SYSTEMATIC INSTRUCTION IN READING FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Second Edition

SYSTEMATIC INSTRUCTION IN READING FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

By

ELVA DURÁN, Ph.D.

California State University, Sacramento

With Contributions by

Douglas Carnine, Ph.D.
Linda M. Carnine, Ph.D.
Elba Maldonado-Colón, ED.D.
Rachael Gonzáles, ED.D.
Porfirio Loeza, Ph.D.
Margaret Lucero
Stacie Ohara
John Shefelbine, Ph.D.

With a Foreword by

Douglas Carnine, Ph.D.



CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER, LTD. Springfield • Illinois • U.S.A.

Published and Distributed Throughout the World by

CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER, LTD. 2600 South First Street Springfield, Illinois 62704

This book is protected by copyright. No part of it may be reproduced in any manner without written permission from the publisher. All rights reserved.

© 2012 by CHARLES C THOMAS • PUBLISHER, LTD.

ISBN 978-0-398-08730-2 (hard) ISBN 978-0-398-08731-9 (paper) ISBN 978-0-398-08732-6 (ebook)

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2011042193

First Edition, 2003 Second Edition, 2012

With THOMAS BOOKS careful attention is given to all details of manufacturing and design. It is the Publisher's desire to present books that are satisfactory as to their physical qualities and artistic possibilities and appropriate for their particular use. THOMAS BOOKS will be true to those laws of quality that assure a good name and good will.

Printed in the United States of America MM-R-3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Durán, Elva

Systematic instruction in reading for Spanish-speaking students / by Elva Durán with contribution by Douglas Carnine . . . [et al.]. -- 2nd ed. p. cm.

Prev. ed. cataloged under title.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-398-08730-2 (hard) -- ISBN 978-0-398-08731-9 (pbk.) --

ISBN 978-0-398-08732-6 (ebook)

1. Hispanic Americans--Education (Primary). 2. Reading (Primary)--United States. 3. Education, Bilingual--United States. I. Title.

LC2672.4.S97 2012 372.4--dc23

2011042193

DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to **Doug Carnine**, my friend and mentor in reading and direct instruction methodologies. He was the first to inspire me to write this book. I have learned so much from all his reading and systematic instruction research for at-risk students as we worked on *Leamos español* reading program. He never left my side as we worked on so many aspects of the Spanish reading series through the years. He is a guiding light through so many things I undertake and most recently with reading courses I was trying to preserve in our area group as we begin to reorganize in our College of Education, especially because those courses have direct instruction methodologies which are most appropriate for our candidates in special education.

This book is dedicated to **Ruth Waugh** who is my friend and was my doctoral advisor at the University of Oregon. She worked hard with me many years ago so that I could learn to be a very good professor at whatever college I would be hired. I shall never forget her and all her hard work with me as a doctoral candidate and later as I was beginning my work as a professor at University of Texas at El Paso which was my first job in a university community.

This book is dedicated to **Michael Lewis**, **Bruce Ostertag**, and **John Shefelbine**. These are colleagues and dear friends who continue to assist me and support me in my work, friendship, and life in general. I am fortunate to have these three colleagues as my dear friends.

This book is dedicated to my medical doctor, **Dr. Kenneth Weisner**. Dr. Weisner helps me by keeping me well so that I can teach my college students, do the work I love, and continue with all that I must do daily. What a gift this medical doctor has given me. His dedication to the medical profession is inspiring.

This book is dedicated to my sister **Fina Lucero** who is always there by my side as I travel so many roads. She is my sister, dear friend, and active listener whom I love and respect greatly. I am blessed to have her in my life on a daily basis.

This book is dedicated to my **college students** who are my inspiration to keep working hard, review the literature, write information to assist them as

they begin teaching in their classrooms, and who work tirelessly to bring the best information and strategies to the at-risk children and English learners they teach.

CONTRIBUTORS

Douglas Carnine, Ph.D., is a Professor Emeritus at the University of Oregon. Dr. Carnine has advised former presidents on education issues. He has affected national policy in reading and mathematics and curricular strategies for persons with disabilities and those children who come from diverse and at-risk backgrounds for many years in California, Virginia, Washington, Texas, Illinois, and New York. He has published more than 100 scholarly publications; 20 chapters in books; and seven books on computer science, direct instruction reading, and math; and has presented all over the United States, Canada, South America, Europe, USSR, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

Linda M. Carnine, Ph.D., earned her doctorate from the University of Oregon with specialties in curriculum and instruction, special education, and educational research. She has done extensive research in the field of reading where she took a longitudinal look at the reading errors made by minority students in kindergarten and first grade. As an educator for over 30 years, she has taught at the preschool, elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. After completing her Ph.D., she entered school administration, where she served as an elementary building principal, director of special services, Title I and ESL bilingual programs. Dr. Carnine is now working as a private educational consultant in school districts with bilingual and minority populations. She is the coauthor of a bilingual language program and Corrective Reading.

Elba Maldonado-Colón, Ed.D., is a Professor and serves as head of the department of Teacher Education at San Jose State University. She has written extensively in the area of culturally and linguistically different students with and without disabilities. Her areas of special-

ization are language and reading. She is a leader in Spanish and English language and literacy development for monolingual and bilingual students, particularly English learners. She has numerous publications and presentations on culturally and linguistically diverse children/youth. She has taught courses in language development, language arts, reading assessment, working with culturally and linguistically diverse families, curriculum and methods to facilitate and promote English language development, and promoting adolescent literacy (with focus on comprehension). She is fluent in English and Spanish.

Elva Durán, Ph.D., holds a Ph.D. from the University of Oregon in special education and reading disabilities. Currently she is a professor in the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, School Psychology, and Deaf Studies at California State University, Sacramento, where she teaches beginning reading, English learner and special education courses for teachers getting credentials in general and special education. She is co-author of *Tesoros de Lectura*, a sheltered content curriculum in content classes and has published a book entitled *Teaching English Learners in Inclusive Classrooms*. She has published extensively in the area of English learners, reading issues related to English and regular learners. She is especially interested in how best to help students who are not grasping the information presented in the classroom. Dr. Durán has been an elementary, reading, and middle school teacher in Texas and overseas, and supervises student teachers in general and special education. She is fluent in English and Spanish.

Rachael Gonzáles, Ed.D., is a Professor of Special Education in the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, School Psychology, and Deaf Studies at California State University, Sacramento. She is a Board member of The Council for Exceptional Children Division of the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Students (DDEL). She is a Coordinator of the California State University and northern California teacher preparation program in special education. She teaches classes in English learners and special education and has developed a course for teaching students with emotional disturbance. Her research interests include English learners, culturally and diverse students in special education, methods in emotional disorders, and mental health. She is fluent in Spanish and English and has participated jointly with northern California teachers in traveling through Cuba to study educational systems and classroom learning environments.

Porfirio Loeza, Ph.D., is a Professor in the Department of Teacher Education at California State University, Sacramento. Dr. Loeza teaches post-bac-calaureate and graduate courses in language and literacy, including language

Contributors ix

acquisition, and coordinates the Graduate Programs in Language and Literacy. He was a bilingual teacher in California for many years. He completed his undergraduate degrees as well as several graduate degrees at the University of California at Berkeley. His doctoral degree is in Language, Literacy, and Culture. He specializes in biliteracy, sociocultural theory, first and second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, and ethnomethodologies. Since 2008, he has been an internal consultant and has guided Guatemala's National Education Reform for Bilingual Education through the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Guatemalan Ministry of Education. He is a Fulbright Fellow and recently became a Senior Fulbright Specialist. Despite his move to the university from K-12, Dr. Loeza continues to keep abreast of the changing trends in the schools. He regularly visits classrooms and assists teachers in their classrooms.

Margaret Lucero is currently a doctoral candidate in science education at the University of Texas at Austin under the supervision of Dr. Anthony Petrosino. Her dissertation work investigates how biology teachers identify and address students' alternative conceptions with regards to evolution and natural selection and has presented research at national conferences, such as the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, American Educational Research Association, and Association for Science Teacher Education. She also holds graduate research and teaching assistantships with the Texas Regional Collaboratives (TRC) for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching and UTeach, UT Austin's award-winning math and science teacher preparation program. Prior to entering her doctoral program, Ms. Lucero was a secondary science teacher for eight years and department chair her final year at Irvin High School, a Title I school in El Paso, Texas. She taught many students, who were English language learners, a variety of science courses, including Biology, Chemistry, and Pre-AP Anatomy and Physiology. Both her bachelor's and master's degrees are in biology.

Stacie Ohara is an Education Specialist for Aspire Public Schools. She completed her undergraduate degree at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo with a degree in Psychology. She went on to receive a Mild/Moderate and Multiple Subject teaching credential from California State University, Sacramento. Her experiences in teaching have focused primarily on reading remediation and teaching students from low-income and at-risk populations.

John Shefelbine, Ph.D., is a Professor in the Department of Teacher Education, California State University, Sacramento, where he teaches courses in language and literacy, assessment, and beginning reading. His scholarly inter-

ests have focused on how students learn word meanings from context, frameworks for making decisions about reading instruction, and polysyllabic decoding strategies.

FOREWORD

The high failure rate of Hispanic students in the United States public schools has remained between 30 and 35 percent over the past 25 years according to the National Center for Policy Analysis. This high Hispanic dropout rate is 2.5 times higher than for blacks and 3.5 times higher than white, non-Hispanics. Whether the blame goes to failed bilingual education programs or overcrowded schools, lack of teacher training, lowered academic expectations, or school bureaucracies discouraging parental involvement does not really matter. What matters is that the achievement of Hispanic students must improve dramatically over the next five years. This book describes one of the cornerstones for bringing about this change.

Like a carefully nurtured hybrid plant bringing together the best qualities of two varieties, Dr. Elva Durán brings together the blend of qualities needed for solutions for improving academic performance in Hispanic students across the country. Dr. Durán went from knowing what it was like to be discriminated against as a Spanish-speaking first grader starting school in a Texas border town to becoming a notable bilingual expert in teacher education. Dr. Durán has received National and State Educator of the Year awards for excellence in teaching and is an expert in early reading/language arts instruction. The answers she and her colleagues put forth in this text center around systematic instruction delivered early to ensure academic success in the primary grades.

The advantages of a bilingual background are actualized when Hispanic pupils are successful in learning how to read and write. For many Hispanic students this will mean early literacy development in both Spanish and English using direct instruction. The critical elements of direct instruction in early literacy are the foundation of the text's pedagogy.

In addition to early development of skills in phonological awareness and the alphabetic principle, the command of academic English is essential to success in early literacy. Several chapters in the text focus on the critical aspects of this language development and instruction. Reading instruction in Spanish and English and the transfer of essential literacy skills from Spanish to English provide the other exegesis (critical explanation) for developing literacy among Hispanic pupils.

This text will help in the preparation of primary grade teachers throughout the United States so that they may be successful with Hispanic students entering the public school with little or no English background. It can also be a useful tool for school districts' staff development in addressing school improvement goals for increasing the achievement of Hispanic pupils.

The contribution of the book is more than its content. The added value comes from the passion of Dr. Durán to bring about the highest levels of student success that are possible. This dedication will hopefully be contagious to those who read the book! Changing the lives of Hispanic students takes more than knowledge; it also requires commitment. This book can serve as a guide for both goals.

Doug Carnine

INTRODUCTION

lmost 10 million children in the United States between the ages of five $m{\Lambda}$ and 17 live in homes and communities in which a language other than English is spoken (Waggoner, 1994). These language minorities represent more than 100 distinct language groups, with Spanish speakers comprising 75 percent of the population (Ortiz & Graves, 2001). Students whose first language is not English are the fastest-growing demographic group in public schools in all regions of the United States (Collier & Thomas, 2009). The U.S. Census predicts that these students, some fluent English speakers and others not yet proficient in English, will make up 40 percent of the school-age population by the 2030s (Berliner & Biddle, 1995). Statistics on the number of students working on developing English proficiency include the following for Grades K-12 across the nation's public schools: In 1990, one in 20 students were English learners; in 2008, one in nine; and U.S. demographers estimate one in four by the 2030s (Goldenberg, 2008). While our nation's 5.1 million English learners come from all regions of the world and speak many different languages, in 2009, 75 percent were of Spanish-speaking background, and 65 percent were born in the U.S. (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2009).

Presently most schools in the United States are undereducating many English learners. Nationwide, the achievement gap between average native English speakers and students who started school with little proficiency in English is very large. By the end of high school, this achievement gap is equivalent to about 1.2 national standard deviations, as measured by standardized achievement tests across the curriculum (Collier & Thomas, 2009). This represents the difference between average scores at the 50th national percentile for native English speakers and the 10th to12th percentiles for students who were initially classified as English learners (Thomas & Collier). According to Collier and Thomas, there are many current and former English learners with unmet needs in the United States.

A group of the language minority population consists of English language learners (ELLs), also referred to as limited English proficient students, whose English skills are so limited that they cannot profit from general education instruction provided entirely in English without support.

Language minority students in general and English learners in particular meet with limited academic success. They experience high rates of retention in the grades, high dropout rates, and disproportionate representation in special education (Ortiz & Graves, 2001). According to Robertson and her colleagues (Robertson, Kushner, Starks & Drescher, 1994), in some states, English learners are underrepresented, while in other states, as many as 27 percent of the students with limited English proficiency are in special education programs. The 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress indicated that 20 percent of fourth grade English learners were also classified as having disabilities (Mazzeo, Carlson, Voekl, & Lutkus, 2000). English learners pose complex challenges relative to referral, assessment, and instruction, and, in many cases, the services they are provided do not respond effectively to their needs (IDEA Amendments, 1997).

For the past 35 years, the federal government has been involved in education to attempt to close the gap which exists between the higher and lower end of students. Even with all of these efforts nationally and in our local governments, 40 percent of all fourth graders cannot read. With the recent signing of the new provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (2001) and IDEA (2004), it is the hope of Congress that every child in America can learn and be able to excel in his or her performance and live out his or her dreams. One of the main focal points of the new bill will be academic instruction and having the students learn English through English language development and native language instruction utilizing scientifically proven educational methods and curriculum which have been tested with many children over long periods of time. Also, the bill will have strong accountability plans in place to determine if the children are learning and will provide for parents to have a greater say in how their children are educated. Additionally, IDEA puts in place that students will be assisted utilizing scientifically-based curriculum and will put less focus on assessing children to utilize IQ-achievement discrepancy to identify children with learning disabilities. The emphasis will be on utilizing scientifically based curriculum and Response to Intervention (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006) as an alternative to assist students utilizing a variety of interventions that are targeted to small group and are also specific to the individual student on a one-to-one basis. This type of specific intervention, or Response to Intervention (Fuchs & Fuchs) has proven to be highly effective in assisting all learners who are struggling to learn. This writer in observing several two-way immersion classrooms in northern California has noted in the chapter on two-way immersion that more RTI needs to be implemented in classrooms where English learners in two-way bilingual immersion Introduction xv

programs may struggle to learn the information being presented to them in both languages. Additionally, this writer has noted in the two-way bilingual immersion chapter that many of the dual language and/or two-way bilingual immersion classrooms need to implement systematic and direct instruction which will additionally be helpful to the English learners as they attempt to learn information in Spanish and English or L1 and L2 instruction.

Such bill provisions have great promise for the many Spanish-speaking children who are learning English, reading, and speaking in their native language, and later learning academic language in the content subjects. Also, this new bill has great promise for the many immigrant children who come from Spanish-speaking countries and are unable to learn English because their native language is weak or they do not have the adequate background, vocabulary, and academic vocabulary to learn English or Spanish. Systematic programs and information indicated by the various authors of this text will serve as a good beginning and knowledge base to better plan programs and curriculum for the Spanish-speaking students.

Some of the research on teaching Spanish-speaking students how to read and learn literacy has recently started to surface from various investigative teams and the results are promising. We know, for example, that in the past when educating many bilingual children, not enough English language development was given to the students as they were learning to read, write, listen, and speak in Spanish. Many schools are adding more time during reading and literacy instruction in the native language to also have their children learn English. Many schools have indicated that English language development should be at least one hour or more daily and have further noted that the English instruction needs to be increased a half hour every grade level until the students have transferred to English reading instruction.

We have also learned that implementing a strong phonological structure to beginning reading will not only help the children become better readers in their native language but will also help the children be better readers in English because of the positive transfer of the phonological skills in both languages.

Additionally, we have learned that giving the students instruction in syllables only in Spanish is helpful, but we have also learned that students need practice in learning the phonemes or individual sounds in Spanish in order to be strong readers in Spanish (Francis, 2001). We also know that students will get practice in learning the sounds once they have transferred or begin reading in English. Having the students learn the individual sounds in Spanish as they are learning to read in their native language will help prepare them for the transfer to English reading.

Just as this book offers a recent review of the scientific evidence on what is effective in teaching Spanish reading instruction, the various authors also offer in their chapters much review of the literature and suggestions for teaching Spanish-speaking students reading and literacy instruction. In Chapter 1, Elva Durán and Doug Carnine introduce the readers to direct instruction and the various components that are found in the systematic approach which can be used with any reading and literacy program and/or instruction. Chapter 2, written by Elba Maldonado-Colón, gives an excellent review of the literature in language development and includes many additional ideas for developing oral language instruction, listening, and speaking with Spanish-speaking students. In Chapter 3, Linda Carnine gives a review of the literature on language development and instruction and presents information on what a comprehensive language development program should look like when being implemented with Spanish-speaking students who are learning Spanish and English instruction. In Chapter 4, John Shefelbine talks about academic language and its importance in developing reading and literacy instruction with Spanish-speaking students. In Chapter 5, Elva Durán discusses components of reading and literacy instruction in Spanish, and in Chapter 6, she outlines for the readers some lesson plan suggestions for teaching reading and literacy to Spanish-speaking students. In Chapter 7, Elva Durán defines transfer and gives us a review of the literature concerning transfer. In Chapter 8, Elva Durán and John Shefelbine discuss the components that transfer and do not transfer from Spanish to English reading instruction. In Chapter 9, Elva Durán and Rachael Gonzáles discuss English language development and Stacie Ohara and Margaret Lucero share with the readers lesson plans on how to implement SDAIE lessons that they have completed in their classrooms. In Chapter 10, Elva Durán and Porfirio Loeza discuss dual language or two-way bilingual immersion and share actual classroom schedules and lessons that teachers have done in two-way bilingual immersion classrooms. Finally, in Chapter 11, Elva Durán gives her reflections and summation of what she feels we need to have in a comprehensive and systematic reading and literacy program for Spanish-speaking students.

Elva Durán

REFERENCES

Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. *Educating English learners for a transformed world.* Albuquerque, NM: Fuente Press.

Introduction xvii

- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2009). Education Week, 28(17), 1–54.
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (2001). Encryption: Congress approves the elementary and secondary education bill. Washington, DC: US Congress. Retrieved from NABE database (*NABE News* article on HRI Conference. Report Doc., January 9, 2002.
- Francis, D. (2001). Review of research in reading for Spanish-speaking students. Presentation made at NICHD workshop, San Francisco.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (2006). Introduction to response to intervention: What and how valid is it? *New Directions in Research*, Vol. 10/RRQ.
- Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—And does not—say. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8–23, 42–44. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/issues/summer08/golden-berg.pdf.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA]. (1997) & (2004) 20 U.S.C., 1400 et seq.
- Mazzeo, J., Carlson, J. E., Voekl, K. E., & Lutkus, A. D. (2000, March). Increasing the participating rate of special needs students in NAEP: A report on 1996 NAEP activities. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education Research and Improvement.
- Ortiz, A., & Graves, A. W. (2001). English language learners with literacy-related learning disabilities. The International Dyslexia Association Commemorative Booklet, 52nd Annual Conference (pp. 31–35). Albuquerque, NM.
- Robertson, P., Kushner, M. I., Starks, J., & Drescher, C. (1994). An update of participation rates of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education: The need for a research and policy agenda. *The Bilingual Special Education Perspective*, 14(1), 3–9.
- Waggoner, D. (1994). Language minority school-ago population now totals 9.9 million. *National Association for Bilingual Education News*, 18(1), 1, 24–26.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This second edition of *Systematic Instruction in Reading for Spanish-Speaking Students* would not have been possible if I had not had many of my same contributors who made revisions to the new edition. I thank each of my author contributors for their wonderful additions to the new edition. Each author who has contributed has added excellent information to make the new edition updated and current.

I also want to thank Mr. Eduardo de León and Mr. Todd Lindeman, two excellent principals/program directors of two-way immersion schools in northern California. Both of them graciously shared information about their two-way immersion classrooms at their schools and gave me excellent insight into how their school programs started and are now progressing in their schools. These principals always showed good leadership and wisdom as they both tried to carefully explain to me the structure and classroom information of each of their schools.

I also want to thank the teachers at both schools who allowed me the opportunity to visit their classrooms on several occasions to learn what they were doing and how they were organizing their two-way bilingual immersion instruction. The teachers were kind, generous, and so helpful as I tried to understand how the various lessons and lesson schedules were structured and organized.

I want to also acknowledge my college students at California State University, Sacramento because it was their questions and their further queries into instruction for teaching English learners that prompted me to add the new chapters on English language development and two-way bilingual immersion which took a considerable amount of time, effort, and research to review the literature, visit classrooms in northern California, and talk to teachers of these classrooms in order to write these chapters which took several months and much hard work to complete. I am so happy I have added these new chapters because more and more schools utilizing Spanish reading are using two-way bilingual immersion and English language development in their schools. It was a necessary addition to include this much needed information in the new edition of *Systematic Instruction in Reading for Spanish-Speaking Students*.

Much care has been taken to visit and interview actual two-way bilingual immersion classroom teachers in order to share updated information with the readers who will hopefully use this text to better understand what takes place in two-way bilingual immersion and/or dual language immersion classrooms.

Additionally, I would also like to thank Diana Vega who has formatted this manuscript and has carefully organized the various chapters according to the publisher's guidelines.

Finally, Dr. Porfirio Loeza, who is one of the contributing authors, would like to thank the following people for allowing him to visit two-way bilingual immersion classrooms: Dr. Jennifer Robles, Director, Ventura USD; Dr. Michelle Dean, Montalvo Elementary, Ventura USD; Ms. Danielle Cortes, Assistant Principal, Buena High, Ventura USD; Ms. Joanne Wakelee, Ventura USD; Mr. Jesus Vaca, Principal, Buena High, Ventura USD; Ms. Ana Huidobro, Teacher, Oakley Union Elementary School District; Ms. Lorena Y. Hernandez, Principal, Cave Language Academy, Vallejo USD; Marietta Tretasco, Assistant Director, Categorical and English Learner Programs. Vallejo USD; Mr. Mitchell Romao, Director, Categorical and English Learner Programs, Vallejo USD; Dr. Linda Montes, Principal, Adelante Spanish Immersion School, Redwood City USD; and, Mr. Eduardo de Leon, Sacramento Language Academy, Sacramento City USD.

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--------|--|
| | ord by Douglas Carnine |
| Introd | uction by Elva Durán |
| Chapte | er |
| 1. | DIRECT INSTRUCTION |
| | Elva Durán and Douglas Carnine |
| | Definition |
| | Background Information of Direct Instruction and Research |
| | Some Components Needed in Teaching Lessons Utilizing |
| | Direct Instruction |
| | Organization of Instruction |
| | Coaching Teachers Utilizing Direct Instruction |
| | Conclusion |
| | References |
| 2. | DEVELOPING LITERACY FOUNDATIONS: ORACY |
| | Elba Maldonado-Colón |
| | Tools for Teaching Learning |
| | Oracy for Communication |
| | Oracy as a Learning Tool |
| | Foundations of Proficient Listening and Speaking |
| | Listening and Speaking with Purpose |
| | Attending to Increasing Complexity |
| | Instructional Planning |
| | Standards, Curriculum, and Benchmarks |
| | Considerations to Structure Practice |
| | Guiding Principles to Promote Oracy |
| | Promoting and Supporting Oracy: Engaged Teachers and Children 36 |
| | Listening and Speaking in Mr. Rubio's Classroom |
| | Listening and Speaking in Ms. Cruz' Classroom |

| | Blueprints to Promote Oracy and Literacy Development | 41 |
|----|--|-----|
| | Kindergarten Lesson | |
| | Second Grade Lesson | 43 |
| | Sixth Grade Lesson | 45 |
| | Closing Comments | |
| | References | |
| | | |
| 3. | LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND INSTRUCTION | 50 |
| | Linda M. Carnine | |
| | Oral Language Development | 51 |
| | Research on Oral Language Development | |
| | Longitudinal Interventions with Bilingual Children | |
| | Introduction of Academic Language in Bilingual Research | |
| | The Need for Accelerated Instruction for Spanish-Only | |
| | Language Students | 56 |
| | Basic Assumptions about Bilingual Language Acquisition for | |
| | Success in School | 50 |
| | Preparing Students for Academic Success Using Direct Instruction | |
| | Language Programs in Spanish and English | 60 |
| | Components and Examples of Direct Instruction Language | |
| | Programs | 69 |
| | Characteristics of the Direct Instruction Language Programs | |
| | Implications for Successful Language Instruction for Bilingual | 00 |
| | Students from Low SES Backgrounds and Future Directions | 79 |
| | References | |
| | References | / c |
| 4. | ACADEMIC LANGUAGE AND LITERACY DEVELOPMENT | 77 |
| 4. | John Shefelbine | // |
| | Academic Language—The Language of Literacy | 78 |
| | Function | |
| | Decontextualized Language | |
| | | |
| | Explicitness | |
| | | |
| | Text Structure | |
| | Syntactic Complexity | |
| | Disembedded Thought | |
| | The Role of Academic Language in Literacy Development | |
| | The Critical Role of Vocabulary Knowledge | |
| | Developing Academic Language: Literacy as a Way of Life | |
| | Reading Aloud to Children and Students | |
| | Reading by Students | 90 |

| Contents | xxiii |
|----------|-------|
| | |

| | Contents | ciii |
|----|---|------|
| | Academic Discussions | 94 |
| | Questioning the Author | 94 |
| | Instructional Conservations | |
| | Text Talk | 95 |
| | Writing | 96 |
| | Teacher-Directed, Instructional-Level writing to Comprehend | |
| | and Learn | |
| | Independent-Level Writing to Comprehend and Learn | |
| | Writing for Pleasure | |
| | Putting it All Together | |
| | Some Concluding Thoughts | |
| | References 1 | 00 |
| 5. | READING AND LITERACY INSTRUCTION FOR | |
| | SPANISH-SPEAKING STUDENTS 19 | 03 |
| | Elva Durán | |
| | Introduction 1 | 03 |
| | Phonological Awareness and Concepts about Print | 04 |
| | Phonological Awareness | 04 |
| | Concepts about Print | 19 |
| | Decoding and Word Recognition | 21 |
| | Introduction | 21 |
| | Phonic Analysis | 23 |
| | Phonic Analysis and English Reading Instruction | 25 |
| | Blending | 27 |
| | Blending and English Reading Instruction | 29 |
| | Sight Word Reading | 29 |
| | Sight Words and English Reading Instruction | 30 |
| | Fluency 1 | 30 |
| | Fluency in English Reading Instruction | 32 |
| | Structural Analysis | 32 |
| | Structural Analysis in English Reading Instruction | 33 |
| | Contextual Analysis | 34 |
| | Contextual Analysis and English Reading Instruction | 34 |
| | Reading Comprehension | 35 |
| | Introduction | 35 |
| | Definition | |
| | Comprehension Components in K-3 | 37 |
| | Vocabulary and Background Knowledge Development in | |
| | Reading Comprehension | |
| | Vocabulary Development and English Reading | 42 |
| | | |

| | Listening and Speaking | 143 |
|----|--|-----|
| | Developing Listening and Speaking in K-3 | 143 |
| | Listening and Speaking in English Reading Instruction | |
| | Writing Instruction and Strategies | |
| | Introduction | |
| | Writing Components in K-3 | 147 |
| | Writing Strategies | |
| | English Reading Instruction and the Writing Process | |
| | References | |
| 6. | INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS FOR TEACHING SPANISH- | |
| | SPEAKING STUDENTS READING AND LITERACY IN | |
| | KINDERGARTEN THROUGH THIRD GRADE | 156 |
| | Elva Durán | |
| | Reading and Literacy Instruction in Kindergarten | 156 |
| | English Language Development | 157 |
| | Spanish Language Development | 158 |
| | Letter Recognition (Concepts about Print) and Letter Formation | |
| | (Writing) and Language | 159 |
| | Comprehension, Listening, concepts about Print and More | |
| | Language Development | 162 |
| | Blending | 164 |
| | Reading and Literacy Instruction in First Grade | |
| | Phonemic Awareness | 164 |
| | Alphabet Review and Recognition | 165 |
| | Reviewing Sounds | 166 |
| | Imitating Sounds and Blending Sounds and Syllables | |
| | Review of Sounds | 168 |
| | Blending Words | 169 |
| | Story Reading | |
| | Story Reading and Comprehension Development | 172 |
| | Writing Sounds and Words | |
| | Story Read Aloud, Comprehension and Writing Development | 174 |
| | Reading and Literacy in Second Grade | 176 |
| | Phonics: Vowels and Consonants | 176 |
| | Reading and Understanding the Literature Selection | 177 |
| | Writing as a Process | 178 |
| | Reading and Literacy Instruction in Third Grade | 179 |
| | Phonics Instruction and Dividing Words into Syllables | 179 |
| | Vocabulary and Comprehension Development Through | |
| | Literature | 179 |

| Contents | XXV |
|----------|-----|
| | |

| | Writing as a Process |
|----|--|
| | References |
| 7. | TRANSFER OF READING FROM SPANISH TO ENGLISH 183 |
| | Elva Durán |
| | Introduction |
| | Review of Transitional Research |
| | Theories Assisting Students in Transferring Reading Skills from Spanish to English |
| | Language Acquisition Stages and Oral Language |
| | Proficiency Assessment |
| | Oral Language Proficiency |
| | Stages of Language Acquisition |
| | References |
| 8. | READING COMPONENTS THAT TRANSFER FROM |
| 0. | SPANISH TO ENGLISH |
| | Elva Durán and John Shefelbine |
| | Concepts of Print |
| | Phonological Awareness |
| | Comparative Phonology |
| | Phonological and Orthographic Factors Affecting |
| | Written Communication |
| | Spelling-Sound Relationships in Spanish and English |
| | An Instructional Intervention |
| | A Summary of Phonemic/Orthographic Correspondences in |
| | Spanish and English |
| | Instructional Implications |
| | Structural and Morphemic Analysis |
| | Cognates |
| | Vocabulary and Background Knowledge |
| | Level of Vocabulary Development in the First Language 231 |
| | Sentence Structure |
| | Comprehension Skills and Strategies |
| | Conclusion |
| | References |
| 9. | ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT |
| | Elva Durán and Rachael Gonzáles |
| | Federal Legislation Supporting English Language Development |
| | and English Learners |

| | English Language Development Components |
|-----|--|
| | Guiding Principles of English Language Development |
| | Second Language Acquisition |
| | Assessing English Language Learners to Determine |
| | Proficiency Levels |
| | Strategies for Oral Language and English Language |
| | Development |
| | Sheltered Instruction |
| | Background |
| | Theoretical Framework |
| | Krashen's Five Hypotheses |
| | The Concepts of BICS and CALP |
| | Sheltered Instruction |
| | Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) 271 |
| | Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol (SIOP) |
| | What Teachers Need to Know |
| | Summary |
| | The Fox and Goat: A SIOP Lesson Plan by Stacie Ohara 280 |
| | Sample Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) |
| | Lesson Plan by Margaret Lucero |
| | Sheltered Instruction and Specially Designed Academic |
| | Instruction in English |
| | English Language Development Curricular Programs |
| | English Language Development Standards |
| | Response to Intervention (RtI) and English Language |
| | Development |
| | Reflections |
| | References |
| | |
| 10. | DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION OR TWO-WAY |
| | BILINGUAL IMMERSION |
| | Elva Durán and Porfirio Loeza |
| | Introduction |
| | What Is Dual Language Education or Two-Way Bilingual |
| | Immersion? |
| | First and Second Language Acquisition |
| | What Are Effective Characteristics of Dual Language Education |
| | or Two-Way Immersion Classrooms? |
| | A Look Inside Dual Language Education or Two-Way Bilingual |
| | Immersion Classrooms: Observations from Two Different |
| | Authors |

| Contents | xxvii |
|----------|-------|
| | |

| | An Example of a Kindergarten Classroom in Northern |
|----------|--|
| | California |
| | An Example of a First Grade Classroom in Northern |
| | California |
| | An Example of a Third Grade Classroom in Northern |
| | California |
| | An Example of a Fourth Grade Classroom in Northern |
| | California |
| | A Second Author's Observations |
| | Two-Way Immersion Programs and Their Promise |
| | Language Distribution: Two Basic TWBI Models— |
| | "90:10" and "50:50" |
| | Program Design |
| | Class Schedules and Grade Level Descriptions |
| | First Grade Schedule and Content Description |
| | Third Grade Schedule and Content Description |
| | Fifth Grade Schedule and Content Description |
| | Instruction in a Dual Language Classroom |
| | What Does the Research Indicate? 347 |
| | Effectiveness of Dual Immersion |
| | Conclusion |
| | References |
| 11. | REFLECTIONS AND SUMMATION |
| | Elva Durán |
| | References |
| Append: | ices |
| A. Alfai | beto en espanol (Alphabet in Spanish) |
| U | encia de Sonidos (Sequence of Sounds) |
| | bario (Syllables) |
| | · |
| D. Decc | odable Text–Examples |
| | Index |

SYSTEMATIC INSTRUCTION IN READING FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING STUDENTS

Chapter 1

DIRECT INSTRUCTION

ELVA DURÁN AND DOUGLAS CARNINE

DEFINITION

Direct instruction is a method by which students are taught face to face in small or large groups utilizing systematic and explicit instruction. This specific means of teaching students may include the teacher signaling, modeling, and following a lesson which is scripted and is designed to have the student respond chorally as the teacher signals the small group or an entire group of students. The pace of a lesson being presented by the teacher is brisk so that the students will respond to what is being presented and will not be distracted. The more engaged and attentive the students are to what is being presented in the highly organized lesson, the more success the students will have in learning the lesson objectives.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF DIRECT INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH

Englemann (1966) started writing some of his conceptual ideas of a methodology that would eventually become known as the direct instruction model in 1966, when he and Carl Bereiter started a preschool designed to help the most disadvantaged children learn the academic subjects. The driving force for Englemann was always to produce materials that would help any student learn. Later, Englemann and his colleague Wes Becker would begin their work in a federally-funded research project known as Project Follow Through. Project Follow Through was a project which was funded from 1967 to 1976 (and still continued as a federally-funded program until 1995 (D. Carnine,

personal communication, July 12, 2000). The project evaluated education model that utilized the direct instruction approach with those schools utilizing a constructivist/discovery learning approach. In the constructivist approach, the child's interests and choice drive the instruction. According to D. Carnine (2000), the major skills-oriented teacher-directed model tested in Project Follow Through was "direct instruction," sponsored by the University of Oregon. D. Carnine, who was one of the lead research scientists in Project Follow Through, notes that key assumptions of the direct instruction model are: "(a) that all children can be taught (and that this is a teacher's responsibility); (b) that low performing students must be taught more, not less, in order to catch up; and (c) that the task of teaching more requires careful use of educational technology and time" (p. 6). Of all the approaches analyzed in the Project Follow Through research in the direct instruction (model), the students who participated in this type of instruction were at or near national norms in math and language and close to national norms in reading (D. Carnine, 2000). D. Carnine further notes that other approaches which are constructivist in concept performed worse than the control group or direct instruction model. This was seen not only in reading and reading comprehension but in other subjects as well. D. Carnine notes the following concerning the Follow Through research:

The performance of Follow Through children in direct instruction sites on the affective measures is an unexpected result. The direct instruction model does not explicitly emphasize affective outcomes of instruction, but the sponsor has asserted that they will be consequences of effective teaching. Critics of the model have predicted that the emphasis on tightly controlled instruction might discourage children from freely expressing themselves, and thus inhibit the development of self-esteem and other affective skills. In fact, this is not the case. (p. 7)

SOME COMPONENTS NEEDED IN TEACHING LESSONS UTILIZING DIRECT INSTRUCTION

The many years of research of the direct instruction model have given much information on what is effective for teachers to know about teaching lessons utilizing direct instruction. In order to have an effective lesson to teach specific curriculum that utilizes direct instruction methodologies, some of the following components are necessary to have in the various lessons presented to the students (Carnine, Silbert, & Kame'enui, 1997). First of all, teachers need to organize their instruction, and also need to evaluate their curricular materials to see if the programs are meeting their student needs, and teachers need to also know presentation techniques that are at the heart of direct instruction

curriculum. Additionally, once the teachers begin using direct instruction curriculum, as Durán and D. Carnine (1999) have learned in field testing the *Leamos* Spanish reading curriculum which utilizes direct instruction, the teachers needed coaching for at least three or four times until they felt comfortable enough to complete the reading lessons on their own. First, some of the effective components that are needed in teaching students lessons that are planned utilizing direct instruction will be given and then each component will be further explained in this chapter.

Organization of Instruction

In the 1970s and 1980s, much information was given to us about effectiveness of instruction and how best students learned (Brophy & Good, 1986; Murphy, Weil, & McGreal, 1986). One of the important components that was given to us from all of this research was the idea that in order for children to learn most effectively, they needed to be engaged actively in what they were learning. Rosenshine and Berliner (1978) talked about direct instruction and further revealed for us that having students engaged in their learning could also help to increase their reading achievement. From much of Rosenshine and Berliner's earlier review of direct instruction and their synthesis of many classroom observational studies, they indicated that students consistently demonstrate higher reading achievement scores when their teachers do the following:

Devote substantial time to active instruction;

- a) break complex skills and concepts into small, easy-to-understand steps, and systematically teach in a step-by-step fashion;
- b) ensure that all students operate at a high rate of success;
- c) provide immediate feedback to students about the accuracy of their work; and
- d) conduct much of the instruction in small groups to allow for frequent student-teacher interactions. (p. 252)

Reading Engaged Time

As a result of all of this review, came a concept that is extremely important in direct instruction, and that is the idea of reading engaged time. According to D. Carnine et al. (1997), reading engaged time refers to the time students actually spend on reading exercises and activities. D. Carnine et al. further note that researchers point out that time spent in reading yielded higher correlations with achievement than any other teacher or student behavior