Reading for Meaning Rubric Manual

Evelyn S. Johnson, Laura A. Moylan, Angela R. Crawford, and Yuzhu Zheng

Boise State University 2017

This research was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, award number

R324A150152 to Boise State University.

Table of Contents

Reading for Meaning Rubric

Overview:

Comprehension of text is a complex process that relies upon the reader's ability to integrate, coordinate, and execute multiple skills and processes in order to construct a mental representation of the text (Cain, Oakhill, & Bryant, 2004; Cain, 2009; Kendeou, van den Broek, Helder, & Karlsson, 2014; Perfetti, Landi, & Oakhill, 2005). The abilities to decode words and read connected text with fluency are necessary skills, but proficiency with these skills does not ensure that comprehension will occur (Moats, 2005; Cain et al., 2004). The Reading for Meaning rubric (RMR) focuses on the methods the teacher implements to support the reader's interaction and engagement with a specific text for the purpose of constructing meaning. In contrast to a lesson that is designed to teach a specific strategy such as summarizing or making predictions, a "reading for meaning" lesson is focused on how students interact with the text and how the teacher guides students to attend to critical ideas, make connections, effectively integrate information, and make inferences in order to understand what they read (Cain et al., 2004; McKeown, Beck, & Blake, 2009). The RMR reflects reading comprehension as a process of extracting meaning from the text and actively constructing understanding; the teacher guides the process by intentionally scaffolding or creating a bridge between the text and the reader (Moats, 2005). The aim is to direct attention allocation to the important elements of the text and develop the processes that work to create a coherent mental model during reading (Kendeou et al., 2014) using effective scaffolding and guidance throughout the reading process.

"The focus is on what readers do with text information to represent it and integrate it into a coherent whole" (McKeown et al., 2009, p. 220).

The RMR was designed for use by supervisors and administrators to reliably evaluate reading for meaning instructional practices, to provide specific, accurate, and actionable feedback to special education teachers about the quality of their reading instruction, and, ultimately, to improve the outcomes for students with disabilities. The purpose of this manual is to provide technical information for implementing the RMR as a tool for evaluation and feedback.

This rubric includes four components: 1) Preparing to Read - Purpose for Reading, 2) Preparing to Read - Background and Schema, 3) Reading for Meaning and Monitoring Understanding, and 4) Teacher Questioning Practices.

Under these four components, there are 19 items. For each item, there are five levels of implementation. Observing either live or from video, the observer assigns a rating based on a scale that ranges from **Implemented** to **Not Implemented.** The rater selects one score from among the following choices:
3 Implemented--meaning the teacher's performance aligns with the descriptor,
2+
2 Partially Implemented--meaning the teacher's instruction reflects this item, but there are flaws or missing components in the way in which it is implemented
2-
1 Not Implemented--meaning the item is either implemented poorly or should have been observed but was not.

Preparation for the Observations

There are several materials you will need in order to use the RMR to conduct the observations. First, you should ensure you have everything you need to conduct the observation including a copy of RMR (either paper or electronic). As you are observing, you will make notes to help you support the ratings you assign and the feedback you will provide to the teacher. The rubric provides space for notes; you may also want to take notes on a separate document that provides more writing space.

Understanding the RMR Structure

There are 19 items in this rubric. Each item is listed in a table below with an explanation and description of the intention of the item to help clarify its meaning. Each item has five levels of implementation. Descriptors are given for high, middle, and low levels of implementation. Examples are included to help you interpret the meaning of the different implementation levels. You should consider these descriptions and examples as you determine the implementation level for each item.

Assigning Rating on RMR

The RMR rating scale includes the scores of **3 Implemented, 2 Partially Implemented, and 1 Not Implemented**. The Partially Implemented category is further divided to allow for assigning a **2+, 2, or 2-** to indicate the degree to which the item is partially implemented. A **2-** indicates a very low level of partial implementation, whereas a **2+** can be used in cases where the item is almost fully implemented.

Observing either live or from video, you assign a rating on the basis of the observations. Assign a rating that comes closest to describing the observation even if not an exact match.

Because the duration of a class may be 40 minutes or more, it is helpful to note whatever is observed and select a score even at a low level. Then if a higher level item implementation is observed making the score inaccurate, the previous choice can simply be changed. This is especially useful when some items need to be observed throughout the whole lesson. For example, after observing the teacher “cue or provide correction of decoding or word level errors and having the student reread the word correctly,” the observer should select ‘Partially Implemented’. If the teacher continues to consistently cue or provide correction and have students reread correctly until the end of the lesson, ‘Partially Implemented’ should be crossed out and a higher level of item implementation should be selected.

Description of RMR

Component 1: Preparing to Read - Purpose for Reading

This component focuses on establishing and communicating the purpose for reading before the reading begins and then maintaining that purpose throughout the lesson. With a clear purpose that is specific to the content of the text, the reader is more likely to read intentionally and efficiently. The purpose clarifies what is expected (e.g., learn something new, use the information in a certain way, or find out about a certain character) and helps the reader to focus their attention on important and relevant information while reading. What readers attend to while reading affects what they comprehend and remember; allocation of attention is influenced by the purpose for reading and text features that signal importance (Driscoll, 2005).

Elements of Component 1 are:
Item 1- The teacher communicates a content specific purpose for reading the text.
Item 2- The purpose for reading is sustained throughout the lesson.

Component 2: Preparing to Read - Background and Schema

Preparing students for reading a particular text establishes a foundation that supports attention, memory, and the construction of meaning. In order to comprehend text, the reader must be able to integrate what they read with background knowledge and schema. Background knowledge is defined as the experiences, ideas, facts, and knowledge that we have about a particular topic. Schema is defined as the network of information constructed in the mind around a particular topic or concept.

Schemata is the plural form of schema. When reading a passage, there are multiple networks of information that can be engaged, beginning with the topic of the passage. If the passage is either a narrative or expository piece about traveling to a zoo, the schema of zoo, taking a trip, and animals may all be relevant. In addition, a more generic schema for text is the general text structure, such as elements of narrative text (e.g., character, setting, goal, or problem,or resolution) or elements of expository text that help organize information.

Connections to relevant background knowledge and/or schema support comprehension in multiple ways. Engaging background knowledge and/or schema supports the ability to make inferences that require the connection of information both within the text and beyond the text (Cain et al., 2004). Engaging relevant schema also provides the reader with a framework for assimilating text information (Gunning, T. G., 2010). Readers are able to more closely monitor their understanding and recognize inconsistencies when connections are made between what they are reading and their background or schema. Schema for text structure influences what is perceived to be important and the allocation of attention, as does a clearly established purpose or objective for reading (Anderson, 1982).

Therefore, it is critical during the preparation phase of a reading for meaning lesson that the teacher prepare the students by engaging relevant background knowledge and schema for both the topic and the structure of the text in addition to establishing a clear purpose for reading.

Finally, students do not always come to the reading experience with all of the necessary background knowledge. It is important students are pre-taught key concepts and vocabulary that are critical to comprehension of the text.

Elements of Component 2 are:
Item 3- The teacher effectively engages background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading.
Item 4- The teacher effectively pre-teaches or reviews key concepts.
Item 5- The teacher purposefully uses text preview strategies that are focused on text structure and aligned with the purpose for reading.
Item 6- The teacher reviews or teaches key vocabulary prior to reading using words that are clear, precise, and accurate.

Component 3: Reading for Meaning and Monitoring Understanding

This component is focused on the strategies that are implemented during and after reading to assist the reader in monitoring their understanding and mentally processing what they are reading in order to build meaning. Strategies are defined as “intentional mental actions during reading that improve reading comprehension” and “deliberate efforts by a reader to better understand or remember what is being read” (Shanahan et al., 2010, p.11). Evidence-based strategies focused on reading for meaning and monitoring understanding addressed in this section include the use of content enhancement tools (graphic organizers), recognizing and using narrative and informational text structures and/or features, prediction, identifying main idea and details, summarizing, and making inferences (Lane, 2014; Shanahan et al., 2010; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [NICHD], 2000). This section also focuses on how the teacher directs students back to the text to support understanding or clarification and how decoding or word level errors are addressed during reading.

Elements of Component 3 are:

Item 7- The teacher actively engages students in the use of content enhancement tools that are aligned to facilitate comprehension (e.g., advanced and graphic organizers, visual displays, mnemonic instruction).

Item 8- The teacher focuses attention on relevant text features and/or structures to organize thinking and support comprehension.

Item 9- The teacher guides students to make predictions about the text AND to confirm, disconfirm, and/or extend them.

Item 10- The teacher supports the students in identifying main idea and supporting details.

Item 11- The teacher guides students to summarize key ideas and/or critical passages to support understanding.

Item 12- The teacher supports making inferences by helping students identify and connect relevant information, fill gaps, and/or connect to prior knowledge.

Item 13- The teacher guides students to support their responses with information from the text.

Item 14- The teacher consistently guides students to reread as needed to support comprehension.

Item 15- The teacher consistently cues or provides correction of decoding or word level errors as needed AND has the student reread the word correctly.

Component 4: Questioning and Discussion Practices

This component looks at all aspects of the teacher's questioning practices including wording, methods, timing, pace, the types of questions, and their utility in guiding understanding and focusing the reading. Effective questioning scaffolds the reading and supports the development of understanding. Questioning practices include questions generated by the teacher, strategies that support student generated questioning or a combination of both. Questions need to be worded using language that is clear and understandable for the students; this includes making appropriate word choices and avoiding multiple questions within a question. The accurate and appropriate use of academic language is also considered in this component. Using academic language in a reading lesson means that the teacher is appropriately using words such as prediction, summarize, plot, transition, or topic sentence. When using academic language, it is important the terms are used in a way that is understandable for students and that the teacher is using them correctly.

Elements of Component 4 are:

Item 16- The teacher's questioning practices effectively promote understanding, guide, and focus the reading.

Item 17- The teacher asks questions using wording that is consistently understandable for the students (e.g., clear, not too long, avoid multiple questions within a question).

Item 18- The teacher consistently and accurately uses academic language (e.g., predict, compare, contrast, infer).

Psychometric properties - *in development*

KEY Terms on RMR:

“**Adequate**” means as much or as good as is necessary to accomplish a purpose or produce intended or expected results.
“**Consistently**” means every time the opportunity arises, the teacher responds in the same or an appropriately similar way. It is different from continuously.
“Deliberately” means consciously, intentionally, with full awareness.
“**Effectively**” means adequate to accomplish a purpose or produce intended or expected results.
“**Frequently**” means regularly or often.
“Guides” means to lead, structure, direct, or support regulation. In order to move students toward independence with a skill supporting or guiding a student in the early stages of skill development may include an intentional model or think aloud provided by the teacher.
“Intentional” means with intention, done with full awareness or on purpose, deliberately, not done randomly or incidentally.
“Purposeful” means directed at a goal or purpose, done with intention, not done randomly or incidentally.

Item 1: The teacher communicates a content specific purpose for reading the text.

This item examines how well the teacher provides students with a clear and focused reason for reading that is specific to the content of the text. A clear purpose guides the reading process and influences the strategies that are selected to construct meaning. The purpose directs attention and focuses comprehension monitoring. A clear purpose also impacts motivation, efficiency, and persistence as the reader works toward a goal. A clear purpose is not a list of things that will happen in the lesson or an explanation of strategies that will be applied. **Purpose examples**: integrate new knowledge with old, confirm or disconfirm predictions, gather knowledge to apply for a purpose, determine the answer to pre-established questions or determine how a specific problem will be solved in a story.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher communicates a **content specific purpose** for reading the text.	The teacher communicates a purpose for reading the text, but the purpose is **broad, vague, or not specific to the content of the text.**	The teacher **does not communicate** a purpose for reading the text.
Examples: ● Continuing with the theme of dishonesty, the teacher explains they will read to determine what the character was dishonest about and the problem it caused. ● Prior to reading the teacher focuses students on reading to identify important details about the diet of sloths. ● The teacher supports the development of predictions prior to reading and then clearly tells students they will read to confirm or disconfirm their predictions.	Examples: ● The teacher explains they will identify the elements within a story map while reading (characters, setting, action, solution/conclusion). ● The teacher tells the students they will read about sloths and list some “things” about the animal on the board as they read. (Not specific enough - are they reading to attend to diet, habitat, physical characteristics?) ● Prior to reading the students develop predictions, but the teacher does not clearly communicate that they are reading to confirm, disconfirm or extend these predictions.	Examples: ● The teacher gives the title of the story and asks a student to begin reading but does not provide a purpose, focus, or goal for the reading. ● The teacher provides a description of what they will do rather than a purpose for reading, “First we will read about sloths and and then answer some questions about them in the workbook.”

Item 2- The purpose for reading is sustained throughout the lesson. This item assesses how well the teacher maintains the focus on the purpose for reading throughout the lesson.		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The purpose for reading **is sustained** throughout the lesson.	The purpose for reading is **inconsistently sustained** throughout the lesson.	The purpose for reading is **not sustained** throughout the lesson.
Examples: ● The teacher stops the group at critical points and moves back and forth between the text and a graphic organizer to help students connect how the character's dishonestly caused a problem. ● The teacher maintains the focus on the sloth's diet by having students consistently highlight relevant sentences throughout the reading of the passage. ● The teacher explains they will identify the elements within a story map while reading (characters, setting, problem, action, solution/conclusion). Throughout the reading the discussion and questioning links back to these story elements and the construction of the story map. *(While this is a broad purpose, the purpose is sustained throughout the lesson)*	Examples: ● The teacher misses some important opportunities to summarize or discuss the character's actions that led to the problem and resolution. ● The teacher inconsistently focuses on the goal of identifying details about the sloth's diet. The teacher allows students to highlight additional details that are interesting but do not always pertain specifically to the diet. ● The teacher explains they will identify the elements within a story map while reading (characters, setting, problem, action, solution/conclusion). Discussion and questioning inconsistently link back to these story elements.	Examples: ● The teacher sets a purpose focused on reading to determine how dishonesty caused a problem in the story, but does not organize discussion to focus on this purpose. ●The teacher says they will read to identify details about the sloth's diet. During reading, the questions and discussion do not focus on this goal and are simply general questions about the reading. ● The teacher explains they will identify the characters, setting, problem, solution while reading but does not return to these elements at any point during the reading. ●The teacher does not provide a purpose for reading.

Item 3- The teacher effectively engages background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading. Background knowledge: the experiences, ideas, facts, and knowledge we have about a topic. Schema: the mental model or web that connects facts and ideas about a particular topic. Schema exists for both the topic of the text and text structure. Effectively engaging background knowledge and/or schema focuses the reading and influences understanding, the ability to make inferences, monitor one's own understanding, and remember what is read. To be effective, the teacher must address and control for irrelevant or distracting information, focus on information related to the reading, and not allow students to get off track or perseverate. This item may be integrated with text preview strategies.		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **effectively engages** background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading.	The teacher **attempts to engage** background knowledge and/or activate schema **but does not** maintain the focus on relevant information.	The teacher **does not engage** background knowledge and/or activate schema relevant to the text prior to reading.
Examples: ● Prior to reading about a con man, the teacher shares a short example of being tricked into believing something not true and asks the students for examples. Then the teacher connects to the story about a con man, focusing on how it feels to be tricked. ● Prior to continuing reading A Trip Down the Amazon River, the teacher guides a discussion using Amazon River concept webs made the day before, focusing on plant life in preparation for a section on Amazon herbivores. ● The teacher reviews the common elements of a familiar fairy tale and provides a chart to refer to while reading the new fairy tale. (activates schema)	Examples: ● The teacher prompts the students to share what they know about playing tricks on people. The prompt is too broad and allows for multiple digressions. ● Prior to continuing reading A Trip Down the Amazon River, the teacher asks, "What is special about the Amazon River?" Students provide limited information that is mostly disconnected from the reading. The teacher does not take the opportunity to redirect or link to the reading from the day before. ● The teacher asks students to tell her about some fairy tales. The identification of common elements is lost in the broad discussion of a number of stories.	Examples: ● The teacher asks what they did yesterday when she was absent. Students tell her they read part one of the story about a con man. However, there is no consistency in student recall, and the teacher does not attempt to clarify understanding, summarize important concepts or connect to the reading for the day. ● The teacher has a student read the title of the passage, and then students begin reading. They do not know if it is expository or narrative or what background they need to tap into to construct meaning. ● The teacher does not engage background prior to reading, but discusses background knowledge after reading.

Item 4- The teacher effectively pre-teaches or reviews key concepts.
This item assesses how well the teacher pre-teaches or reviews concepts related to the text topic that will directly impact comprehension. Gaps in knowledge about key concepts can have a negative impact on the ability to construct meaning, monitor one's understanding, and make inferences. This item may be connected to engaging background knowledge. If students do not have the necessary background knowledge or schema, the teacher will need to pre-teach to develop it.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **effectively** pre-teaches or reviews **key** concepts.	The teacher pre-teaches or reviews **key** concepts **but not effectively**.	The teacher **does not** pre-teach or review **key** concepts.
Examples: ● Prior to reading a story set in Alaska, the teacher shows students a table of sunrise and sunset times, focuses on the days with minimum sunlight, and gives examples of how that would affect life. ● Understanding what a cargo ship does is important for comprehending the text. Prior to reading, the teacher provides a short, sufficient explanation about how goods are transported and shows a picture of a cargo ship.	Examples: ● Prior to reading the story, the teacher shows students that the day is short in some parts of Alaska but does not fully develop the concept of how this impacts daily life. ● Prior to reading, the teacher spends more time than is needed showing pictures and videos and elaborating on the topic of cargo ships, ports, goods that are transported, and trade with other countries. OR ● The teacher gives an all oral explanation of a cargo ship, and the student appears to remain confused. A visual example would have been beneficial.	Examples: ● The teacher does not preteach. Therefore, the students are unable to make inferences in the story because they lack background knowledge about living in Alaska when daylight is limited. ● The teacher frequently interrupts the reading to explain what a cargo ship is and how it transports goods. It would have been beneficial to anticipate and pre-teach the concepts critical to comprehension.

Item 5- The teacher purposefully uses text preview strategies that are focused on text structure and aligned with the purpose for reading.

This item assesses how well the teacher uses text preview strategies as a scaffold to create a context for reading. Effective preview strategies provide a deliberate connection or bridge between the text to be read, relevant background knowledge and/or schema, and the purpose for reading. The preview maintains a focus on key information and concepts that are relevant to the text and the purpose for reading. Effective preview strategies also focus on elements of text structure that impact comprehension with the particular text (e.g., narrative/expository text structure, bold words, captions, headings, pictures). Text preview allows the teacher to engage background knowledge, assess what students already know, establish a framework for new information that will be learned while reading, and familiarize students with the structure of the text (Honig, Diamond, & Gutlohn, 2000).

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **purposefully uses** text preview strategies that are **focused** on text structure **and aligned** with the purpose for reading.	The teacher **uses** text preview strategies that are **somewhat focused** on text structure **and aligned** with the purpose for reading.	The teacher **does not use** text preview strategies; **OR** text preview is **not at all focused** on text structure and purpose for reading.
Examples: ● Prior to reading the story, the teacher reads the first paragraph and draws connections between the setting, what students know about the desert climate, and how it might impact daily life for the main character. ● Prior to reading a passage on the water cycle, the teacher guides a discussion about the title, headings, and picture captions, continually connecting back to the purpose for reading to learn the stages of the water cycle.	Examples: ● Prior to reading the story, the teacher reads the title, and the students discuss what they see in the pictures. There is some discussion about the boy in the pictures, but there is not an intentional focus on the setting that has an important impact on the main character. ● Prior to reading a passage on the water cycle, the teacher asks students to identify the title and headings but does not explicitly link them to the purpose for reading or guide the students in understanding how the headings support learning about the stages of the water cycle.	Examples: ● The teacher walks the students through the pictures in the story allowing for an open and broad discussion that is not at all directed toward the elements of narrative text or the purpose for reading. ● Prior to reading a passage on the water cycle, the teacher reads the title, and then a student is selected to begin reading. ● Prior to reading, the teacher and/or students do not use text preview.

Item 6- The teacher reviews or teaches key vocabulary prior to reading using words that are clear, precise, and accurate.

This item focuses on pre-teaching or reviewing words that will directly impact comprehension of the text. This is a component of developing background knowledge; it is critical that the teacher use language that is accurate and appropriate for the context and the students' level. Key vocabulary is defined as those words that are critical to pre-teach in order for students to fully comprehend the text. A more in-depth vocabulary lesson may happen during a different lesson.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher reviews or teaches **key** vocabulary **prior to reading** using words that are clear, precise, and accurate.	The teacher reviews or teaches **some key** vocabulary as they are encountered **AND/OR** uses words that are not always clear, precise, and accurate.	The teacher **does not** review or teach **key** vocabulary.
Examples: ● Prior to reading, the teacher says, "In this story you will read about a man that is an aristocrat." She follows with a precise and accurate explanation of the word and how it relates to the meaning of the story. ● Prior to reading, the teacher explains they are reading about shearing sheep. After discussing the picture of sheep in the book, she clearly explains that shearing is cutting the wool off the sheep and compares it to getting a haircut. Two other key-words are also explained with similar clarity. ● The teacher pre-teaches three words that are key to comprehending the text. During reading she stops at one point to explain the meaning of an additional word that students appeared unsure of.	Examples: ● Prior to reading, the teacher says, "In this story you will read about a man that is an aristocrat." She follows with an explanation of the word that is unclear. ● The teacher defines two key words clearly and accurately. However, with the word "shearing," she gives an oral explanation that is confusing for the students and may negatively impact comprehension. ● The teacher frequently stops during the reading to review or teach vocabulary words as they come up, but the list is not intentional and it is not done prior to reading.	Examples: ● Prior to reading, the teacher has students choral read a list of words that will be in the story, but there is no discussion of meaning with words that have implications for comprehension. ● The teacher has students begin reading without any discussion of important or unfamiliar terms.

Item 7- The teacher actively engages students in the use of content enhancement tools that are aligned to facilitate comprehension (e.g., advanced and graphic organizers, visual representations, mnemonic instruction). This item evaluates the teacher's use of content enhancement tools as a scaffold for constructing meaning. The items focuses on how well the teacher is engaging students in the use of tools such as cognitive maps or webs, story maps, venn diagrams, mnemonics (FIST, TWA), framed outlines, or embedded cues AND whether or not the teacher is using them in a way that has a positive impact on comprehension.		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **actively engages** students in the use of content enhancement tools that are **aligned** to facilitate comprehension (e.g., advanced and graphic organizers, visual representations, mnemonic instruction).	The teacher **provides** content enhancement tools that are **aligned** to facilitate comprehension **but does not actively engage** students in their use.	The teacher **does not provide** content enhancement tools at all; **OR** the teacher **provides** content enhancement tools that are **not aligned** to facilitate comprehension **AND/OR** refers to content enhancement tools **but does not implement** them.
Examples: ● The teacher provides each student with a story map, ensures each student records critical elements on their map, and then cues them to use it to support discussion. ● The teacher prompts students to use their cue card with the mnemonic for self-questioning steps. At the end of each paragraph, the students use the card with a partner to practice self-questioning with appropriate teacher prompting and guidance. ● While reading to identify characteristics of dolphins, the teacher guides the students to create their own concept web of ideas and consistently guides students to access the web during discussions.	Examples: ● The teacher displays a story map to discuss elements that are encountered in the story, but the students do not actively interact with the story map during or after reading. ● The teacher provides self-questioning cue cards. At the end of some sections, she stops and asks students to self-question, but she does not scaffold consistently with the use of the cue card as a tool to move students toward independence. ● The teacher demonstrates creating a concept web about dolphins but does not consistently guide students in accessing it to make connections, recall information, or draw conclusions.	Examples: ● After the student has read the story aloud, the teacher says, "Now we will fill out a story map." The map is not used to support comprehension but is a task to be completed. ● The teacher points to a poster and says, "Remember the strategy for self-questioning. We will use it when we read." She does not return to poster, prompt the use of the mnemonic, or provide an opportunity for students to use the strategy. (Does not implement). ● The teacher provides a complex graphic organizer the students are to complete. The students become lost due to the complexity of the organizer and lack of guidance. (Distracting).

Item 8-The teacher focuses attention on relevant text features and/or structures to organize thinking and support comprehension.

This item assesses how well the teacher uses text features as tools to support comprehension and text structures as a framework for constructing meaning. When used effectively, text features and structures focus the reader on important information, support the engagement of background knowledge, and organize reading into meaningful and manageable chunks**.**

Text features are cues imbedded in text that highlight important information (e.g., bold words, font sizes, bullets, headings, picture captions, tables or charts, paragraph topic sentences, signal words unique to the text structure, introductions, chapters, table of contents).

Text structure is the way a text is organized. The framework is used to guide the reader to anticipate and focus on critical information. Examples: Expository elements such as cause/effect, description, sequence, comparison or Narrative story elements such as character, setting, problem, solution or specific frameworks such as fairy tale or myth.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **focuses** attention on **relevant** text features and/or structures **to organize thinking and support comprehension.**	The teacher **points out some** text features and/or structures **but does not deliberately use** them to organize thinking and support comprehension.	The teacher **does not use** text features and/or structures.
Examples: ● In an article on volcanoes, the teacher draws attention to the bold words “magma” and “eruption” and models using the definition boxes on the side of the article to support understanding. ● While a reading about ecosystems, the teacher reads the heading for the first section and uses think aloud to model how the heading helps her anticipate what the section will be about. In the next section, she reads the heading and asks the students what they think this section will be about and what questions they think will be answered.	Examples: ● In an article on volcanoes, the teacher draws attention to the bold words “magma” and “eruption” and says they are important words but does not model using the definition boxes on the side of the article to support understanding. ● While a reading text on ecosystems, the teacher reads the heading for the first section and explains that the heading tells them what the next section will be about. They then read the section without actively using the heading to generate questions, make predictions, or anticipate new information.	Examples: ● In an article on volcanoes, the teacher does not draw attention to the bold words “magma” and “eruption” or access definition boxes on the side of the article. ● While reading a text on ecosystems, the teacher has students read the headings as part of the passage but does not draw any further attention to them.

Item 8 - Continued		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
● The teacher uses a beginning, middle, and end story map as a record for main events. She prompts students to highlight cue words such as first, later, then, after that, and finally to support the sequencing of events in the story about the Little Red Hen. ● The teacher reviews the structure of problem and resolution found in narrative text. During reading the teacher uses intentional questioning and discussion to focuses the students on the main character's problem, the sequence of steps the character takes to solve the problem and the final resolution.	● The teacher explains stories usually have a beginning, middle, and ending and that, after they finish reading, they will recall what happened first, next, and last. ● During reading the teacher points out the problem the main character is having. The students continue to read. At the end the teacher asks how the problem was solved. There is not a focused and explicit link throughout the reading that guides students from problem to resolution.	● While having students read the story about The Little Red Hen, the teacher does not refer to cue words for sequencing or explain that they should anticipate a beginning, middle, and end in the story. ● The story is read without discussion focused on problem or resolution.

Item 9- The teacher guides students to make predictions about the text AND to confirm, disconfirm, and/or extend them.

This item focuses on how the teacher prompts and supports students to make predictions either before or during reading. When making predictions, effective readers integrate clues from the text (e.g., pictures, patterns, text structure) and their own background knowledge. Teachers are able to guide this process by focusing students on relevant information and connecting to background knowledge. This item also focuses on whether the teacher provides students the opportunities to confirm, disconfirm, and/or extend their predictions.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **guides** students to make predictions about the text **AND** to confirm, disconfirm, and/or extend them.	The teacher **asks** students to make predictions **AND** gives the opportunity to confirm, disconfirm, and/or extend them **but without adequate guidance** (e.g., lacks connection to relevant information or background knowledge).	The teacher **does not ask** students to make predictions; **OR** the teacher **does not provide the opportunity** to confirm, disconfirm, or extend predictions that are made.
Examples: ● The teacher guides a discussion about the character's traits, the problem he has to solve, and ways the student might solve the same problem. She prompts the student to make a prediction about how the character will solve the problem. After finishing the story, they discuss the student's prediction. ● The teacher uses a think aloud to model using her background knowledge and what she learned from the text preview to make a prediction. Then, she asks students to follow the same process. In the middle of the story, she models changing her prediction based on new information and provides students with the same opportunity.	Examples: ● The teacher prompts the student to predict what will happen next and also returns to confirm the prediction at the end. However, the teacher does not connect information within or outside the story, such as character traits or the student's own experiences, to support making a prediction. ● Students make predictions at the beginning, and then, at the end, the teachers asks, "Were you right?" Students say yes or no. The focus is on being right or wrong rather than on connecting to important information and being flexible as they learn more as they read.	Examples: ● The teacher does not prompt students to make predictions before or during reading. ● The teacher stops in the middle of the story and asks the student to tell her their predictions for what will come next, but she does not return to those predictions at any point in the lesson.

Item 10- The teacher supports the students in identifying the main idea and supporting details.

Main idea is a "statement that subsumes all of the details in a piece of writing" (Gunning, 2010, p. 360). It is the "gist"--what all the ideas of a paragraph, passage, or larger piece of writing are about or how you would classify a collective group of ideas. To identify the main idea effectively, the teacher may guide students to use text features such as titles, topic sentences, or headings, use specific cueing questions, or help students to classify the details to identify the main idea.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **supports** the students in identifying the main idea and supporting details.	The teacher **provides some support** for identifying main idea and supporting details **but more is needed** (e.g., lacks clear process).	The teacher **does not support** the identification of main idea and supporting details.
Examples: ● The teacher directs attention to the list of important details that are recorded on a chart as they read. She asks the students to identify what they all have in common ("living on the space station") and defines this as the main idea. ● The teacher asks students to read a paragraph in a passage and underline details about how the camel has adapted to its environment. Using the details and a think aloud, she models identifying the main idea of the paragraph. She then has them identify the details in the following paragraph and think aloud about the main idea. ● The teacher uses a sentence frame to support the development of main idea. (___ wanted ___ but___so __).	Examples: ● After reading the passage, the teacher asks the students what they think the main idea is or "what the passage is all about". The students recall multiple details orally and eventually conclude "living on the space station," but there is not a clear process. ● The teacher asks students to read a passage about camels that is three pages long and underline details about the camels. Her explanation for how these details connect to finding main idea is not explicit and clear throughout the lesson.	Examples: ● The teacher begins the lesson by telling students they will be reading to find the main idea. The story is read with some questions being asked, but the teacher does not align questioning to support main idea identification or return to the identification of main idea throughout the lesson. ● After reading a passage about camels the teacher asks students about the main idea and/or details but does not provide support or guidance that is needed.

Item 11- The teacher guides students to summarize key ideas and/or critical passages to support understanding.

This item assesses how well the teacher guides students in the use of summarizing to monitor understanding and improve comprehension. Summarizing helps students attend to, process, and synthesize important information in order to understand and remember what they have read. A summary contains only the most important information (eliminating redundant or less relevant information). Summarizing can be scaffolded with clear steps, intentional questions, or rules for selecting the most important information, deleting less important information, and creating a logical order. Summarizing can take place within a small section of text (paragraph or small passage) or across multiple main ideas that would be involved in a more complex body of text (several paragraphs, long selection, chapter or book). Summaries may be written, oral, or in the form of graphic organizers.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **guides** students to summarize key ideas and/or critical passages to support understanding.	The teacher provides **some guidance** for summarizing, **but more is needed** (e.g. focus, structure, more opportunity).	The teacher **does not guide** students to summarize key ideas and/or critical passages to support understanding.
Examples: ● The teacher stops at key points in the passage and uses a set of familiar prompts (somebody, wanted, but, so) to guide a focused summary. ● The teacher guides the students to identify and list the most important details in the paragraphs about how icebergs form. Then, the teacher provides a main idea topic sentence and helps students synthesize details into a summary. ● The teacher guides students in the creation of a semantic map on a passage about elephant habitats. The teacher prompts to ensure critical information is included and redundant information is avoided in this form of summary.	Examples: ● The teacher stops at key points to ask what happened, but the discussion lacks structure to support a focused summary. ● The teacher asks students to summarize what they read about how icebergs form. Students give details (some important, others not). The teacher does not adequately help them identify the most important information. ● The teacher asks students to create a semantic map on a passage about elephant habitats. The teacher <u>does not</u> prompt to ensure that critical information is included and redundant information is avoided in this form of summary.	Examples: ● The teacher asks the students to summarize the passage, “Tell me what it was all about.” However, she does not provide further scaffolding (guidance). ● The students read a section of the text containing important information about how icebergs form. The teacher does not stop to have students summarize the important information before continuing. ● The teacher does not provide students with a method for summarizing critical information while reading a passage about elephant habitats.

Item 11 - Continued		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
●The teacher adequately supports students in summarizing the critical traits of an important character and several important passages that impact comprehension (key ideas and critical passages for the story were summarized).	●The teacher stops at one point in the passage and adequately supports students in summarizing the traits of a character, but misses other important opportunities to guide the students in summarizing key ideas or critical passages.	●The teacher does not ask students to summarize.

Item 12 - The teacher supports making inferences by helping students identify and connect relevant information, fill gaps, and/or connect to prior knowledge.
This item assesses how effectively the teacher scaffolds making inferences. Comprehension may break down when students are unable to make appropriate connections or develop a complete mental model. Making inferences requires the reader to make connections between relevant information in the text, connect information in the text to relevant background knowledge, or fill gaps in the text. The teacher can support this by effectively focusing students on keywords/phrases, intentionally linking to background knowledge, providing tools to help students connect relevant sections of the text, and modeling through think aloud.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **supports** making inferences by helping students identify and connect relevant information, fill gaps, and/or connect to prior knowledge.	The teacher **supports** making inferences **but more support is needed** (e.g. identify and connect relevant information, fill gaps, and/or connect to prior knowledge).	The teacher **does not support** making inferences.
Examples: ● The teacher focuses students on keywords that help identify the beach as the setting of the story (sand, seagulls, swimsuits). The teacher asks, “Using these keywords, where do you think that the children are playing?” ● The teacher asks, “What are some clues that tell us how the man is feeling at this point in the expedition?” Together they identify clues and conclude that he is discouraged. ● While reading a passage on Jane Goodall, the teacher asks the students to list her characteristics and what they know about animal trust. The teacher guides the use of these characteristics to infer why she works well with animals.	Examples: ● The teacher asks, “Where are the children playing?” The students infer they are at a pool because of swimsuits. The teacher corrects them without focusing them on the keywords of sand and seagulls. ● The teacher asks, “ How does the man feel?” The teacher suggests he might be discouraged and gives some reasons but does not focus on key information to support the inference. ● While reading a passage on Jane Goodall, the teacher asks students to infer why she works well with animals without sufficiently supporting the identification of clues or the connection to schema. More scaffolding was needed.	Examples: ● Students are reading a story set at the beach but the setting is not explicitly stated. The teacher does not help students connect information within the story in order to develop a more complete understanding of the setting. ● The teacher does not focus the student on the clues that tell how the character is feeling or prompt this inference even though it is critical to comprehension. ● While reading a passage on Jane Goodall, the teacher does not support making inferences when it would have been beneficial for comprehension.

Item 13 - The teacher guides students to support their responses with information from the text. This item focuses on how the teacher engages students in recognizing and extracting explicit information from the text to support responses to questions, conclusions, or inferences made throughout the reading process. The aim is to develop an active, rather than passive, approach and to encourage students to use the text as a resource rather than always relying on memory or personal experiences to formulate responses.		
The teacher **guides** students to support their responses with information from the text.	The teacher **guides** students to support their responses with information from the text, **but more guidance is needed.**	The teacher **does not guide** students to support their responses with information from the text
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
Examples: ● While reading about Lewis and Clark, the teacher asks the students why they went on the expedition. She points the students to a paragraph and asks them to locate and read the sentence that tells why they went on the expedition. Together they discuss the sentence. ● The goal of the lesson is to determine why people call Albert Einstein a genius. During reading, the students mark evidence in the text using a highlighter. After reading, the teacher prompts students to return to highlighted sections to support a group discussion. ● The teacher prompts the student to look at the picture and reread the sentence that provides information about how the boy in the story feels.	Examples: ● While reading about Lewis and Clark, the teacher asks the student why they went on the expedition. When the student is unable to answer, the teacher suggests that he reread to find the out. When he is unsuccessful, she gives him the key word expedition and asks him to try again. ● The goal of the lesson is to determine why people call Albert Einstein a genius. The teacher asks students to skim the text to locate the information to support their discussion, but students appear to need more support to efficiently skim and locate information. ● The teacher prompts the student to look at the picture to determine how the boy feels but does not direct her to the sentence that provides important information.	Examples: ● While reading about Lewis and Clark, the teacher asks the students why they went on the expedition. When students are unable to answer, the teacher provides the answer without referring to the text. ● Students are asked to restate from memory reasons that Albert Einstein is considered a genius but are never directed back to the book when it would have been beneficial.

Item 14- The teacher consistently guides students to reread as needed to support comprehension.

This item evaluates the teacher's prompting and guidance that supports a student's ability to flexibly and effectively respond when they are confused or not understanding what they are reading. This item relies upon the reader and/or the teacher to first monitor understanding in order to recognize when it is appropriate to reread to support comprehension. Then, by rereading or looking back into the text, the reader is able to locate information or details that were either overlooked or lost from working memory. Rereading also supports the reader's ability to connect and process information, clarify understanding, clear up confusion, or confirm memory or thinking.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **consistently guides** students to reread **as needed** to support comprehension.	The teacher **misses some opportunities** for students to reread as needed to support comprehension **AND/OR** does **not always provide sufficient guidance.**	The teacher **does not guide** students to reread **as needed** to support comprehension.
Examples: ● After reading a section of the text, the student demonstrates a lack of clarity. The teacher says, "Let's reread the paragraph before this to remember what the man was thinking before he went into the room." She then helps him connect this information to the next paragraph where he became confused. ● The teacher says, "Sometimes when I am confused about what I have just read, I will go back and reread." She then models and supports clarifying a point of confusion.	Examples: ● After reading a section of the text, the student demonstrates a lack of clarity. The teacher prompts him to reread the paragraph he just read but does not help him make connections to the prior paragraph to further clarify. ● The teacher is inconsistent. Sometimes she has the students refer back to the passage to locate details. However, when the students need clarification at a critical point in the story, the teacher provides a long explanation without guiding students to refer back to the text to support her explanation (missed opportunity).	Examples: ● The student demonstrates a lack of understanding in places. The teacher does not guide him to reread for clarification or model this as an effective strategy when it would have been beneficial to do so.

Item 14 - Continued		
● When reading to determine how a character's dishonestly created a problem, the teacher stops and prompts the students to reread a critical section that provides important information connected to this purpose. (reinforces purpose for reading)	● When reading to determine how a character's dishonesty caused a problem the teacher misses some important opportunities for rereading to support the connection of information within the text.	

Item 15-The teacher consistently cues or provides correction of decoding or word level errors as needed AND has the student reread the word correctly.

This item focuses on how the teacher cues and prompts accurate reading during a reading for meaning lesson. While decoding is not the primary focus of a reading for meaning lesson, decoding errors may impact comprehension if they are not addressed. An abundance of decoding issues can also overtax working memory and inhibit comprehension. The method for addressing decoding errors will vary depending upon the student(s), the goal of the lesson, and the nature of the error (e.g., student is prompted to apply decoding strategies, student is cued with the first sound, word is given to the student, teacher models decoding, teacher prompts meaning). Regardless of the correction method, the teacher must prompt the students to reread the word correctly. This item addresses error cueing and correction procedures as well as the case when a teacher has selected text that is too difficult to decode and therefore inhibits comprehension.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **consistently** cues or provides correction of decoding or word level errors **as needed AND** has the student reread the word correctly.	The teacher **inconsistently** cues or provides correction of decoding or word level errors **AND/OR inconsistently** has the student reread the word correctly.	The teacher **does not** cue or provide correction of decoding or word level errors **OR does not** have the student reread the word correctly; **OR** the teacher has selected a text that is **not at the instructional level** of **most** students and decoding errors inhibit comprehension.
Examples: ● <u>The teacher consistently cues or prompts</u>: When the student reads *criter* for critter she points out the double t and has him decode the word correctly and reread the sentence **AND** supports decoding the word hatch, provides the word amphibian and has the student repeats the words correctly before continuing. ● Cues or correction are not needed at any point in the lesson.	**Examples:** ● <u>The teacher is inconsistent:</u> When the student reads *criter* for critter she points out the double t and has him decode the word correctly and reread the sentence; **BUT** when the student incorrectly reads hatch, the teacher does not provide correction; **AND** she provides several words, but the student does not always repeat the word before continuing to read.	**Examples:** ● The teacher does not correct the words critter or hatch and provides the words migrate and amphibian without having the student reread. ● The teacher consistently gives the word, and the student continues reading without rereading the word in the context of the sentence. ● The teacher has selected text that is not at appropriate instructional level for most students.

Item 16- The teacher's questioning practices effectively promote understanding, guide, and focus the reading.

This item assesses how effectively the teacher uses questioning practices to facilitate the construction of meaning, support comprehension monitoring and maintain a clear focus on the purpose for reading. Questioning practices include the nature of the questions and the questioning process, which includes pacing. Effective questioning practices may include questions generated by the teacher, student generated questions, or a combination of both. The goal is to encourage active, engaged, and reflective reading through purposeful and well designed questions and questioning strategies.

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher's questioning practices **effectively** promote understanding, guide, and focus the reading.	The teacher's questioning practices **somewhat** promote understanding, guide, and focus the reading.	The teacher's questioning practices **do not** promote understanding, guide, and focus the reading; **OR** the teacher **does not ask** questions.
Examples: ●The teacher consistently supports responses and involvement by cueing the question type or providing clarification as needed (e.g., "This is a “right there” question.”) ●The teacher asks a variety of questions, both factual and inferential, that are designed to promote understanding and encourage students to focus on the purpose for reading. ● The teacher’s questions directly align to the purpose for reading which is to identify specific facts about whales. She does not ask higher level questions, but this is appropriate for the goal of this lesson.	Examples: ● The teacher does not consistently encourage student responses and sometimes provides the answer to questions herself rather than providing scaffolding. The teacher misses some opportunities to prompt, explain, or clarify as needed. ● The teacher is attempting to guide and focus the reading. At times, the questions are superficial and lack the depth that is needed to support understanding at a level that is appropriate for the students and the text. ● The teacher does <u>not always</u> maintain a pace for questioning that promotes understanding. At times, the pace of questioning and discussion is so slow that it takes away from the focus.	Example: ●The teacher does not encourage students to respond or engage with the text, or the teacher does not ask questions. ● The teacher's questions during reading were used to gather correct responses. The process lacks authentic connection to meaning or the purpose for reading. ● The teacher does not prompt, explain, or clarify as needed to promote understanding. ● The teacher’s pace for questioning is consistently too fast or too slow, causing comprehension to be compromised.

Item 16 - Continued		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
● The teacher consistently maintains a pace for questioning that promotes understanding by providing an appropriate amount of think time but not allowing for so much time that students become disinterested. ● At key points, the teacher has students ask one question that may be answered in the next section using who, what, when, where, why, and how prompt cards to support question generation. ● The teacher engages students in the use of the FIST strategy (read first sentence of paragraph, write a question, read to see if answered, summarize/retell). ●The teacher uses a "look back strategy." At key places in the text, the teacher prompts students to look at what they have read and select one sentence starter to generate a question (e.g., "I question…", "I wonder…")	● The teacher does <u>not always</u> maintain a pace for questioning that promotes understanding. At times, the teacher does not provide the students with time to think about one question before she moves on. ● The teacher instructs the student to generate a question about the text prior to reading but does not guide him to use clues such as the title, topic sentence, pictures, or his background knowledge to help him generate a meaningful question to consider while reading. ● The teacher asks the students to write a question related to the topic of the passage. They would have benefited from a more specific prompt or a sentence starter. Several students are unable to generate a question independently.	● At the end of some sections of the chapter, the teacher asks students if they have any questions. Some reply, others do not. It does not appear to be a structured application of self-questioning.

Item 17-The teacher asks questions using wording that is consistently understandable for the students (e.g. clear, not too long, avoid multiple questions within a question). This item specifically examines the wording, length, and complexity of questions asked by the teacher throughout the lesson.		
3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher asks questions using wording that is **consistently understandable** for the students (e.g. clear, not too long, avoid multiple questions within a question).	The teacher asks questions using wording that is **not always understandable** for the students.	The teacher asks questions using wording that is **confusing** for the students (i.e., unclear, too long, multiple questions within a question); **OR** the teacher does not ask questions.
Examples: ● The teacher's questions are direct and focused on only one thing at a time (e.g., "What happened that made the boy so upset?") ● The teacher words questions clearly and restates as needed to clarify. For example,she asks what the climate is. When they do not understand, she explains the word climate and restates the question. ● The question wording is consistently clear, (e.g., "Remember the setting is where the story takes place, what is the setting of this story?")	Examples: ● The teacher words questions clearly but sometimes lumps multiple questions together (e.g., Why is he so distraught? What does he say? Does it seem fair that he would get cut from the team?) ● The teacher asks some questions in a casual manner. For example, it is not clear to the students what she is asking when she says, "So, what's going on?" ● The teacher's questions are not consistently clear. Students occasionally have difficulty in knowing what she wants them to answer (e.g., "Where is our setting taking place?")	Examples: ● The teacher frequently asks multiple questions within a question that makes it difficult for students to follow. ●The teacher consistently uses wording that is unclear and confusing. Rather than clarifying, she simply repeats using the same words. ●The teacher combines long explanations with questions that make it unclear as to what is being asked of the students.

Item 18-The teacher consistently and accurately uses academic language (e.g., predict, compare, contrast, infer, define, evidence, theme, summarize, narrative).

This item assesses the teacher's use of academic language as it is appropriate throughout the lesson. Both the consistency and accuracy of the use of academic language are considered in this item. For the purposes of this rubric, academic language is defined as "the specialized language, both oral and written, of academic settings that facilitates communication and thinking about disciplinary content" (Nagy & Townsend, 2012, p.91).

3 Implemented	**2 Partially Implemented**	**1 Not Implemented**
The teacher **consistently and accurately** uses academic language (e.g., predict, compare, infer).	The teacher **uses** academic language but **not consistently AND/OR not always accurately.**	The teacher **does not use** academic language **OR** uses it **inaccurately.**
Examples: ● The teacher says, "We are identifying the most important idea. That is called the main idea." She consistently uses this term throughout and clarifies between main idea and details. ● The teacher accurately uses terms for text features throughout the lesson (e.g. character, setting, problem). ● The teacher explains the meaning of a word using the term synonym, consistently talks about transition words, and accurately uses the terms prediction, cause, and effect. ● The teacher models and encourages academic language. (Teacher, "What is a fact?" Student, "A fact is something that's true. I can back it up with evidence." Teacher, "Yes and the evidence is right here in this sentence…").	Examples: ● The teacher alternates between using the words main idea, big ideas, important ideas, and details throughout the lesson. The lack of consistency in language is confusing. ●The teacher uses some unclear language, "Because we were summarizing the text, we will be able to pull out cause and effect." ●The teacher accurately uses some academic language (synonym, prediction), but she also misses some opportunities (transition word, cause and effect). ● The teacher intentionally uses the terms infer, sequence, and hypothesize. She provides a quick definition for each term. However, it is not clear that the students understand what she means by hypothesize.	Examples: ● Throughout the lesson, the teacher incorrectly uses the term main ideas when referring to details that support the main idea ("These are the main ideas.") ● The teacher does not use academic language to guide students during discussion when he has the opportunity (synonym, prediction, cause and effect). ● The teacher uses the term prediction inaccurately and uses the terms summarize and hypothesize repeatedly, but it is not clear that the students understand the meaning. ● The teacher intentionally uses the terms infer, sequence, and hypothesize but not in a way that is understandable for the students.

References:

Anderson, R. C. (1982). Allocation of attention during reading. In A. Flammer & W. Kintsch (Eds.), *Discourse processing*. New York: North-Holland Publishing.

Bakken, J. P., Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (1997). Reading comprehension of expository science material and students with learning disabilities: A comparison of strategies. *The Journal of Special Education, 31*(3), 300–324.

Beck, I. L., Perfetti, C. A, & McKeown, M. G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*(4), 506-521.

Berkeley, S., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (2010). Reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities, 1995–2006: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 31*(6), 423–436.

Billingsley, B. S., & Wildman, T. M. (1990). Facilitating reading comprehension in learning disabled students:Metacognitive goals and instructional strategies. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(2), 18–31.

Blanton, W., Wood, K., & Moorman, G. (1990). The role of purpose in reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 43*(7), 486-493.

Boulineau, T., Fore, C., Hagan-Burke, S., & Burke, M. D. (2004). Use of story-mapping to increase the story-grammar text comprehension of elementary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*(2), 105–121.

Boyle, J. R. (2000). The effects of a Venn diagram strategy on the literal, inferential, and relational comprehension of students with mild disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 10*(1), 5-13.

Boyle, J. R., & Weishaar, M. (1997). The effects of expert-generated versus student-generated cognitive organizers on the reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 12*, 228–235

Cain, K. (2009). Making sense of text: Skills that support text comprehension and its development. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy, 35(*2), 11-14.

Cain, K. & Oakhill, J. (2007). Reading comprehension difficulties: Correlates, causes, and consequences. In *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 41-76). NY: Guildford.

Cain, K., Oakhill, J. V., Barnes, M. A., & Bryant, P. E. (2001). Comprehension skill, inference making ability, and the relation to knowledge. *Memory and Cognition, 29*(6), 850–859.

Cain, K., Oakhill, J. V., & Bryant, P. E. (2004). Children's reading comprehension ability: Concurrent prediction by working memory, verbal ability, and component skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(1), 31–42.

Carnine, D. W., Silbert, J., Kame'enui, E. J., & Tarver, S. G. (2010). *Direct instruction*

reading (5th ed.). Columbus, OH:Pearson/Merrill.
Carr, S. C., & Thompson, B. (1996). The effects of prior knowledge and schema activation strategies on the inferential reading comprehension of children with and without learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 19*(1), 48–61.
Catts, H. W., & Kamhi, A. G. (2017). Prologue: Reading comprehension is not a single ability. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *48*(2), 73-76.
Ciullo, S., Sabrina Lo, YL., Wanzek, J., & Reed, D. K. (2016). A synthesis of research on informational text reading interventions for elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,49*(3), 257-271.
Connor, C. M., Spencer, M., Day, S. L., Giuliani, S., Ingebrand, S. W., McLean, L., & Morrison, F. J. (2014). Capturing the complexity: Content, type, and amount of instruction and quality of the classroom learning environment synergistically predict third graders' vocabulary and reading comprehension outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(3), 762–778.
Darch, C., & Carnine, D. (1986). Teaching content area material to learning disabled students. *Exceptional Children, 53*(3), 240– 246.
Darch, C., & Kameenui, E. (1987). Teaching LD students critical reading skills: A systematic replication. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 10*(2), 82–91.
Dexter, D. D., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). Graphic organizers and students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 34*(1), 51–72.
DiCecco, V. M., & Gleason, M. M. (2002). Using graphic organizers to attain relational knowledge from expository text. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*(4), 306 –320.
Driscoll, M. E. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Duke, N., & Pearson, D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. Farstrup & J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed.) (pp. 205-242). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
El Zein, F., Solis, M., Vaughn, S., & McCulley, L. (2014). Reading comprehension interventions for students with autism spectrum disorders: A synthesis of research. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 44*(6), 1303-1322.
Elleman, A. M., & Compton, D. L. (2017). Beyond comprehension strategy instruction: What's next?. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *48*(2), 84-91.
Ellis, E., Lenz, K., & Sabornie, E. (1987). Generalization and adaptation of learning strategies to natural environments: Part 2: Research into practice. Remedial and Special Education, 8, 6-23. Gardill, M. C., & Jitendra, A. K. (1999). Advanced story-map instruction: Effects on the reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education, 33*(1), 2-17.
Englert, C. S., & Mariage, T. V. (1991). Making students partners in the comprehension process: Organizing the reading "POSSE." *Learning Disability Quarterly, 14*(2), 123–138.
Englert, C. S., Tarrant, K. L., Mariage, T. V., & Oxer, T. (1994). Lesson talk as the

work of reading groups: The effectiveness of two interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27*(3), 165–185.

Flores, M. M., & Ganz, J. B. (2007). Effectiveness of direct instruction for teaching statement inference, use of facts, and analogies to students with developmental disabilities and reading delays. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 22*(4), 244–251.

Fritschmann, N. S., Deshler, D. D., & Schumaker, J. B. (2007). The effects of instruction in an inference strategy on the reading comprehension skills of adolescents with disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 30*(4), 245–262.

Gajria, M., Jitendra, A.K., Sood, S., & Sacks, G. (2007). Improving comprehension of expository text in students with LD: A research synthesis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40*(3), 210–225.

Gajria, M., & Salvia, J. (1992). The effects of summarization instruction on text comprehension of students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 58*(6), 508–516.

Gersten, R., Fuchs, L. S., Williams, J. P., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching reading comprehension strategies to students with learning disabilities: A review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(2), 279–320.

Gitomer, D., & Bell, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Grünke, M., Wilbert, J., & Calder Stegemann, K. J. (2013). Analyzing the effects of story mapping on the reading comprehension of children with low intellectual abilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 11*(2), 51-64.

Gunning, T. G. (2010). *Assessing and correcting reading and writing difficulties.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hagaman, J. L., Casey, K. J., & Reid, R. (2010). The effects of the paraphrasing strategy on the reading comprehension of young students. *Remedial and Special Education, 20*, 1–14.

Hall, C. S. (2016). Inference instruction for struggling readers: A synthesis of intervention research. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*(1), 1–22.

Hansen, J., & Pearson, P.D. (1983). An instructional study: Improving the inferential comprehension of good and poor fourth-grade readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*(6), 821–829.

Hanson, S., & Padua, J. F.M. (2014). *Text Features.* Retrieved from http://prel.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/TF_EIS_vFINAL.pdf

Honig, B., Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2000). *Teaching reading: Sourcebook for kindergarten through eighth grade*. Novato, CA: Arena Press.

Idol, L., & Croll, V. J. (1987). Story-mapping training as a means of improving reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 10*(3), 214–22.

Idol-Maestas, L. (1985). Getting ready to read: Guided probing for poor comprehenders. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 8*(4), 243–254.

Jitendra, A. K., Cole, C., Hoppes, M. K., & Wilson, B. (1998). Effects of a direct instruction main idea summarization program and self-monitoring on reading comprehension of middle school students with learning disabilities. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 14*(4), 379–396.

Jitendra, A. K., Edwards, L. L., Sacks, G., & Jacobson, L. A. (2004). What research says about vocabulary instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 70*(3), 299–322.

Jitendra, A. K., Edwards, L. L., Starosta, K., Sacks, G., Jacobson, L. A., & Choutka, C. M. (2004). Early reading instruction for children with reading difficulties: Meeting the needs of diverse. J*ournal of Learning Disabilities, 37*(5), 421–439.

Jitendra, A. K., & Gajria, M. (2011). Reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 43*(8), 1–16.

Jitendra, A. K., Hoppes, M. K., & Xin, Y. P. (2000). Enhancing main idea comprehension for students with learning problems: The role of summarization strategy and self-monitoring instruction. *Journal of Special Education, 34*(3), 127–139.

Joseph, L. M., Alber-Morgan, S. R., Cullen, J. M., & Rouse, C. A. (2016). The effects of self-questioning on reading comprehension: A literature review. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 32*(2), 152-173.

Katims, D. S., & Harris, S. (1997). Improving the reading comprehension of middle school students in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 41*(2), 116-123.

Kelley, M. J., & Clausen-Grace, N. (2010). Guiding students through expository text with text feature walks. *Reading Teacher, 64*(3), 191-195.

Kendeou, P., van den Broek, P., Helder, A., & Karlsson, J. (2014). A cognitive model of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 29*(1), 10–16.

Kim, W., Linan-Thompson, S., & Misquitta, R. (2012). Critical factors in reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities: a research synthesis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 27*(2), 66-78.

Kim, A., Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., & Wei, S. (2004). Graphic organizers and their effects on reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 37*(2), 105–118.

Klingner, J. K., Urbach, J., Golos, D., Browneii, M., & Menon, S. (2010). Teaching reading in the 21st century: A glimpse at how special education teachers promote reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 33*(2), 59-74.

Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. (2007). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties: What works for special-needs learners*. New York: Guilford.

Kilpatrick, D.A. (2015). *Essentials of assessing, preventing, and overcoming reading difficulties.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Lane, H. B. (2014). *Evidence-based reading instruction for grades K-5* (Document No. IC-12). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Holly_Lane3/publication/282219257_Evidence-Based_Reading_Instruction_for_Grades_K-5/links/560852f008ae5e8e3f3a8a84.pdf

Lundberg, I., & Reichenberg, M. (2013). Developing reading comprehension among students with mild intellectual disabilities: An intervention study. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 57*(1), 89–100.

Malone, L. D., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1992). Reading comprehension instruction: Summarization and self-monitoring training for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 58*(3), 270–279.

Manset-Williamson, G., Dunn, M., Hinshaw, R., & Nelson, J. (2008). The impact of self-questioning strategy use on the text-reader assisted comprehension of students with reading disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education, 23*(1), 123–135.

Mason, L. H. (2013). Teaching students who struggle with learning to think before, while, and after reading: Effects of self-regulated strategy development instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 29*(2), 124–144.

Mason, L. H., Snyder, K. H., Sukhram, D. P., & Kedem, Y. (2006). TWA + PLANS strategies for expository reading and writing: Effects for nine fourth-grade students. *Exceptional Children, 73*(1), 69–89.

McClintock, B., Pesco, D., & Martin-Chang, S. (2014). Thinking aloud: Effects on text comprehension by children with specific language impairment and their peers. I*nternational Journal of Language & Communication Disorders, 49*(6), 637-648.

McCormick, S., & Hill, D. S. (1984). An analysis of the effects of two procedures for increasing disabled readers' inferencing skills. *Journal of Educational Research, 77*(4), 219–227.

McMaster, K. L., van den Broek, P., Espin, C. A., White, M. J., Rapp, D. N., Kendeou, P., ... Carlson, S. (2012). Making the right connections: Differential effects of reading intervention for subgroups of comprehenders. *Learning and Individual Differences, 22*(1), 100–111.

McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., & Blake, R. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(3), 218–253.

Moats, L. C. (2005). *Language essentials for teachers of reading and spelling* (LETRS). Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services.

Moats, L.C. (2015). *Teaching comprehension through text-driven instruction*. Retrieved from http://www.voyagersopris.com/webinar-series/leadership/2015-leadership-series/teaching-comprehension-through-text-driven-instruction

Nagy, W., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: learning academic vocabulary as

language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(1),91-108.
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.
Nelson, J. N., & Manset-Williamson, G. (2006). The impact of explicit, self-regulatory reading comprehension strategy instruction on the reading-specific self-efficacy, attributions, and affect of students with reading disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 29*(3), 213-230.
Nelson, J. R., Smith, D. J., & Dodd, J. M. (1992). The effects of a summary skills strategy to students identified as learning disabled on their comprehension of science text. *Education and Treatment of Children, 15*, 228–24.
Nguyen, N. N., Leytham, P., Whitby, P. S., Gelfer J. I. (2015). Reading comprehension and autism in the primary general education classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(1), 71-76.
Oakhill, J. V., Cain, K., & Bryant, P. E. (2003). The dissociation of single-word reading and text comprehension: Evidence from component skills. *Language and Cognitive Processes, 18*(4), 443-468.
O'Connor, I. M., & Klein, P. D. (2004). Exploration of strategies for facilitating the reading comprehension of high-functioning students with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 34*(2), 115–127.
Palincsar A.S. and Brown A.L. (1984) Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117-175.
Pany, D., & Jenkins, J. R. (1978). Learning word meanings: A comparison of instructional procedures. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 1*(2), 21-32.
Pany, D., Jenkins, J. R., & Schreck, J. (1982). Vocabulary instruction: Effects on word knowledge and reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 5*(3), 202–215.
Perfetti, C. A., Landi, N., & Oakhill, J. (2005). The acquisition of reading comprehension skill. In M. J. Snowling & C. Hulme (Eds.), *The science of reading: A handbook* (pp. 227-247). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Pressley, M., Johnson, C. J., Symons, S., McGoldrick, J., & Kurita, J. (1989). Strategies that improve children's memory and comprehension of what is read. *Elementary School Journal, 90*(1), 3-32.
Pressley, M., & Wharton-McDonald, R. (1997). Skilled comprehension and its development through instruction. *School Psychology Review, 26*, 448–467.
Reed, D. K. & Vaughn, S. (2012). Comprehension instruction with reading disabilities in grades 4 through 12. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 10*(1), 17-33.
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.

Rouse, C. A., Alber-Morgan, S. A., Cullen, J. M., & Sawyer, M. (2014). Using prompts fading to teach self-questioning to fifth-graders with LD: Effects on reading comprehension. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practices, 29*(3), 117-125.

Sachs, A. (1983). The effects of three prereading activities on learning disabled students' reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 6*(3), 248–251.

Sachs, A. (1984). Accessing scripts before reading the story. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 7*(3), 226-228.

Scruggs, T., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1989). Mnemonic instruction of LD students: A field based study. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 12*(2), 119–125.

Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1990). Mnemonic instruction for students with learning disabilities: What it is and what it does. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 13*(4), 271–281.

Self-Questioning (n.d.). Retrieved from http://powerupwhatworks.org/strategy-guide/self-questioning

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide* (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from whatworks.ed.gov/publications/practiceguides

Solis, M., Ciullo, S., Vaughn, S., Pyle, N., Hassaram, B., & Leroux, A. (2012). Reading comprehension interventions for middle school students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of 30 years of research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 45*(4), 327–340.

Solis, M., ElZein, F., Vaughn, S., McCulley, L. V., & Falcomata. T. S. (2016). Reading comprehension interventions for students with autism spectrum disorders: an alternating treatments comparison. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 31*(4), 284-299.

Stagliano, C. & Boon, R. T. (2009). The effects of a story-mapping procedure to improve the comprehension skills of expository text passages for elementary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 7*(2), 35-58.

Stetter, M. E., & Hughes, M. T. (2010). Using story grammar to assist students with learning disabilities and reading difficulties improve their comprehension. *Education & Treatment of Children, 33*(1), 115–151.

Stringfield, S. G., Luscre, D., & Gast, D. L. (2011). Effects of a story map on accelerated reader postreading test scores in students with high-functioning autism. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 26*(4), 218–229.

Swanson, P. N., & De La Paz, S. (1998). Teaching effective comprehension

strategies to students with learning and reading disabilities. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 33*(4), 209-219.

Swanson, H. L. (1999). Reading research for students with LD: A meta-analysis in intervention outcomes. J*ournal of Learning Disabilities, 32*(6), 504-532.

Swanson, H. L., & Hoskyn, M. (2001). Instructing adolescents with learning disabilities: A component and composite analysis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 16*(2), 109–119.

Taylor, L., Alber, S., & Walker, D. (2002). The comparative effects of a modified self-questioning strategy and story mapping on the reading comprehension of elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 11*(2), 69-87.

Therrien, W. J., & Hughes, C. (2008). Comparison of repeated reading and question generation on students: Reading fluency and comprehension. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 6*(1), 1–16.

Therrien, W. J., Wickstrom, K., & Jones, K. (2006). Effects of a combined repeated reading and question generation intervention on reading achievement. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 21*(2), 89–97.

van den Broek, P., Tzeng, Y., Risden, K., Trabasso, T., & Basche, P. (2001). Inferential questions: Effects on comprehension of narrative texts as a function of grade and timing. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*(3), 521–529.

Vaughn, S., & Wanzek, J. (2014). Intensive interventions in reading for students with reading disabilities: Meaningful impacts. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 29*(2), 46–53.

Wilkinson, I. A. G., & Son, E. H. (2011). A dialogic turn in research on learning and teaching to comprehend. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.), Handbook of reading research (Vol. IV, pp. 359–387). New York, NY: Routledge

Wong, B. Y. L., & Jones, W. (1982). Increasing metacomprehension in learning disabled and normally achieving students through self-questioning training. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 5*(2), 228–238.