Comprehension monitoring and metacognition.** Multiple sources among ELL researchers identify comprehension monitoring and/or metacognition as a particularly important area for ELLs to develop their skills. For example:
 - Metacognitive strategy instruction—defined by Meltzer and Hamann (2005) as “allow[ing] students to effectively monitor their own comprehension and skill in reading, writing, speaking, and listening” (p. 36)—was one of two major components of “emphasis on thinking,” one of the eight instructional practices they identified as supported by the literature for both mainstream adolescents and ELLs.⁶
 - Similarly, García and Godina’s (2004) guideline related to strategy instruction for ELLs (noted on previous page under *Explicit instruction in comprehension strategies*) included a focus on helping students learn to “monitor and repair their comprehension in English” (p. 317, citing Jiménez et al., 1995, 1996; Nagy et al., 1993).

6 The other component was cognitive strategy instruction, which refers to “developing high-order thinking skills [related to] the use of reading, writing, speaking, and listening both to learn and to demonstrate learning” (p. 36).

- Describing differences between ELLs and native English readers, Klingner and Vaughn (2004) wrote, “Jiménez et al. (1996) [noted] that the skilled English-only readers they studied seldom needed to monitor their comprehension overtly the way second-language readers needed to, because they rarely encountered unknown vocabulary and had well-developed background schemas that were relevant to the text they read” (p. 189). This suggests a particular importance to comprehension monitoring as a strategy for ELLs.
- Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited Greenleaf et al. (2001) in support of “the effectiveness and utility of using metacognitively oriented conversations (i.e., conversations that explicitly draw learners’ reflective attention to their learning strategies) with struggling readers, including ELLs” (pp. 37–38).
- **Making predictions.** Klingner and Vaughn (2004) identified predicting as a practice that “appear[s] promising for improving the reading comprehension of adolescent English language learners” (pp. 195–196, citing Anderson & Roit, 1990, 1993, 1996). Describing how to use prediction as an effective strategy, they wrote, “Prediction can be better situated to assist English language learners when teachers first establish the context for a story, then help students relate the context to their prior experiences. Written cues and ideas can be written down to aid students while they are reading. . . . Students should later return to their predictions to assess how accurate they were” (p. 196, citing Gersten & Jiménez, 1994). Similarly, as cited above, both Short and Fitzsimmons (2007, p. 34) and Meltzer and Hamann (2005, p. 29, citing Peregoy & Boyle, 2000) endorsed prediction as part of a process-based approach to reading.
- **Text structures.** Several researchers identified instruction in the structures of text as among the useful practices that may be particularly helpful for ELLs.
 - Klingner and Vaughn (2004) identified research to the effect that “[i]n general, passages organized in a familiar structure are easier to comprehend and remember than passages structured in a less familiar way. . . . Text structures are culturally determined, and knowing them takes a great deal of implicit learning, though explicit instruction can help. In a study of 70 sixth-grade students studying English as a foreign language, Amer (1992) found that direct instruction in text structure facilitated students’ comprehension and recall” (pp. 190–191, citing Amer, 1992; Carrell, 1984; Fitzgerald, 1995a; Hinds, 1983).
 - Along similar lines, they stated, “Explicitly teaching text structures can increase English language learners’ comprehension. In one procedure . . . teachers teach students a new text structure, such as problem-solution, by prompting them to ask a series of questions about the text that corresponds to its structure. For example, ‘What is the problem? What is the cause of the problem? What will happen if the problem continues? How can the problem be solved?’” (Klingner & Vaughn, 2004, p. 196, citing Anderson & Henne, 1993; McLaren & Anderson, 1992).
 - Meltzer and Hamann (2005) identified “understanding text structures within the content areas” as one of eight research-supported instructional practices for improving literacy development and content-area learning for both mainstream students and ELLs: “According to the literature, both L1 English students whose literacy skills are on or below grade level and their ELL peers benefit from explicit instruction in the . . . text structures, and discourse features of the various content areas” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, pp. 1, 62). These benefits include “provid[ing] readers with a frame of reference when interpreting new information or determining how to approach academic writing tasks” (p. 52). Meltzer and Hamann (2005) also cited Fitzgerald’s (1995b) review of 110 articles on reading English as a second language, which “found that reading instruction targeting specific student knowledge, such as . . . text-structure knowledge was generally effective” (p. 29).
 - The same authors identified “[s]trategies for unpacking text structures” as including “using signals for predicting, mapping, teaching story grammar, inventing main ideas, making hierarchical summaries, translating the main ideas into visual frames or organizers, scaffolding by example from the teacher, and selecting assignments that require attention to structures and features (e.g., chapter previews, text scavenger hunts, and use of textual clues in the completion of summaries) and text queries” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 52, citing Dickson et al., 1995a, 1995b; Pearson & Fielding, 1991; Schoenbach et al., 1999; Symons, Richards, & Greene, 1995; Taylor, 1992).

- **Academic genres.** Along similar lines, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited several sources on the importance of exposing ELLs to multiple genres, particularly “academic” genres, and instructing them on the features of those genres. For example, they quoted Callahan (2005) as stating, “Because they are not native English speakers, [ELLs] require explicit instruction in the genres of academic English used in scientific reports, court documents, public information articles, and the like. Exposure to domain-specific language facilitates content-area understanding, bringing English learners to the academic forefront” (p. 323, quoted in Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 2). Elsewhere, they stated, “[T]here is increasing acceptance that the task of reading differs according to purpose and genre. Reading an article for facts is different from reading a mystery novel for pleasure. Teaching adolescents about genre-based differences in reading requires that the teacher act as an expert reader, modeling for students how to approach reading in a variety of texts” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 19).
- **Explicit instruction in content-area reading and writing.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) identified an emphasis on reading and writing in the content areas as one of eight practices supported by research and expert opinion related to both mainstream and ELL adolescents. They wrote, “The second recommendation from the research is an increased emphasis on reading and writing instruction within the context of content-area learning. . . . Chances to practice are not enough; there is growing consensus that to support students’ abilities to maximize learning from texts, content-area teachers need to provide content-area reading *instruction* as part of teaching in the content-focused classroom” (p. 27, citing Jacobs, 1999; Langer, 2002; Moore, Alvermann, & Hinchman, 2000; Vacca, 2002; emphasis in original). They went on to state, “Explicit teaching of the discourse features particular to specific content areas is especially important for ELLs and students with a limited background in the academic literacy expectations of schools” (p. 49, citing Heath, 1983; Mohan, 1990; Reyhner & Davidson, 1992; Spanos, 1992). This suggests a value to providing professional development that can help content-area teachers learn effective strategies for incorporating reading and writing instruction, relevant to the specific content area, into their classes.
 - Meltzer and Hamann (2004) endorsed the strategy of using professional development to help content-area teachers develop these skills, stating, “Training all secondary-school teachers to promote content-area literacy development can be part of the strategy for improving schools’ capacity to respond to secondary-level ELLs” (p. 37).
 - Similarly, Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) argued, “Content-area language and discourse—an understanding of how language is used in a specific subject area or discipline and of subject-specific text genres and structures” should be “part of the teacher development programs for all teachers” (pp. 23, 24, citing Crandall, 2000; Crawford, 2003; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004; Grant & Wong, 2003; Short & Echevarria, 2004; Wong, Fillmore, & Snow, 2002).⁷

Integrating Language Modalities

Incorporating both written and oral language and integrating all four language modalities—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—represent key research-based strategies advocated by experts for supporting ELL literacy and content learning.

- García and Godina (2004) wrote, “Teachers who work with English language learners in ESL and all-English classrooms need to know how to shelter students’ comprehension of English instruction through the integration of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and the use of visuals, gestures, drama, physical activity, and *realia*” (p. 316, citing Peregoy & Boyle, 2001).
- According to Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), “ELLs benefit from the integration of explicit instruction in reading, writing, listening, and speaking across the curriculum, regardless of student proficiency level. . . . Research strongly suggests that reading and writing are mutually reinforcing skill domains, and that this holds true for ELLs just as it does for native English speakers. . . . Oral language development is also important because it facilitates English literacy development. . . . To be academically literate, students must be able to engage in the oral discourse of the classroom as well as the reading and writing activities in the lessons. Therefore, teachers should integrate all four language skills in their lessons, and oral language practice should not be sacrificed for more time on reading and writing” (p. 34, citing August, 2002; August & Shanahan, 2006; Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006; Genesee et al., 2006).

⁷ We note that the References list in Short & Fitzsimmons (2007) does not list any source dated 2000 with Crandall as the sole author. However, a source dated 2000 lists Crandall, Jaramillo, Olsen, & Kreeft Peyton as authors. This source is listed in the References list for this section.

- Similarly, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) wrote, “The ELL literature generally agrees that to maximize literacy development, assignments should require students to use reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills and should contain aspects that draw students’ attention to both spoken and written language use (their own and others) as well as content” (p. 18, citing Anstrom, 1997; Carrasquillo & Rodríguez, 2002; Doherty et al., 2003; Enright & McCloskey, 1988; Fillmore & Snow, 2000). They also stated, “[E]xplicit instruction can and should incorporate each of the domains of literacy—that is, reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking—because the most effective strategies for comprehension and communication in the content areas vary by learner, topic, task, etc.” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 62).
- Meltzer and Hamann (2005) also wrote, “The use of classroom talk in conjunction with learning from and creating texts may be particularly useful for supporting academic literacy development in struggling readers and second language learners, especially when opportunities to talk about text are structured as small group discussions” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 31, citing Alvermann & Phelps, 1998; Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989; Tharp, 1999).
- More broadly, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited Nurss and Hough (1992) and “many others” in support of the conclusion that “oral language is a key aspect of literacy development for ELLs. . . . They note that ELL students need frequent verbal interactions with teachers and with peers. Teachers provide the academic and content-related language that students need, as well as language related to the management of learning and the classroom. Peers can provide socially appropriate ways of using language for communication. Both are necessary in order for ELLs to develop oral language competence in English” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 33).
- Notwithstanding the critical importance of oral language, Meltzer and Hamann (2004, 2005) also cited research on the particular importance for ELLs of providing written texts as a basis for student work:
 - *“Text itself emerges in the ELL literature as a key instructional aid for content-area learning. Scarcella (2002) identifies it as essential input for advanced literacy development. Harklau (2002) . . . notes that the reviewability of text is a key and often preferred feature for ELLs. Unlike oral communication (which, unless recorded, disappears as fast as it is spoken), written text is available for ongoing examination, which allows ELLs (and other learners) to reread, to check emergent interpretive hypotheses, to compare to L1 literacy rules and conventions they may know, and to practice repeatedly” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 30).*
 - *Harklau (2002) “observed that [secondary-level ELLs] often preferred to work with written as opposed to oral sources of input because texts were reviewable, unlike the talk of teachers and peers” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 35).*
 - *Also according to Harklau (2002), “On a broader level, a distinguishing characteristic of print is the possibility for language learners to interact without the pressures of face-to-face communication, allowing them to slow the pace, make exchanges reviewable and self-paced, and to put contributions in editable form” (p. 337, quoted in Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 35).*
 - *Based on this research, Meltzer and Hamann (2004) concluded, “Text, therefore, becomes an even more important vehicle for engaging adolescent ELLs than for other adolescents” (p. 35).*

Collaborative Learning Strategies

According to Meltzer and Hamann (2004),

Text-based discussion and collaborative learning . . . emerge in the ELL literature as two key instructional approaches for engaging ELLs with content-area learning and literacy development. Much evidence exists that interactional learning encourages cooperation and discourse, which in turn drive language learning. . . . This seems to be the case even when all the students in the group lack full English proficiency. (p. 33, citing Waxman & Tellez, 2002; Joyce, 1997)

Meltzer and Hamann (2004, 2005) identified several benefits of collaborative learning for promoting both general and content-area literacy. For example:

- “Evidence suggests that the purposeful use of cooperative learning structures in content-area classrooms motivates ELLs’ participation and supports their achievement. . . . Well-designed cooperative learning is an important literacy development strategy for adolescent native and nonnative speakers because it allows the social construction of meaning through collaborative effort” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 36, citing Montes, 2002; Waxman & Tellez, 2002).
- “[P]eer interaction . . . offers ELLs the chance to practice the vocabularies and genres specific to various content areas” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 35).
- “Verplaetse (2000b) notes four underlying reasons for the importance of classroom interaction for ELL students:

First, the social and communicative strategies needed to gain access to the content are acquired simultaneously during the learning of the academic content (Mehan, 1978). As stated by Green and Harker, “curriculum . . . is tripartite in nature; it is composed of academic, social, and communicative demands” (1982, p. 183). In other words, students learn how to communicate and how to express social relationships at the same time that they are learning course content. Second, interaction allows the student the opportunity to share in the co-construction of knowledge (Wertsch & Toma, 1990). Students who take part in the interaction take part in the construction of the knowledge. Third, with regard to higher level academic communicative skills, interaction provides a learner the repeated practice needed to develop this communicative competency (Hall, 1993; Snow, 1990). [. . .] Fourth, with regard to social role definition, interaction determines the level of co-membership a student is to experience with the group (Zuengler, 1993). In other words, students establish social roles within the classroom community, in part, through their interactive roles. Consequently, limited interactive roles [limited in type or number] for [limited English proficient] students could restrict the development of their social and academic communicative skills, limit their opportunities to co-construct knowledge, and simultaneously marginalize their social roles within the classroom community. (pp. 20–21)⁸

- “Scarcella (2002) notes that ELLs’ classroom interaction with speakers of Standard English contributes to the acquisition of advanced English literacy skills. Such interaction exposes ELL students to academically sanctioned forms of English and offers them the practice and feedback needed to develop phonology, lexicon, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, pp. 33–34)
- “In their summary of the literature on effective instruction for ELLs, Waxman and Tellez (2002) assert that collaborative learning emerges as both an important structure for supporting instructional conversations and as a delivery strategy for addressing principles of culturally responsive instruction, such as diversity. They claim that group tasks are crucial for language learning and conclude, ‘Other aspects of collaborative learning communities like debate and compromise can be developed through aspects of instructional conversation practice’ ” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 41, quoting Waxman & Tellez, 2002, p. 2).

Specific recommendations related to collaborative strategies, including text-based collaborative learning (both with texts students read to interpret and with texts they write themselves), are described below.

- **Interactive discussions of texts.** As noted in the quote from Meltzer and Hamann (2004) on the previous page, text-based discussion is a “key instructional [approach] for engaging ELLs with content-area learning and literacy development” (p. 33). Interactive discussions related to text represent one of the key strategies identified by researchers as positive ways for students to collaborate as they build their knowledge of texts.

⁸ Sources referenced in this quote from Verplaetse (2000b) were not listed in the References for Meltzer & Hamann (2005) and therefore do not appear in the References list for this section.

- **Peer review of writing.** Meltzer and Hamann (2004) wrote, “Cooperative learning can also be usefully extended to having peers review each others’ written work. In their study of second-language learners at the secondary level, Tsui and Ng (2000) found that while students preferred feedback on their writing from their teacher, most also found peer comments to be helpful. In particular, peer comments enhanced a sense of audience, raised learners’ awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses, encouraged collaborative learning, and fostered the ownership of text. This was true for both less experienced and more experienced second-language writers” (p. 36).
- **Diverse grouping experiences.** According to Meltzer and Hamann (2005), “ELLs, like many students, learn best when they have a mix of individual, small group, and whole class work” (p. 24, citing Anstrom, 1997).
- **Guidelines for collaborative grouping.** Meltzer and Hamann (2004) identified a variety of strategies for successful collaborative learning, including the following specific strategies that *Jamestown Reading Navigator* supports:
 - *Using strategies for assigning students to groups, including “mixing native and nonnative speakers; creating groups around interest/inquiry; [and] choosing group membership based on strengths brought to bear on project completion” (p. 36)*
 - *“[E]stablishing working group routines around particular types of tasks” (p. 36)*
 - *Assessing both groups and individuals (p. 36)*

Motivation and Engagement

Summarizing their comparison of mainstream adolescent literacy research and research on adolescent ELLs in the area of motivation and engagement, Meltzer and Hamann (2004) concluded broadly,

Our reviews of the literature confirm that research-grounded recommendations related to the academic literacy development of adolescents and effective instruction for secondary-level ELLs substantively overlap in the area of student motivation and engagement. (p. 37)

Specific practices that have been identified for promoting motivation and engagements among ELLs include the following:

- **Appropriate challenge level.** Meltzer and Hamann (2004) identified making sure that students are working at an appropriate instructional level to ensure their academic success as a key strategy for helping ELLs be motivated and engaged. They wrote, “If we want adolescents to be able to competently use reading, writing, and speaking in English to learn, to define themselves and their worlds, and to develop their voice . . . they need learning environments . . . where we scaffold their growing abilities so they can successfully use academic language. . . . These conditional requirements are as relevant to ELLs as to any other secondary school students. . . . If ELLs are embarrassed, if tasks are too far above or below their proximal zone of development, or if teachers do not provide frequent opportunities and strategies for ELLs to successfully develop as readers and writers, then ELLs will disengage just like other adolescents confronting learning environments stacked against them. . . . It is difficult to become better at something if one refuses to engage with it” (p. 13, citing Ballenger, 1997; Erickson, 1987; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; Hall & Verplaetse, 2000; Verplaetse, 2000a, 2000b). This speaks to the important motivational effects of making sure students are matched to tasks that are at an appropriate difficulty level for them or are provided with appropriate scaffolding to help ensure that assigned tasks are brought within their capabilities.
- **Clear expectations.** Describing research findings for promoting motivation and engagement among ELLs, Meltzer and Hamann (2004) wrote, “Successful programs . . . require an explicit delineation of expectations (the teacher’s, the student’s, and the state’s—i.e., state curriculum frameworks or content area standards)” (p. 39). This suggests the importance of providing clear goals as a motivating factor for students—an element confirmed in mainstream research as well.
- **Student choices.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) endorsed the importance of student choice as an important factor for motivation of ELLs, just as for mainstream students, writing, “Most students tend to be more motivated and more successful in reading when they have meaningful opportunities to exercise choice, whether that means choice of text (deciding what to read), choice of task (what sort of reading or writing project to do with the text), or choice of partner (picking a partner with whom to do a project)” (p. 37).

- **Relevance to students' interests and lives.** Meltzer and Hamann (2004, 2005) identified several advantages from connecting instruction to ELL students' interests and/or making instruction relevant to the circumstances of their lives.
 - *Describing the value of “safe and responsive classrooms” for ELLs, they wrote, “To be culturally responsive, classrooms must be centered around instruction that ‘emphasizes students’ cultural and situational concerns, including critical family and community issues, and incorporates them into the curriculum, textbooks, and learning activities’ ” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 25, quoting Waxman & Tellez, 2002, pp. 1–2).*
 - *In this connection, they noted the importance for ELLs of “Seeing choices of texts and hearing examples and discussion of issues that reflect ELLs’ social realities” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 25).*
 - *Describing learner-centered classrooms—one of the eight instructional practices they identified as improving literacy development and content-area learning for both mainstream students and ELLs—they wrote, “A learner-centered classroom builds upon students’ background, interests, and experiences” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 40).*
- **Professional development.** Meltzer and Hamann (2004) argued for the importance of professional development specifically directed toward helping teachers learn about motivation and engagement:

Focusing upon these strategies to improve student motivation and engagement with literacy within preservice and inservice training for secondary school teachers is doubly important because it responds to two related contemporary needs. Teachers who learn to be effective promoters of adolescents' literacy development through attention to motivation and engagement possess an important part of the toolkit they need to work effectively with ELLs. Therefore . . . teachers are better positioned to recognize and attend to issues that are particular to second language learners. (p. 38)

Diverse Texts

- **Reading level, wide range of topics.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) wrote, “Adolescent ELLs will benefit from access to diverse texts that present a wide range of topics at a variety of reading levels. High-interest, low-difficulty texts play a significant role in a successful adolescent ELL literacy program and are critical to the fostering of reading skills of struggling readers and to engaging all students. Appropriate grade-level textbooks are important tools, but are more difficult for ELLs to read . . . so they must be supplemented by a selection of more accessible texts to reach multiple proficiency levels and connect to students’ background experiences” (p. 38, citing Hornberger, 2003). This suggests the value, for ELL students, of providing
 - *Texts that are supplements to standard textbooks*
 - *Texts at a variety of reading levels, so students can read texts that are at a level appropriate for them*
 - *Texts on a variety of topics*
 - *Texts on topics that are likely to interest students*
- **Texts reflecting students’ identity.** Several benefits have been identified from providing texts that relate to students’ cultural, ethnic, and/or racial identity.
 - *According to Meltzer and Hamann (2004), “Studying and reading texts that reflect one’s ethnic and/or racial identity are known critical supports for healthy adolescent identity development” (p. 30, citing Tatum, 1997).*
 - *According to García and Godina (2004), “To motivate students and help them develop strong inferencing strategies, students should be provided with opportunities to read culturally familiar/relevant texts, as well as texts that are part of the all-English curriculum. Saunders and Goldenberg (1999), in particular, pointed out the importance of helping English language learners identify relationships between their personal experiences and texts that they read” (p. 317).*
 - *Klingner and Vaughn (2004) stated, “Selecting materials that represent culturally familiar material that also is based on students’ prior knowledge and experience is valuable” (p. 197, citing Brozo, Cantú Baleiro, & Salazar, 1996).*

Writing

As noted previously, writing and reading are paired with each other as important areas for adolescent ELLs to develop their skills. For example, Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) identified “Teach[ing] the components and processes of reading and writing” as an instructional practice that is “potentially effective for developing literacy in adolescent ELLs” (p. 34). Similarly, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) paired reading and writing in their recommendation for “More time spent reading and writing—more reading and writing assignments accompanied by more reading and writing instruction” (p. 17).

- **Writing process approach.** García and Godina (2004) cited findings by Valdés (1999), who “thought that the middle-school English language learners she observed would have benefited more from the writing process approaches that their English-speaking classmates received in the all-English classrooms than they did from the structural linguistic approach used by some of their ESL teachers” (pp. 310–311). This conclusion was endorsed by Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), who stated, “After adolescent ELLs acquire the basic skills, they need to become active readers and writers who use reading and writing processes, such as . . . brainstorming, drafting, editing, and publishing. . . . Skilled readers and writers engage in these processes in academic settings and in ‘real life,’ and researchers have found that adolescent ELL literacy is enhanced when teens are taught using a process-based approach” (p. 34, citing García & Godina, 2004; Valdés, 1999; Villasenor, 2003).
- **Instruction in writing strategies.** Meltzer and Hamann’s (2005) emphasis on the importance of students’ “deliberate and frequent use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies” extends not only to reading, but also to “producing texts” (p. 35). Along similar lines, García and Godina (2004), while emphasizing the importance of process writing approaches, also cited Reyes’s (1991, 1992) recommendation that “this type of instruction [i.e., process writing] should be combined with explicit instruction on topics/conventions unfamiliar to many English language learners (e.g., how to edit English writing, how to write specific genres)” (p. 318).
- **Opportunities to write different types of texts.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited Schleppegrell’s (2004) discussion of “how ELLs’ writing also can reflect common training and activities from ESL classes. For example, if in such settings students are often encouraged to write personal narratives, it follows that a first impulse in writing in any content area is to write as if the genre calls for a personal narrative. . . . [Schleppegrell] cites Hinkel’s (2002) work to support this assertion, adding, ‘Teachers need to create opportunities for students to write different types of texts and help them focus on how those texts are most effectively constructed so that students can extend their repertoires and make register choices that realize new and more challenging genres’ ” (p. 31, quoting from Schleppegrell, 2004, p. 151). This suggests a particular value both in having students write a variety of texts and in having those texts include the types of academic texts they are likely to be required to use in their content-area classes.
- **Writing as a tool for content learning.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited Harklau (2002) to the effect that “the act of producing text (writing) in addition to speaking and listening activities seems to be more effective than lecture or discussion alone for enhancing content-area learning and academic literacy development” (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 30). This suggests that for ELLs, as for mainstream adolescent readers, writing can be an important tool for learning content.
- **Practice.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) cited Curry’s (2004) argument that “multiple opportunities to practice,” among other strategies, “can assist ELLs to master essay writing” (p. 50). They also described a study by Snow (1990) of “both native and nonnative English speaking students [that] illustrates the importance of these opportunities to practice. Snow found a strong correlation between schooling *in English* and the ability to give formal definitions (both formal and informal definition prove knowledge of a word, but the former better matches the academic genre preferred and rewarded in school). Snow concludes that the ability to practice definitions enables students to produce formal definitions” (pp. 50–51; emphasis in original). Taken together these suggest a value in providing students with extensive English-language practice in writing.
- **Word processing.** *Writing Next* reported an effect size of 0.52 from a study in which students with English as a second language in grades 9–12 used a word processor for 13 weeks to compose their texts (Graham & Perin, 2007, p. 52, describing Silver & Repa, 1993).

Assessment

- **Formative assessment.** As noted on page 11, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) identified formative assessment as part of a cycle of instruction that included teacher modeling, explicit teaching, and assessment that “can help teachers meet the academic literacy development needs of diverse learners, including ELLs” (p. 20). They clarified, “Ongoing formative assessment provides teacher and student alike with useful information about the student’s literacy habits and skills and/or the student’s content knowledge and is recognized throughout the literature as critical for improving academic literacy habits and skills” (p. 25, citing Biancarosa & Snow [2006]).
- **Frequent assessment.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) wrote, “[T]he literature supports the notion that assessment, at least informal assessment, of ELLs should be frequent in order to provide appropriate and adequate support of ELLs’ academic progress” (p. 26, citing Echevarria & Goldenberg, 1999).
- **Multiple forms of assessment.** “[U]sing multiple forms of assessment” was identified as part of Meltzer and Hamann’s (2005) eight research-verified practices for both mainstream and ELL students (p. 1). They clarified, “Use of more than one form of assessment makes it easier for assessment to be responsive to student needs, learning styles, and strengths, greatly improving the chances that, over time, assessments will accurately reflect learning and alert teachers to additional areas for attention” (p. 25, citing Moore et al., 1999; Quenemoen et al., 2004; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). They also noted that “multiple forms of assessment can help students understand their literacy strengths and areas of challenge, thereby empowering students to take better charge of their learning” (p. 24).
- **Feedback.** Summarizing their research findings, Meltzer and Hamann (2005) identified “timely and intelligible feedback” as an “important [practice] for teachers” (p. 62). Elsewhere, they noted that large-scale, high-stakes standardized tests do not provide “the immediate, individualized, nuanced feedback” that is valuable for students (p. 25, citing Sarroub & Pearson, 1998).
- **Clear expectations.** Meltzer and Hamann (2005) noted the importance of being aware of students’ “preconceived understandings of schooling and assessment,” including “assumptions about appropriate ways to demonstrate knowledge on a formal assessment—for example, cultures and schooling systems differ in their embrace of the injunction ‘show your work.’ ELLs may need explicit instruction regarding both the teacher’s expectations and how to meet those expectations” (p. 26, citing Jeannot, 2004; Olsen & Jaramillo, 2000; Valdés, 2001). This speaks to the importance of ensuring that students clearly understand what they are expected to do as part of their assessments.

Differentiated Instruction

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, researchers note the distinct needs of English language learners—including some needs that are broadly shared across many ELLs and others that are more specific to ELLs who share similarities in areas such as language backgrounds, levels of native and English language proficiency, cultural background, and length of time in the United States (e.g., Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007, pp. 10, 27, 40; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, pp. 4, 19; Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, pp. 6–7).

ELLs need instruction that is differentiated to meet those distinct needs and characteristics. At the same time, as Meltzer and Hamann (2004) cautioned,

Ensuring that students’ identities and cultural backgrounds are attended to in the content of the curriculum needs to avoid the hazards of defining cultural identities as homogeneous and unchanging. (p. 19, citing Gonzalez, 1999; Lucas, 1993)

This speaks to two distinct priorities in the area of differentiated instruction for ELLs:

- Students should be provided with resources that are tailored to the distinct needs of English language learners.
- Notwithstanding such group characteristics, instruction should be managed in a way that differentiates based on individual student performance.

Technology

According to Short and Fitzsimmons (2007), “The incorporation of technology into instruction for ELLs is seen as promising, as the practical relevance and often two-way nature of the work are thought to positively impact student motivation” (p. 37, citing Kim & Kamil, 2004).

- **Scaffolding.** Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) wrote, “In general, computer-based literacy instruction can promote reading and writing development for adolescent ELLs but that instruction should be highly scaffolded. . . . Kim and Kamil (2004) recommended that instruction for ELLs include strategies for reading in a ‘multimedia environment’ ” (p. 37). This suggests a value both to scaffolding that can help students succeed in their uses of technology and to teaching students strategies that can help them interpret information in a multimedia environment.
- **Multimedia.** Describing “certain realities about adolescent learners” that “must be kept clearly in mind . . . [a]s possible interventions are considered,” Short and Fitzsimmons (2007) stated that adolescents in general “are often attracted to technology and multimedia, so instructional practices that make use of these media can be beneficial” (p. 13). This suggests a value to incorporating multimedia as part of instruction for motivational purposes.

Professional Development

Meltzer and Hamann (2005) wrote about the importance of improved teacher professional development to help teachers implement their findings about instructional practices that benefit both mainstream and ELL students:

Our work demonstrates the profound need for increased attention to teacher preparation—specifically the careful and comprehensive training of teachers to be responsive to ELLs and, hence, effective literacy teachers for all learners. . . . We found that the adolescent literacy literature and the literature on promising practices with secondary ELLs both describe recommended teaching practices that are not common in today’s middle schools and high schools. Our hope is that . . . these practices do become commonly taught and commonly employed because they are useful for working with ELLs, because they are helpful for supporting all students’ development of advanced literacy across the content areas, or for both reasons. However, we recognize that effective implementation of [research-supported instructional strategies] is a significant undertaking that will require many hours of professional development, teacher collaboration, and coaching to become routine core elements of teacher practice. (p. 60)

Support for Infrastructure Improvement

- **Time for reading and writing.** One of the eight research-verified practices that Meltzer and Hamann (2005) identified as effective for both mainstream students and ELLs was “More time spent reading and writing—more reading and writing assignments accompanied by more reading and writing instruction” (p. 17). This aligns with the recommendation from *Reading Next* for two to four hours of literacy-connected learning daily (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 20).
- **Schoolwide focus.** Meltzer and Hamann (2004) endorsed the need for a schoolwide focus in instructing ELLs. They wrote: “These findings . . . imply that training content-area teachers for effective literacy work with ELLs involves challenges similar to those of other attempts at implementing schoolwide adolescent literacy initiatives. Both the adolescent literacy literature and the research on schooling ELLs emphasize that *all* teachers need to share in the educational task, whether it be promoting literacy across the content areas . . . or the general assurance that ELLs are academically well attended to” (p. 37, citing Miramontes et al., 1997; Moore, Alvermann, & Hinchman, 2000; Schoenbach et al., 1999; emphasis in original).

How Jamestown Reading Navigator Aligns with Recommendations for Teaching English Language Learners

The following table describes how *Jamestown Reading Navigator* aligns with recommendations described on the previous pages for improving the performance of English language learners. In some cases, these align with recommendations described elsewhere in this paper for a general population of struggling adolescent readers; in other cases, these recommendations are specific to ELLs.

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
Instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics should be provided for adolescent ELLs with skill deficits in this area.	Trek 1 (Level 1) of <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates comprehensive instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics. Students are recommended for placement into this trek if they test at readability grade levels 1–2 in an initial placement test. They can also be placed into this trek by decision of the teacher, based on factors such as the teacher’s knowledge of their prior language background. For more information, see the Decoding section earlier in this paper.
Instruction in decoding should be organized so that students can receive specific, targeted instruction on sounds that may present particular challenges to them (e.g., because they do not exist in students’ native languages).	Decoding instruction in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> is organized into journeys (lessons) that correspond to specific word families and their associated sounds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports available through the Learner Management System help teachers identify specific sound-letter combinations that cause challenges for individual students. • Teachers can assign students to complete specific journeys in Trek 1 for areas in which they may be experiencing difficulty. • <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources for Trek 1 include activities that tutors can use to reteach and reinforce the phonics and language structure skills covered in each online journey. These resources can be used either for students with decoding difficulties in specific areas or across the board as a general reinforcement for students throughout Trek 1.
Materials for teaching decoding should be age appropriate for adolescents.	All of the instructional materials in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> were developed specifically for adolescent readers.
Fluency instruction should be provided for adolescent ELLs.	<i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates extensive fluency instruction and practice throughout Treks 1–4. For more information, see the Fluency section earlier in this paper.

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Vocabulary instruction should be a major component of ELL literacy instruction.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates a significant vocabulary instruction component at every level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each online journey provides direct instruction on targeted vocabulary words. • In Trek 1, targeted vocabulary words consist of five common sight words during each journey. Over the course of the trek, students learn 100 common “instant words” that students must learn to recognize by sight, since they do not feature phonemic sound-spelling correspondences. • Students in each journey in Trek 1 are also introduced to 10 word family words, in two groups of five—typically related to two word families. Additionally, supplemental words and their meanings are introduced to help students transfer their word family knowledge. • In each journey during Treks 2–4, students are introduced to eight target vocabulary words that are used in the text selection for that journey. These words were selected on the basis of general usefulness for reading academic text, importance for understanding the text selection, and recurrence in subsequent journeys within the quest (unit). A Spanish glossary is provided with definitions of the targeted vocabulary words. • Interactive vocabulary word cards in Treks 2–4 provide explicit information about synonyms, antonyms, examples, and non-examples. They also include Spanish cognates where applicable. Students are encouraged to add personalized information to the word cards (e.g., sample uses of the vocabulary word in context). • Activities such as semantic mapping help introduce students to other words conceptually related to the targeted vocabulary words. • An online dictionary provides information on words that are featured in the text selections but are not targeted vocabulary words. Students type in the word and see the word, its definition, and a visual. • Substantial professional development offerings and a section of the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> focusing on vocabulary provide teachers with additional suggestions for how to help their students increase their vocabulary.
<p>ELLs should be able to listen to spoken text while following along with printed text.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers can choose to make audio support available for the online reading selection in each journey, allowing students to read along while listening to text. • In online fluency activities, students listen to an expert reader read the excerpt as they follow along, before they practice and record the excerpt. Students can listen to the expert reader as often as they want. • Audio recordings are available for the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections. • Extensive audio support is provided for key instruction, reading tips, captions, and directions in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>, providing further opportunities for students to experience text both visually and auditorily.
<p>Bilingual resources (dictionaries, glossaries, etc.) can help ELLs learn difficult concepts more effectively.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides Spanish-language glossaries for targeted vocabulary words in Treks 2–4 that teachers can download and print or e-mail to students.</p>

Continued ➡

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
Students should be taught to identify cognates in English that are related to words in their native languages, and vice versa.	The Spanish-language glossaries provide a resource to help native Spanish-speaking students identify cognates for targeted <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> vocabulary words. Additionally, online vocabulary word cards for targeted vocabulary words include Spanish cognates where applicable.
ELLs should be taught to analyze word meanings based on context.	Two online journeys in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> (one each in Treks 2 and 3) focus on teaching students to analyze the meaning of words from context. Additional suggestions and materials for teaching this skill are provided to teachers in the <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> materials.
ELLs should be taught to identify word meanings by analyzing the structure of words (i.e., morphemic analysis).	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> teacher support materials and professional development for teachers provide some suggestions for teaching students to analyze the structure of words.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> section on Enriching Vocabulary includes the recommendation to “Point out connections between words, such as common prefixes, suffixes, roots, or words with similar meanings.” • Lesson plans include vocabulary activities that teach morphemic analysis, such as “Tell students that the prefix <i>dis-</i> means ‘opposite.’ Ask them what <i>disagree</i> means.” • An optional on-site training session on Developing Academic Vocabulary includes morphemic analysis among strategies that are taught to teachers.
ELLs should be directly taught content-area vocabulary words.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target words for vocabulary instruction in Treks 2–4 include words that are critical for understanding the text selection that is the focus of each journey’s reading. Since many of these text selections are content-area texts, instruction in vocabulary words includes a sizable component of words that are particularly useful in reading content-area texts. • An optional on-site professional development session on Developing Academic Vocabulary focuses on helping students develop transferable vocabulary learning strategies and on helping teachers—including content-area teachers—utilize strategies to help students learn specific academic vocabulary.
ELLs should be taught multiple meanings of words.	Some multiple-meaning words are explicitly taught in Trek 1. Additionally, the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> section on Improving Vocabulary includes a suggestion for teachers to focus on words with multiple meanings, such as <i>magnet</i> .
Vocabulary should be taught in authentic contexts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Trek 1, many of the targeted sight words are used in a poetry context, with picture support. • All of the targeted vocabulary words in Treks 2–4 appear in the text selection that is the focus of the journey. • The online vocabulary word cards that are provided for all the targeted vocabulary words include sample sentences for each new vocabulary word.

Continued ➔

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Vocabulary instruction for ELLs should incorporate instructional aids and devices such as visuals, graphic organizers, and demonstrations.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> uses a variety of instructional aids and devices to teach vocabulary to students. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Trek 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Within each journey, students practice recognizing and using sight words in an interactive exercise and receive immediate feedback on their work. – Three times in a journey, students listen to and read a poem, with animated illustrations, that contains sight words and word family words. – Students practice word family words in a variety of interactive formats, with immediate feedback to reinforce understanding. – Students practice recognizing supplemental words in an interactive format by matching the words to the appropriate picture. – Students complete scored review activities with immediate feedback covering both sight words and word family words. Their performance is reported to teachers. • In Treks 2–4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Each vocabulary word is pronounced orally, and students are taught the meaning of the word and given a sample sentence. – Students complete a quick match interactive activity that reinforces meanings of the words. – A common prereading activity involves students using semantic mapping to complete a word web. – A My Notes section provides a place for students to add memory aids, associations, sample sentences, etc., to create a personalized “word card” for each vocabulary word. – Within the text selection, vocabulary words are hyperlinked to their associated word cards, which students can modify. – Students who do poorly on an assessment of vocabulary knowledge complete a review lesson that features flash animation to reteach the meaning of vocabulary words. If further reteaching is needed, the program alerts teachers. • The <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> section on Enriching Vocabulary includes several suggestions for using graphic organizers to help students explore concepts represented by new vocabulary words.
<p>Students should engage in writing and speaking tasks that help them incorporate words into their expressive vocabulary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey writing assignments require students to use at least two of the vocabulary words from that journey. Students see the list of vocabulary words as part of the planning step for the writing. • Quest writing assignments require that students use at least three vocabulary words from the journey text selections they read during the quest. Students see the list of vocabulary words as part of the planning step for the writing. • <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes discussion activities in which students will typically use vocabulary words in a context of expressing their ideas.

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Teachers should connect instruction to ELL students' prior knowledge and experience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prereading activities for each online selection prompt students to activate their prior knowledge about the selection's topic. For example, students are often prompted to complete a KWL (Know/Want to know/Learned) chart or a word web prior to reading a selection, which prompts them to remember and process information they already know about the topic. • The model lesson plan provided in the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> for use with the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections includes strategies for activating prior knowledge before students read the text selections. • An optional on-site professional development session titled Front Loading helps teachers use engagement strategies to access students' prior knowledge. • Tips in the <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources often include suggestions for ways to connect instruction to students' prior knowledge.
<p>Instruction should help build ELLs' background knowledge through strategies and resources such as hands-on experiences, manipulatives, video clips, and demonstrations.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> helps build students' general background knowledge in a variety of ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video clips at the beginning of each quest introduce the topic of the quest and provide background information for the readings. • Direct instruction in key vocabulary prior to each online reading activity helps students build their background knowledge. • One of the prereading activity formats used in journeys where students are likely to need additional background information is the Background Builder. In this activity format, students see two images with audio that help remind them of what they may already know about the topic and build background knowledge prior to reading. Students can also choose to see a third image with audio that provides additional background. • Suggestions in the <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources include activities, demonstrations, and direct instruction from teachers to help students build background knowledge in specific areas, including suggestions tailored specifically to ELLs.
<p>ELLs should be allowed time to activate prior knowledge and build background knowledge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because students work individually online, they can spend as much time as desired in the online activities. • Automatic review features provide extra instruction for students who struggle with specific skills and/or vocabulary. • <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources provide opportunities for students to spend extra time as needed to develop specific skills in which they may lack prior knowledge or for which concepts are particularly difficult. • Teachers are informed (via the Learner Management System) of student performance and how much time it takes students to complete each activity in the program. This allows teachers to monitor each student's progress, pacing, and possible need for further instruction.

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Instruction for ELLs should use themes to provide a content-oriented context for student development of language and literacy skills.</p>	<p>Each quest in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> is organized around a guiding question, related to one or more content areas, that provides a focus for students' work within the quest. For example, the guiding question for the first quest in <i>Trek 2</i> is "When is change good?" related to the content area of science.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guiding questions for <i>inClass Reader</i> units correspond to the guiding questions developed in the online quests. These guiding questions also are the basis for students' literature circle discussions. • In each Quest Wrap-Up, students are assigned to write an essay that answers the guiding question and to use information from the journey selections in the quest to support their answers.
<p>Comprehension skills should be taught in context.</p>	<p>All of the reading skills and strategies in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> are taught and practiced in the context of specific text selections.</p>
<p>Comprehension instruction should incorporate a cycle of modeling, explicit teaching, and formative assessment.</p>	<p>As described elsewhere in this table, <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates modeling, explicit teaching, and formative assessment of comprehension strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically, modeling and explicit instruction are combined, followed by practice with texts. • Formative assessments help determine whether students need additional review and reteaching with a specific strategy or if they are ready to proceed to the next segment of instruction.
<p>Comprehension strategies should be explicitly taught to ELLs.</p>	<p>Each journey (lesson) in <i>Treks 2–4</i> in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> has a specific comprehension skill/strategy focus. <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides explicit instruction in 32 comprehension skills/strategies. (For a complete listing of these skills/strategies, see the section on Comprehension earlier in this paper.)</p>
<p>Instruction in comprehension strategies should include modeling of strategy use.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates modeling of comprehension strategies in several ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animations in the online Focus on the Skill and Look Back at the Skill sections model strategy use by reading aloud a text and using a Think Aloud procedure to demonstrate use of strategies, so the process is apparent to students. • From these same sections, students can use the Tutor buttons to access yet another explanation of the reading skill, with another modeling of a Think Aloud. • The <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources include a section titled Teacher Modeling for every skill. This section provides a sample passage and explicit guidance to the teacher on modeling use of the skill for students. • The online professional development module on Comprehension includes a reading specialist's demonstration of how she uses teacher modeling with students. • An optional on-site professional development session titled Scaffolded Instruction with Think Alouds provides guidance in using Think Aloud strategies to model instruction as part of the gradual release of responsibility model.

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>ELLs should be actively involved in processing texts.</p>	<p>Students complete a variety of active processes with the texts they are reading. For example, as part of the reading process for text selections in Treks 2–4, students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are taught a reading skill and pre-taught key vocabulary that will be part of the focus for their reading of the selection • Complete an activity to activate prior knowledge • Choose a purpose for reading the selection • Are reminded to use comprehension strategies while they read through reading tips and comprehension monitoring questions • Are prompted to use the Add a Note feature to record thoughts while they are reading the selection • Can access and revise vocabulary word cards • Revisit their purpose after completing their reading • Tell what they learned from reading the selection or are offered possible ideas about why they didn't accomplish their purpose • Revisit and update their work from the before-reading activity (e.g., updating a KWL chart) • Answer comprehension questions that relate to the journey reading skill, previously taught reading skills, and targeted vocabulary, and receive substantive feedback for each question • Complete a writing activity that typically requires them to incorporate content from the text selection or build on the selection in some way
<p>Instruction should take a process-based approach to reading texts, including before-, during-, and after-reading activities.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> guides students through a process for reading texts in Treks 2–4 as described in the previous row, including extensive activities before, during, and after reading. (For more details about these activities, see the Support for Content-Area Literacy section earlier in this paper.)</p>
<p>ELLs should be taught critical thinking and reasoning as part of text comprehension.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a variety of reading skills/strategies that are directed toward helping students learn to reason and interpret texts critically.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Analyzing media</i> (Treks 2–4) teaches students to look critically at information from books, newspapers, magazines, TV, radio, and the Internet. When students analyze media, they consider, question, and interpret information. Students are asked to think about who provided the information for a text, what the purpose of the text is, and whether it can be trusted. • <i>Connecting across texts</i> (Treks 2 and 3) helps students understand and interpret multiple texts that may present different perspectives on the same topic. • <i>Recognizing fact and opinion</i> (Treks 2–4) helps students learn to identify facts and opinions in written texts. • <i>Understanding author's purpose</i> (Treks 2–4) helps students recognize an author's reason(s) for writing: e.g., to persuade, describe, explain, or entertain. • <i>Understanding author's viewpoint</i> (Treks 2–4) helps students recognize an author's viewpoint—how the author thinks, feels, or believes about something—through careful reading of a text.

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Comprehension instruction should help ELL students develop metacognitive abilities to monitor their own comprehension.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> helps students develop their metacognitive and comprehension monitoring abilities in several ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trek 1 includes an online metacognition activity at the end of each journey. • Questioning to monitor comprehension is taught as a focus skill in three journeys, one each in Treks 2–4. • Students are prompted to think about their reading with comprehension monitoring questions, note-taking prompts, and reading tips as they read the various journey text selections. • Sections of the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> related to fluency, vocabulary, and writing include suggested activities to help students think about themselves metacognitively as readers and writers. • Additional resources for teaching comprehension monitoring are provided in the <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> materials. • The online professional development module on Comprehension models use of Think Alouds to demonstrate comprehension monitoring. This module also encourages teachers to have students ask themselves questions about what they are reading. • An optional on-site professional development session titled Monitoring Comprehension and Using Fix-up Strategies helps teachers develop activities to teach students how to (a) recognize when comprehension breaks down and (b) use strategies to clarify their understanding.
<p>ELLs should be guided to make predictions about texts they will read—first considering the context for the text, relating it to their prior experiences, making predictions, and then checking their predictions after reading.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes lessons focusing on helping students learn to make predictions in Treks 2–4. These lessons teach students to analyze what they know about texts, connect it to their prior knowledge, and make predictions before reading; ask themselves questions and make further predictions based on what they learn from the text while reading; and check their predictions after reading.</p>

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>ELLs should be explicitly taught a variety of text structures.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes explicit instruction to help students learn how to identify and/or analyze a variety of text structures, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause and effect (Trek 2 and 3) • Compare and contrast (Trek 2 and 3) • Narrative and informational (Trek 2 and 3) • Problem and solution (Trek 4) • Sequence (Trek 2 and 3) <p>The program exposes students to a variety of different structures of text through the online and print reading selections and walks students through the process of interpreting those various types of texts. Additionally, <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> teaches a wide range of skills and strategies for “unpacking” text structures, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzing media • Analyzing story elements • Finding the main idea and details • Identifying sequence • Identifying theme • Making inferences • Making predictions • Recognizing cause and effect • Recognizing compare and contrast • Recognizing problem and solution • Summarizing
<p>ELLs should be exposed to multiple genres, including academic genres; taught their characteristics; and taught how to interpret them through modeling.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes texts from a variety of genres, including informational nonfiction, fiction, plays, poetry, folktales, myths, mysteries, memoirs, speeches, and biographies. For each of these types of texts, students are walked through a process of interpreting the text, using specific, appropriate reading skills and strategies.</p>
<p>Professional development should be provided to help content-area teachers incorporate content-area reading and writing instruction into their classes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> offers an on-site professional development session for content-area teachers, titled Using Reading as a Process for Content-Area Instruction. The session focuses on helping content-area teachers learn strategies for presenting subject-area texts so that their students use reading as a tool for learning and mastering content-area standards. • The online professional development modules on oral reading fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing include information that is appropriate for helping content-area teachers incorporate effective literacy practices into their instruction.

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Instruction for ELLs should incorporate written and oral language to support student learning.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates both oral and written language use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each journey centers on student reading of a text selection. Additional offline activities focus on reading text selections from print sources. All of the activities in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> are centered on texts students can read, reread, and reference as appropriate, whether online or in the <i>inClass Reader</i> anthologies and the <i>inTIME</i> Magazines. • Each journey includes a writing activity. • Collaborative activities include multiple opportunities for students to speak and listen to teacher and peers. • Teachers can choose to make audio resources available so that students can use listening to support much of their reading.
<p>Instruction for ELLs should integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> integrates reading, writing, speaking, and listening in several ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing activities are integrated with reading activities, so that they focus on themes and ideas presented during the readings. • Audio support is available for texts within <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>, so that students can read along while listening. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All of Trek 1 is automatically supported by audio. – Audio support is available for key instruction, reading tips, captions, and directions in Treks 2–4, if students click the audio icon. – Teachers can choose to make audio support available for the online reading selections in Treks 2–4. – All of the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections are supported by audio. • Online fluency activities involve students’ listening to an expert reader read an excerpt from the journey text selection. Students then read the excerpt aloud, make up to three recordings of their reading, and submit their best recording to the teacher. • After students have read the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections for each quest, teachers are prompted to organize students into literature circles. Within the literature circles, they discuss specific questions that relate to the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections and to the guiding question for the quest. • Recommended learning activities in <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> incorporate student listening to teacher modeling and explanations, student talking in response to questions and discussion prompts, and student reading of texts with which students practice skills.

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Collaborative activities should be incorporated into ELL instruction.</p>	<p>Students have multiple opportunities to work together in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The inClass Reader</i> anthologies include end-of-selection questions for partner or small-group discussions. • The <i>inClass Reader</i> Teacher Guide also provides suggestions for literature circle activities and discussions in conjunction with the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections, including nonliterary texts. • The <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources for Treks 2–4 include small-group activities for interacting with text, for students who need additional instruction to help them learn specific skills. • Vocabulary activities in the <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> lesson plans and suggestions in the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> section on Enriching Vocabulary include recommendations for collaborative activities. • Writing activities in the <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> lesson plans and suggestions in the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> section on Improving Writing include recommendations for collaborative activities to have students discuss and respond to each other’s writing, interact over their writing, and/or collaboratively complete portions of the writing process. • The online professional development module on Comprehension provides numerous suggestions for engaging groups in collaborative activities before, during, and after reading. The online professional development module on Vocabulary includes collaborative activities for vocabulary learning.
<p>Instruction for ELLs should incorporate interactive discussions of texts.</p>	<p>As noted above, <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides multiple opportunities for students to discuss texts interactively, primarily in relation to the <i>inClass Reader</i> selections and the <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources.</p>
<p>ELLs should review other students’ written work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section on Improving Writing in the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> includes recommendations to have students work together in pairs to suggest revisions to each other’s written work. • Lesson plans in the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> include activities in which students discuss and respond to each other’s writing, interact over their writing, and/or collaboratively complete portions of the writing process. • A resource for teachers titled <i>Flexible Grouping: Strategies for Success</i> includes specific suggestions related to grouping students as they interact in response to each other’s writing.
<p>ELLs should experience a mix of individual, small-group, and whole-class work.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides a mix of individual online activities, recommended paired and small-group activities, and suggested whole-class activities and discussions.</p>

Continued ➔

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Teachers should use effective strategies for organizing collaborative group work for ELLs, in areas including group assignments, working routines, and assessments of groups and individuals.</p>	<p>A resource for teachers titled <i>Flexible Grouping: Strategies for Success</i> includes specific suggestions related to strategies for organizing collaborative group work among students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested grouping considerations include oral language levels, primary language levels, reading levels (homogeneous or heterogeneous), skill strengths, skill weaknesses, student expertise/group role, focus on specific strategies, and student choices. • Responsibilities are described for a variety of group roles, including activity leader, connector, discussion leader, evaluator, predictor, scribe, summarizer, and timekeeper. <p>Additionally, the <i>inClass Reader</i> Teacher Guide provides teachers with guidance for forming literature circles, based on student self-selection of texts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A form is provided for students to conduct a self-assessment after every literature circle activity by answering questions about group performance, individual contributions, areas for group improvement, and personal commitment to improve. Spaces are provided for teacher responses after each question.
<p>Instruction should match ELLs with tasks of the appropriate level of challenge.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a variety of features to help ensure that students are matched with tasks that present an appropriate challenge for them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial placement tests provide suggestions for students' appropriate placement in the program. Based on placement test scores and other factors (such as standardized test performance, previous student work, and teacher observation), teachers accept the program's suggested placement or place students in the program trek (level) they believe is appropriate for their students. • Ongoing assessments help teachers evaluate how well students are doing and intervene as needed to provide additional support or change students' placement in the program.
<p>Instruction should provide scaffolding support to ELLs so they can succeed in their assigned tasks.</p>	<p>Instruction in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> is scaffolded in a variety of ways to help ensure that students can succeed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading skills and strategies are introduced using the gradual release of responsibility model. (For more details, see the Comprehension section earlier in this paper.) • Tutor buttons within the program provide students with information and hints that can help them complete tasks within the online activities. • Reteaching support is provided within the online program for students who do not do well on the assessments. • Additional <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources are provided to the teacher for use with students who need extra help offline. These resources can be used as the basis for strategic tutoring.
<p>Expectations should be clear to ELLs.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> clearly spells out expectations and goals of instruction for students. Learning goals for a student's current journey appear on the student's home page. Trek 1 learning goals relate to the journey's targeted sight words and word family words. Learning goals for Treks 2–4 address the targeted reading skill, vocabulary, writing, and fluency for that journey.</p>

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>ELLs should be provided with opportunities to make choices about their learning.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> gives students choices in a variety of areas. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students in Treks 2–4 choose which of two selections they want to read in even-numbered journeys in the online program. • From four selections in each <i>inClass Reader</i> unit, students choose two or more to read. • For independent reading, students can choose to read from the <i>inTIME</i> Magazines and other level-appropriate recommended texts. • Students have a choice of whether to take the Journey Pretest in Treks 2–4. • When students read selections in Treks 2–4, they can set their own written purpose for reading, or they can accept the purpose provided in the program. • Students are given the opportunity to take notes while they are reading online in Treks 2–4 but are not required to do so. • Students can choose whether to listen to the audio recording of the journey text selection, if the teacher has made this option available. • Students can choose whether to add notes to the vocabulary word cards in Treks 2–4. • Students in Treks 2–4 can choose whether to revisit the Focus on the Skill animation, review the vocabulary word cards, and/or reread the journey selection before taking a Journey Test.
<p>Instruction should be tailored to ELL students’ interests and relevant to their lives.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> is tailored in several ways to make it relevant to students’ interests and lives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both online and print texts have been selected to match students’ likely interests and relate to their circumstances. Examples of topics and themes that were included are cars, cell phones, friendships, personal health, sports, the environment, and becoming independent. Examples of topics that are particularly relevant for many ELLs include immigration, feelings about moving to a new country, and changes in culture. • Video clips with a narrator and exciting real-world footage build relevant prior knowledge for upcoming readings. • Many of the text selections are written about adolescents or from an adolescent’s perspective. • Students have choices of which text selections to read in some of the online lessons and in the print materials. • Efforts were made to make writing topics interesting to students by giving them the opportunity to describe their own thoughts, opinions, and experiences. Students are encouraged to be creative and expressive in writing short stories, plays, poems, and journal entries.
<p>Teachers of ELLs should have access to professional development focusing on student motivation and engagement.</p>	<p>Professional development sessions are available through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> that focus on motivating the adolescent nonreader and the adolescent less proficient reader and on social interaction to deepen learning and motivate.</p>

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Students should have access to texts that extend beyond regular textbooks, representing a range of appropriate reading levels and interesting topics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates a variety of non-textbook, authentic literature and content-area nonfiction. • <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides texts at readability grade levels 1–9, matched to students’ reading levels. • Texts in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> address a diverse range of topics that are likely to be interesting and relevant to students’ lives, as described earlier in this table. <p>(For more details, see the Diverse Texts section.)</p>
<p>Students should have access to texts that reflect their cultural, ethnic, and/or racial identity.</p>	<p>Text selections in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> represent a range of diverse cultures, reflecting the cultural and demographic diversity of the United States and of the world as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text selections reflect perspectives and experiences of diverse cultures. • Selections discuss music styles, dances, cuisines, personalities, and historical events associated with a variety of countries and cultural backgrounds. • Visual images have been carefully selected to represent minorities, genders, ages, and people from all walks of life. • Suggested additional readings for each quest in Treks 2–4 represent a diverse range of cultural influences. • The <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> materials for Literary Devices: Style, Mood, and Tone include a list of poets from different time periods and ethnic backgrounds whom students might enjoy.
<p>Instruction for ELLs should include a substantial component dedicated to writing instruction.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a substantial component that is dedicated to writing. (For more details, see the Writing section.)</p>
<p>ELLs should be taught using a writing process approach.</p>	<p>Online writing activities in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> guide students through a four-part writing process: plan, draft, revise, and publish. Students experience this process as they write in a variety of genres they will be expected to use in high school and beyond, including letters, newspaper and magazine articles, summaries, personal responses, journal entries, stories, essays, and examples of narrative, expository, persuasive, and descriptive prose.</p>
<p>ELLs should be taught strategies for carrying out specific writing tasks.</p>	<p>Students in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> receive instruction on writing strategies related to planning, revising, and editing compositions. The program also teaches strategies for specific types of writing.</p>
<p>ELLs should produce multiple types of texts, including academic texts.</p>	<p>Over the course of their writing assignments, students practice writing in a variety of genres and for a variety of audiences, including typical academic types of writing such as letters to the editor, speeches, newspaper and magazine articles, summaries, poems, advertisements, personal responses, journal entries, stories, essays, and narrative, expository, persuasive, and descriptive prose.</p>

Continued ➔

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
ELLs should write to learn content material.	Many of the writing assignments in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> have students reinforce and build upon content information from the text selections, which are drawn from various subject areas. In order to fulfill these assignments, students must use the content they learned in the selection.
ELLs should experience extensive opportunities to practice writing in English.	Each online journey and each Quest Wrap-Up in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a writing activity. Additional writing opportunities are suggested in the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> in the Improving Writing section.
Writing instruction for ELLs should include use of word processors.	Students writing in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> use a program with basic word-processing capabilities, including copying, pasting, and deleting.
Instruction for ELLs should incorporate formative assessment.	Within the treks, students complete activities that function as ongoing formative assessments of student learning. Examples include prereading skill activities, vocabulary matching, and comprehension monitoring questions.
Assessments should be frequent.	<i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a variety of assessment features that ensure frequent assessment of student progress, including both formal and less formal assessments. A student who works daily in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> will likely encounter multiple assessments on a daily basis.
Instruction for ELLs should incorporate multiple forms of assessment.	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> incorporates a variety of different forms of assessments, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A placement test, consisting of text passages followed by reading skill and vocabulary comprehension questions • Journey Pretests that allow students to test out of skills and vocabulary they already know. The pretest consists of an excerpt from the journey selection, followed by comprehension questions that test students' knowledge of the targeted reading skill and vocabulary. • Informal formative assessments, as described above • Graded activities on sight words and word family words (Trek 1) • Assessments of text comprehension and application of reading skills • Assessments (conducted by the teacher) of student fluency recordings for reading rate, quality of oral reading, and miscue analysis • Assessment of students' vocabulary knowledge in multiple ways, including assessing knowledge of definitions, synonyms, antonyms, characteristics of new words, and meaning in context • Summative quest tests that check for transfer of skills (Treks 2–4) • Progress Monitoring Maze multiple-choice cloze tasks • Teacher evaluations of students' writing assignments, in conjunction with the rubrics for each writing activity, in the areas of focus, organization, development of ideas, and conventions • Teacher review of students' completed <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> blackline masters • Student self-assessments in the context of literature circle activities

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Assessments should provide timely, useful, and intelligible feedback to students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students receive timely feedback on every scored activity or assessment they complete online in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. In many cases, feedback includes information on why their answer was correct or incorrect. Feedback is written at a low readability level and easy to understand. • The <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> provides guidance to teachers on how to score students' writing assignments and fluency recordings. Teachers are guided to assess students' writing and fluency assignments in ways that are clear and provide accurate feedback to students.
<p>Students should clearly understand what they are expected to do as part of their assessments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animated instructions explain to students how to complete the placement test and the progress-monitoring tests. • Clear directions are given on each assessment screen. Students can choose to listen to the directions as well as read them. • Each test question has an accompanying Tutor button that shows students how to manipulate the screen. Guidance via the Tutor button also encourages students to reread the question and to think through their answer choices carefully.
<p>ELLs should have access to resources that are tailored to meet their specific needs.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes several resources to help meet the specific needs of English language learners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish glossaries list targeted vocabulary words (in English) from Treks 2–4, with their corresponding Spanish terms and definitions in Spanish. Teachers can download these files and print or e-mail them to students. • Vocabulary word cards include Spanish cognates where applicable. • Three Spanish issues of <i>inTIME</i> Magazine are provided, one per trek in Treks 2–4. • <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources for Treks 2–4 include suggestions for ELL instruction. These typically include ideas for additional explanations, alternate activities, and/or high-interest, low-readability reading materials. • A section of the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> provides specific recommendations for familiarizing ELLs with computer technology and assisting them in using <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>.
<p>Instruction for ELLs should be managed in a way that differentiates based on individual student performance.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a variety of features that differentiate instruction based on individual student performance. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement in the program is based on individual test scores and informed teacher decisions based on factors such as language background and observation of student work in class. • Students work at their own pace. • Students complete online reteach lessons based on their performance on assessments. • Learner Management System reports give information on how each student is doing and identify individual students who need further help with specific skills and content. • <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> resources provide support for additional small-group or individual instruction for students with specific needs.

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Technology should be incorporated to enhance student motivation.</p>	<p>Technology is at the heart of <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator's</i> approach to literacy instruction. Speaking broadly, students use technology to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read text online • Listen to text (optional) • Record spoken text • Interact with text in various ways • Answer questions and receive immediate feedback • Compose text • View videos and animations • Choose which selection to read • View reports of their progress • Write personalized notes online that are linked to specific points in the reading selection
<p>ELLs' use of technology should be scaffolded to help them succeed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive support is provided for students' learning in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> through the gradual release of responsibility model. (For more information, see the section on Comprehension.) • Learner Management System reports inform teachers if students are struggling with the program, so that teachers can provide additional support as needed. • Extensive, easy-to-use directions are provided to guide students in completing the online activities. Additional directions can be accessed through the Tutor buttons. • A section of the <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> provides specific recommendations for assisting ELLs in using <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Checklists of basic computer skills and vocabulary and key vocabulary used in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> – Suggested activities for developing ELLs' knowledge of computer vocabulary and <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> vocabulary – Recommendations for additional computer activities ELLs can complete related to graphics and audio, in addition to their work in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>ELLs should be taught strategies to interpret information in a multimedia environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes journeys in Treks 2–4 that teach students how to interpret information from graphics, particularly charts, graphs, and maps. • Within each trek in Treks 2–4, a journey focuses on helping students learn to analyze media, which includes critically looking at information from books, newspapers, magazines, TV, radio, and the Internet. As part of this skill, students are taught to consider, question, and interpret information. They think about who provided the information for a text, what the purpose of the text is, and whether it can be trusted. • Internet articles are used for text selections in many of the online journeys within <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>—providing students with guided practice in applying reading skills and strategies to the types of texts they might encounter on the Internet.
<p>Instruction should incorporate multimedia.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> uses multimedia in a variety of ways within the program, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video clips with a narrator and real-world footage to introduce quest topics and to provide background information in prereading activities • Audio recordings of texts and directions • Animations in initial skill teaching activities and review activities • Graphics associated with text and activities to illustrate content and generate interest • Activities in which students work with text and answer questions in a variety of interactive formats • Students’ use of a microphone to record their fluency readings, play them back, and rerecord up to three times
<p>Professional development should be provided to help improve the skills of teachers who work with ELLs.</p>	<p>Jamestown Education offers a range of professional development services in connection with <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. (For specific details, see the Professional Development section.)</p>
<p>Professional development for teachers who work with ELLs should focus on effective, research-verified practices of adolescent literacy instruction.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> professional development covers effective research-based instructional practices on a wide range of literacy topics. (For a list of topics, see the section on Professional Development.)</p>
<p>Professional development should be ongoing and long term, providing “many hours” of teacher training.</p>	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> provides resources for ongoing, long-term professional development that stretches over the instructional year and provides many hours of training.</p>

Continued ➡

Summary of ELL Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
Professional development should incorporate teacher collaboration and coaching.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The online professional development modules involve teachers sharing lesson plans and experiences through discussion boards. • The on-call <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> reading coach provides a resource to help answer questions, brainstorm ideas, and problem-solve with educators as they carry out instruction and apply concepts from the professional development. The reading coach also e-mails educators frequently to keep in touch, encourage questions, and provide tips and best practices, and may also suggest articles for further reading and discussion. • Follow-up training can include guidance in using peer coaching among local teachers as a strategy to improve implementation of <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. • On-site professional development sessions on Peer Coaching, Classroom Visitations and Debriefings, Creating Focused Study Groups, and Action Research provide a systematic and formal system for teacher sharing, collaboration, and feedback.
ELLs should spend more time reading and writing.	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> accommodates instruction blocks of 45 to 90 minutes in a variety of educational settings, offering flexible options for how much time each day students will work in the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a rule of thumb, each journey in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> is estimated to require approximately two 45-minute periods to complete, although actual time requirements may vary widely from classroom to classroom and student to student. • Each trek in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes at least 16 journeys: 26 for Trek 1, 32 each for Trek 2 and Trek 3, and 16 for Trek 4.
Instruction for ELLs should involve a schoolwide focus.	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> offers on-site professional development sessions that focus on building a school literacy community. These sessions provide opportunities for schools to develop or revise a school literacy plan that incorporates <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>, regular language/literacy courses, content-area instruction, and other school resources. This setting can be used to develop a schoolwide program that addresses the specific instructional needs of ELLs.</p>

ELL References

- Abedi, J. (2005). Issues and consequences for English language learners. In J. L. Herman & E. H. Haertel (Eds.), *Uses and misuses of data for educational accountability and improvement: The 104th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2* (pp. 175–198). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Moore, D. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 951–983). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Phelps, S. F. (1998). *Content reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Amer, A. A. (1992). The effect of story grammar instruction on EFL students' comprehension of narrative text. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 8(2), 711–720.
- Anderson, V., & Henne, R. (1993, December). *Collaborative, integrated reading and writing strategy instruction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC.
- Anderson, V., & Roit, M. (1990, December). *Developing active reading behaviors with disabled adolescent learners*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.
- Anderson, V., & Roit, M. (1993). Planning and implementing collaborative strategy instruction for delayed readers in grades 6–10. *Elementary School Journal*, 94(2), 121–137.
- Anderson, V., & Roit, M. (1996). Linking reading comprehension instruction to language development for language minority students. *Elementary School Journal*, 96(3), 295–309.
- Anstrom, K. (1997). *Academic achievement for secondary language minority students: Standards, measures, and promising practices*. Washington, DC: The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Retrieved August 14, 2004, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/reports/acadach.htm#Overview>.
- Au, K. H. (2002). Multicultural factors and the effective instruction of students of diverse backgrounds. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 392–414). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- August, D. (2002). *Transitional programs for English language learners: Contextual factors and effective programming* (Report No. 58). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.
- August, D. (2003). *Supporting the development of English literacy in English language learners: Key issues and promising practices*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority school children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ballenger, C. (1997). Social identities, moral narratives, scientific argumentation: Science talk in a bilingual classroom. *Language and Education*, 11(1), 1–14.
- Bernhardt, E. (2005). Progress and procrastination in second language reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 133–150.
- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 8, 2007, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf>.
- Brozo, W. G., Cantú Baleiro, P., & Salazar, M. M. (1996). A walk through Gracie's garden: Literacy and cultural explorations in a Mexican American junior high school. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 40, 164–170.
- Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *The literacy curriculum and bilingual education: A critical examination*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Callahan, R. (2005). Tracking and high school English language learners: Limiting opportunity to learn. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(2), 305–328.
- Callahan, R., & Gándara, P. (2004). On nobody's agenda: Improving English-language learners' access to higher education. In M. Sadowski (Ed.), *Teaching immigrant and second language students: Strategies for success* (pp. 107–127). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Carlo, M. S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C., Dressler, C., Lippman, D., et al. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English-language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 188–215.
- Carrasquillo, A., & Rodriguez, V. (2002). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Carrell, P. L. (1984). Evidence of a formal schema in second language comprehension. *Language Learning*, 34(2), 87–112.
- Collins, A., Brown, J., & Newman, S. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 453–494). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crandall, J., Jaramillo, A., Olsen, L., & Kreeft Peyton, J. [per Google search] (2000). Diverse teaching strategies for immigrant children. In R. W. Code (Ed.), *More strategies for educating everybody's children* (pp. 33–71). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Crawford, A. (2003). Communicative approaches to second-language acquisition: The bridge to second-language literacy. In G. Garcia (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 152–181). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Cummins, J. (2001, October). *School responses to ELLs*. Public presentation at Task 2 meeting convened by Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory, Providence, RI.
- Curry, M. J. (2004). UCLA Community College Review: Academic literacy for English language learners. *Community College Review*, 32(2), 51–68.
- Denti, L., & Guerin, G. (2004). Confronting the problem of poor literacy: Recognition and action. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 20, 122–133.
- Dickson, S. V., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (1995a). *Text organization and its relation to reading comprehension: A synthesis of the research*. Technical Report No. 17. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators. Retrieved March 1, 2005, from <http://idea.uoregon.edu/~ncite/documents/techrep/tech17.html>.

- Dickson, S. V., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (1995b). *Text organization: Curricular and instructional implications for diverse learners*. Technical Report No. 18. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators. Retrieved March 1, 2005, from <http://idea.uoregon.edu/~ncite/documents/techrep/tech18.html>.
- Doherty, R. W., Hilberg, R. S., Pinal, A., & Tharp, R. G. (2003). Five standards and student achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1(1), 1–24.
- Echevarria, J., & Goldenberg, C. (1999, October). *Teaching secondary language minority students*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence Research Brief #4. Retrieved August 16, 2004, from <http://www.cal.org/crede/pubs/ResBrief4.htm>.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education. How do teachers help English language learners? *Journal of Educational Research*, 95, 1–28.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- Enright, D. S., & McCloskey, M. L. (1988). *Integrating English: Developing English language and literacy in the multilingual classroom*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Educational Quarterly*, 18, 335–356.
- Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED444379)
- Fitzgerald, J. (1995a). English-as-a-second-language learners' cognitive reading processes: A review of research in the United States. *Review of Educational Research*, 65, 145–190.
- Fitzgerald, J. (1995b). English-as-a-second-language reading instruction in the United States: A research review. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27(2), 115–152.
- García, G. E. (1991). Factors influencing the English reading test performance of Spanish-speaking Hispanic children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26, 371–392.
- García, G. E., & Godina, H. (2004). Addressing the literacy needs of adolescent English language learners. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy and research and practice* (pp. 304–320). New York: The Guilford Press.
- García, G. E., & Nagy, W. (1993). Latino students' concept of cognates. In D. J. Leu & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Examining central issues in literacy research, theory, and practice: Forty-second yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 171–177). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gersten, R., & Jiménez, R. (1994). A delicate balance: Enhancing literacy instruction for students of English as a second language. *Reading Teacher*, 47, 438–449.
- González, N. (1999). What will we do when culture doesn't exist anymore? *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 30(4), 431–435.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved February 12, 2007, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/WritingNext/WritingNext.pdf>.
- Grant, R. A., & Wong, S. D. (2003). Barriers to literacy for language-minority learners: An argument for change in the literacy education profession. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(5), 386–394.
- Graves, M. (2006). *The vocabulary book: Learning and instruction*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Greenleaf, C. L., & Mueller, F. (with Cziko, C.). (1997). *Impact of the pilot academic literacy course on ninth grade students' reading development: Academic year 1996–1997*. A report to the Stuart Foundation. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Education Review*, 71(1), 79–129.
- Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interactions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harklau, L. (1994a). Tracking and linguistic minority students: Consequences of ability grouping for second language learners. *Linguistics and Education*, 6(3), 217–244.
- Harklau, L. (1994b). “Jumping Tracks”: How language-minority students negotiate evaluations of ability. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 25(3), 347–363.
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 329–350.
- Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S. educated learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Henze, R., & Lucas, T. (1993). Shaping instruction to promote the success of language minority students: An analysis of four high school classes. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 69, 54–82.
- Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3(2), 183–195.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hornberger, N. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Jacobs, V. A. (1999, July/August). What secondary teachers can do to teach reading: A three-step strategy for helping students delve deeper into texts. *Harvard Education Letter*. Retrieved August 5, 2005, from <http://www.edletter.org/past/issues/1999-ja/secondary.shtml>.
- Jeannot, M. T. (2004). Trapezoids, estuaries, and kudzu: What English-language learners face on high-stakes tests—and how educators can help. In M. Sadowski (Ed.), *Teaching immigrant and second-language students: Strategies for success* (pp. 47–58). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Jiménez, R. T., García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1995). Three children, two languages, and strategic reading: Case studies in bilingual/monolingual reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 31–61.

- Jiménez, R. T., García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31(1), 90–112.
- Joyce, D. C. (1997). *Strategies for responding to the writing of ESL students*. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED421014)
- Kim, H. S., & Kamil, M. L. (2004). Adolescents, computer technology, and literacy. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 351–368). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kindler, A. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services, 2000–2001 summary report*. Washington, DC: NCELA.
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Strategies for struggling second-language readers. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 183–209). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Langer, J. A. (2002). *Effective literacy instruction: Building successful reading and writing programs*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lucas, T. (1993). What have we learned from research on successful secondary programs for LEP students? A synthesis of findings from three studies. In *Proceedings of the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Middle and High School Issues, Vol. 1*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. Retrieved August 10, 2004, from <http://www.nclae.gwu.edu/pubs/symposia/third/lucas.htm>.
- Lucas, T. (1996). *Promoting secondary school transitions for immigrant adolescents* [Report No. EDO-FL-97-04]. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED402786)
- Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60(3), 315–339.
- McLaren, J., & Anderson, V. (1992, December). *Instruction in two text structures: Effects on understanding and written production of expository text by elementary school students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2004). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content area learning: Part one: Focus on motivation and engagement*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/adlit/adell_litdv1.pdf.
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2005). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content-area learning: Part two: Focus on classroom teaching and learning strategies*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/adlit/adell_litdv1.pdf.
- Miramontes, O. B., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. L. (1997). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mohan, B. (1990). *LEP students and the integration of language and content: Knowledge structures and tasks*. Paper presented at the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues, OBEMLA. Retrieved November 14, 2001, from <http://ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/symposia/first/lep.htm>.
- Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1), 38–69.
- Montes, F. (2002, Fall). *Enhancing content areas through a cognitive academic language learning based collaborative in South Texas*. CAPE Program in South Texas. Retrieved October 23, 2007, from http://brj.asu.edu/content/vol26_no3/pdf/art12.pdf.
- Moore, D. W., Alvermann, D. E., & Hinchman, K. A. (2000). *Struggling adolescent readers: A collection of teaching strategies*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., and Rycik, J. A. (1999). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1036_adolescent.pdf. Also published in the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43, 97–112.
- Nagy, W. E., & Anderson, R. C. (1984). How many words are there in printed school English? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19, 304–330.
- Nagy, W. E., García, G. E., Durguno_lu, A., & Hancin, B. (1993). Spanish-English bilingual children's use and recognition of cognates in English reading. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 25(3), 241–259.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *The condition of education 1997, supplemental and standard error tables: Supplemental table 4-1*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved July 15, 2004, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=97988>.
- NICHHD (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development). (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Center for School and District Improvement. (2004). *English language learner (ELL) programs at the secondary level in relation to student performance*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved October 1, 2007, from <http://www.nwrel.org/re-eng/products/ELLSynthesis.pdf>.
- Nurss, J. R., & Hough, R. A. (1992). Reading and the ESL student. In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (2nd ed., pp. 277–313). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Olsen, L., & Jaramillo, A. (2000). When time is on our side: Redesigning schools to meet the needs of immigrant students. In P. Gándara (Ed.), *The dimensions of time and the challenge of school reform* (pp. 225–250). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pearson, P. D., & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 951–983). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2000). English learners reading English: What we know, what we need to know. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(4), 237–247.
- Peregoy, S. E., & Boyle, O. F. (2001). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for K–12 teachers*. New York: Longman.

- Quenemoen, R., Thurlow, M., Moen, R., Thompson, S., & Morse, A. B. (2004). *Progress monitoring in an inclusive standards-based assessment and accountability system* (Synthesis Report 53). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Reyes, M. (1991). A process approach to literacy using dialogue journals and literature logs with second language learners. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 25, 291–313.
- Reyes, M. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 427–446.
- Reyhner, J., & Davidson, D. (1992). *Improving mathematics and science instruction for LEP middle and high school students through language activities*. Paper presented at the Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Middle School and High School Issues. Retrieved July 15, 2004, from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/symposia/third/reyhner.htm>.
- Riches, C., & Genesee, F. (2006). Literacy: Crosslinguistic & crossmodal issues. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. Saunders, & D. Christian (Eds.), *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodriguez, T. A. (2001). From the known to the unknown: Using cognates to teach English to Spanish-speaking literates. *Reading Teacher*, 54(8), 744–746.
- Rosenshine, B. (1997, March). *The case for explicit, teacher-led, cognitive strategy instruction*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved November 14, 2001, from <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/barak/barak1.html>.
- Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(4), 479–530.
- Rosenshine, B., Meister, C., & Chapman, S. (1996). Teaching students to generate questions: A review of the intervention studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(2), 181–221.
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (with Clewell, B. C.). (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved February 13, 2007, from <http://www.urban.org/pdfs/overlooked.pdf>.
- Santos, M. G. (2002, April). *Supporting the ESL student beyond ESL programs*. Paper presented at the TESOL annual meeting, Salt Lake City, UT. Retrieved April 19, 2005, from http://www.instruction.greenriver.edu/avery/faculty/TESOL02_santos.htm.
- Sarroub, L., & Pearson, P. D. (1998). Two steps forward, three back: The stormy history of reading comprehension assessment. *Clearing House*, 72, 97–105.
- Saunders, W. M., & Goldenberg, C. (1999). Effects of instructional conversations and literature logs on limited- and fluent-English proficient students' story comprehension and thematic understanding. *Elementary School Journal*, 99(4), 277–301.
- Scarcella, R. (2002). Some key factors affecting English learners' development of advanced literacy. In M. J. Schleppegrell & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power* (pp. 209–226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schleppegrell, M., Achugar, M., & Orteiza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 67–93.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., Cziko, C., & Hurwitz, L. (1999). *Reading for understanding: A guide to improving reading in middle and high school classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1997). Developing self-efficacious readers and writers: The role of social and self-regulatory processes. In J. T. Guthrie & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Reading for engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction* (pp. 34–50). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Short, D. (1999). Integrating language and content for effective sheltered instruction programs. In C. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 105–137). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Short, D., & Echevarria, J. (2004–2005). Teacher skills to support English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 8–13.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved February 27, 2007, from <http://www.carnegie.org/literacy/pdf/DoubletheWork.pdf>.
- Silver, N. W., & Repa, J. T. (1993). The effect of word processing on the quality of writing and self-esteem of secondary school English-as-second-language students: Writing without censure. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 9, 265–283.
- Snow, C.E. (1990). Rationales for native language instruction in the education of language minority children: Evidence from research. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 60–74). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 3–13.
- Spanos, G. (1992). *ESL math and science for high school students: Two case studies*. Paper presented at the Third National Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Middle and High School Issues. Retrieved November 14, 2001, from <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/symposia/third/spanos.htm>.
- Symons, S., Richards, C., & Greene, C. (1995). Cognitive strategies for reading comprehension. In E. Wood, V. E. Woloshyn, & T. Willoughby (Eds.), *Cognitive strategy instruction for middle and high schools* (pp. 66–87). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? And other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.
- Taylor, B. (1992). Text structure, comprehension, and recall. In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 220–235). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Tharp, R. (1999, January). Proofs and evidence: Effectiveness of the five standards for effective pedagogy. *Effective Teaching*, 2. Retrieved November 14, 2001, from <http://www.crede.ucsc.edu/Standards/Effectiveness/effectiveness.html>.

- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147–170.
- Vacca, R. T. (2002). Making a difference in adolescents' school lives: Visible and invisible aspects of content area reading. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 184–204). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Valdés, G. (1999). Incipient bilingualism and the development of English language writing abilities in the secondary school. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, & ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 138–175). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Van den Broek, P., & Kremer, K. (2000). The mind in action: What it means to comprehend during reading. In B. M. Taylor, M. Graves, & P. van den Broek (Eds.), *Reading for meaning: Fostering comprehension in the middle grades* (pp. 1–31). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Verhoeven, L., & Snow, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Literacy and motivation: Reading engagement in individuals and groups*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Verplaetse, L. S. (2000a). Mr. Wonderful: Portrait of a dialogic teacher. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interactions* (pp. 221–242). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Verplaetse, L. S. (2000b). How content area teachers allocate turns to limited English proficient students. *Journal of Education*, 182(3), 19–36.
- Villasenor, J. A. (2003, May). *Contrastive rhetoric and standardized writing assessment: The experiences of non-native speakers of English in a secondary setting*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, OH.
- Waxman, H. C., & Tellez, K. (2002). *Effective teaching practices for English language learners*. The Laboratory for Student Success, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved December 10, 2004, from <http://www.temple.edu/LSS/pdf/spotlights/700/spot705.pdf>.
- Wong, S. D., Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–53). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Zehler, A. M., Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Stephenson, T. G., Pendzick, M. L., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities, Volume 1A: Research report*. Development Associates, Inc. Retrieved January 7, 2005, from <http://www.devassoc.com/LEPdoclist.html>.



The McGraw-Hill Companies

ONE PRUDENTIAL PLAZA
130 E. RANDOLPH STREET, #900
CHICAGO, IL 60601

1-800-334-7344
glencoe.com
glencoe.com/catalog