
April 2003

Reading Excellence Act: A View from a Day, a Month, and a Year

Sharon Walpole

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj>

Recommended Citation

Walpole, Sharon (2003) "Reading Excellence Act: A View from a Day, a Month, and a Year," *Michigan Reading Journal*: Vol. 35 : Iss. 3 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj/vol35/iss3/10>

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Reading Journal by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Reading Excellence Act: A View from a Day, a Month, and a Year

BY SHARON WALPOLE

As someone whose recent work has been intimately tied to the Reading Excellence Act, I find that I am frequently asked to explicate this governmental reform effort. I have been active at multiple levels of this effort. At the national level, I twice served as a member of the "Expert Panel." In this capacity, I reviewed state applications and presented at major national technical assistance conferences. At the state level, I presented at state-level technical assistance conferences and served as a professional development consultant. At the local level, I wrote and administered an educational agency grant. In this article, I share the insights that I have gained through my experiences as I describe my work at each level. The long and the short of it is this: Knowledge at the building level is what really matters.

What is the REA?

The REA is the federal government's most recent effort at large-scale school reform. Congress authorized the *Reading Excellence Act of 1998* with \$260 million to initiate a two-tiered grant process. The U.S. Department of Education would provide competitive grants to states. States in turn would offer competitive grants to school districts with schools high in poverty or with Title 1 School Improvement Status or both. Congress authorized an additional \$260 million for grants awarded in 2000 and \$286 million for grants awarded in 2001.

The REA Model

Constraints within the legislation. Both the state and district competitions were highly constrained within the legislation to attend specifically to reading achievement by the end of third grade, to include attention to early intervention with the hope of decreasing referrals to special education, to include preschool and family literacy components, and to fund instruction and tutoring initiatives. In all areas, the legislation privileged

scientifically based reading research. This was defined as research employing "systematic, empirical methods for observation or experiment," "rigorous data analyses adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the conclusions drawn," "measurements or observational methods that provide valid data across evaluators and observers and across multiple measurements and observations," and was "accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review."

State and local competitions were further constrained by a definition of reading addressing "Six Dimensions of Reading" explicitly defined as "a complex system of deriving meaning from print" that requires all of the following:

1. The skills and knowledge to understand how phonemes, or speech sounds, are connected to print.
2. The ability to decode unfamiliar words.
3. The ability to read fluently.

Sharon Walpole is assistant professor in the School of Education at the University of Delaware. Her interest in school-wide reform efforts began with her work with CIERA researchers to understand the characteristics of effective schools and accomplished teachers. She is currently working with the Reading Excellence Act reform effort in Georgia.

4. Sufficient background information and vocabulary to foster reading comprehension.
5. The development of appropriate active strategies to construct meaning from print.
6. The development and maintenance of a motivation to read." (Reading Excellence Act of 1998, Section 2252, p. 4)

Sources of support. The United States Department of Education recommended sources to develop the knowledge base needed to complete the state applications, including both print and electronic resources (<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/REA/research.html>). Recommendations included specific mention of works produced by the National Reading Panel (e.g. Bowman, Donovan, & Burns, 2000; Burns, Griffin, & Snow, 1999; National Reading Panel, 2000; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Other shorter works were also recommended and distributed by REA staff members (e.g., Learning First Alliance, 1998, 2000; Moats, 1999; U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

State-level applications. State-level applications were accepted in three separate competitions. The state proposals were judged by a panel including members nominated by the secretary of education, the National Institute for Literacy, the National Research Council, and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. The charge of the panel was to evaluate state applications against the legislation, scoring them with a rubric for understanding and commitment to effective reading instruction based on scientifically based reading research, demonstration of need, quality of district and school activities, quality of the plan for state leadership, oversight, evaluation, and adequacy of resources (REA Nonregulatory Guidance). Panelists scored applications privately, preparing extensive written feedback to the states. Then they met for discussion of each application. Finally, they voted to fund or not fund each state proposal. Proposals not funded in 1999 and 2000 were returned to the states so that the feedback from the panel could be used by the states to reenter the competition the next year.

The state application process was rigorous. In the first year of the competition, 17 of 49 state proposals (35%) were funded. In the second year, it was 10 of 30 (33%), and in the final year, it was 13 of 24 (54%). By 2001, 40 states plus the District of Columbia had won REA funds, a total of 70% of the eligible entities (personal communication, N. Rhett, Feb. 11, 2002). Table 1 lists the states receiving funding each year of the competition and the amounts awarded.

A View from a Day: The National Effort Technical Assistance

I had never even heard the term "technical assistance" before I was invited to provide it as part of REA efforts. I made REA technical assistance presentations about the characteristics of reading reform in the school setting where I worked, highlighting its

Table 1. REA grants to states¹

1999	2000	2001
Alabama (\$7,500,000)	California (\$60,000,000)	Alaska (\$8,729,749)
Florida (\$26,000,000)	Colorado (\$7,498,525)	Arkansas (\$11,730,600)
Iowa (\$10,000,000)	District of Columbia (\$4,209,500)	Connecticut (\$13,760,966)
Kansas	Illinois (\$37,934,297)	Georgia (\$48,086,734)
Kentucky (\$7,500,000)	Mississippi (\$31,308,288)	Hawaii (\$18,765,212)
Louisiana (\$15,014,966)	New Mexico (\$5,000,000)	Indiana (\$25,225,140)
Maine (\$4,000,000)	North Carolina (\$15,000,000)	Minnesota (\$24,552,421)
Maryland (\$14,975,575)	Oklahoma (\$7,504,000)	Montana (\$10,912,187)
Massachusetts (\$18,306,000)	Virginia (\$15,000,000)	Nevada (\$26,189,248)
Ohio (\$30,637,008)	Washington (\$15,000,000)	New Hampshire (\$3,273,656)
Oregon (\$6,243,775)		New York (\$81,841,400)
Pennsylvania (\$30,000,000)		South Carolina (\$25,915,680)
Rhode Island (\$4,000,000)		Tennessee (\$28,644,445)
Texas (\$35,999,855)		
Utah (\$8,000,000)		
Vermont (\$2,010,472)		
West Virginia (\$5,992,005)		

¹ <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/REA/awardees.html>

direct connection to the REA model and illustrating the parts of the model with teachers and children that I knew (Walpole, October 1999, November 2000, 2001). Always my presentations followed presentations by members of the National Reading Panel, describing their research reviews and defining the dimensions of the REA model. Always the audience for these presentations was large and heavily weighted toward state-level education policy makers, those who would draft or commission the applications for REA money. I had a clear sense that there was no trick about how to get REA money. The scope of the legislation was fixed; the application process was clear; the research to be included was specific. What was difficult, though, was to envision how the state policy makers would see that knowledge and skills would be improved for individual classroom teachers in individual schools.

The Expert Panel

The charge to the panel reviewing state applications was equally fixed, clear, and specific. We were only to compare state applications to the REA legislation and rate the quality of the applications for state and local activities. There was absolutely no pressure from the REA staff to react positively or negatively to any applications. Although I do not have any written records of my own ratings or the ratings of the other panelists (they were taken from us, blinded by the REA staff members, and passed directly on to the states), I remember being surprised at the number of state applications that did not even pay lip service, so to speak, to the REA model. Extensive state resources had been used to research and write applications to fund activities either outside the scope of the legislation or in direct conflict with the definitions provided in the legislation. Needless to say, the low rates of funding each year were partially a result of that problem.

I had one specific concern as I carried out my charge on the panel. Because of my training and my administrative experience, I was especially equipped to visualize potential quality of local efforts. I noticed two important problems. What was missing from the applications (and from the entire application process) was a description of the type or quality of instruction that currently existed in each state, especially in poor or low-performing districts. States were asked to provide a data analysis of student achievement, disaggregated to show the relative success of children by race and socio-economic status. This they did, and the results were as expected. What they did not show, though, was the current state of knowledge and practice for

teachers of those same children. What those teachers already knew about the dimensions of the REA model and what they did each day to support the model were unknown.

A second nagging question for me was the question of state capacity. Many states proposed the hiring of a cadre of new professionals to run the REA effort: experienced researchers and well-trained staff developers to lead state efforts, reading specialists and teacher trainers to lead local efforts. I wondered how many such people were available in each state. Again, I wanted to know the current state of training of the in-service teachers in the state and also a projection of the number and a description of the knowledge of new teachers and reading specialists trained each year in each state. I wanted to know about the infrastructure in the state supporting professional development.

A View from a Month: State Efforts

Establishing the Knowledge Base

I have been invited to give addresses at state-level technical assistance conferences in Virginia (Walpole, 2000) and Georgia (Walpole, 2001). In those settings, the audience was weighted entirely differently from the federal technical assistance conferences. Most in attendance were superintendents hoping to win local grants, together with principals and teachers who would implement the change. In most of those settings, I had more time to speak and more latitude in my choice of talk. While still always framing my addresses within the REA dimensions, I chose to speak on issues of assessment and resource allocation. I also had time to interact informally with individuals and teams working in schools and filtering REA demands through various local lenses. At these state and cross-state meetings, there was excitement about REA funds and serious investigation of possibilities. What schools wanted most of all, though, were models.

Developing a Consulting Role

I developed a long-term consulting role with a small school division in a Midwestern state. All that I had wondered about at the national level was true in this district. They were located far from any university (or city, for that matter). Teachers knew very little about the REA. The dimensions of reading, especially phonemic awareness, decoding, and fluency, were entirely new to them. They did not use any building-level assessments to guide instruction. There were no reading specialists in their schools, and no reasonable local opportunities for earning that endorsement. A grant writer from the

state educational agency serving the area had written the grant with little input from the schools. It was she who hired me as the consultant. I learned later that the division superintendent had told teachers that they had to sit politely through my initial visit, but that they did not have to do anything different. It seemed a recipe for disaster. But it hasn't been.

Developing knowledge and skills. Luckily, I was naïve about the local context, so I jumped right in. I assumed that the building leaders, at least, knew and supported the REA model. My first visit, the summer before year 1 of their 2-year grant, was a weeklong institute on assessment. We started with the REA model, and then I taught teachers how to assess and support phonemic awareness, decoding, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. We ended by establishing an assessment calendar and a grouping plan to ensure

small-group, instructional-level reading instruction for all children. I left a book list of resources that I had found especially useful to in-service teachers. It is reproduced in Figure 1. You will notice that those resources are not the same ones recommended by the U.S. Department of Education.

The second summer, I brought a colleague, and we divided our cohort into teachers of kindergarten and first grade and teachers of second and third grade. In this institute, we focused on implementing explicit decoding and comprehension instruction during small-group reading instruction and explicit comprehension modeling during whole-class read alouds.

Providing support. Support was sustained in this REA effort in two ways. First, I had ongoing contact with the effort. I visited twice each year to observe teachers and to give individual, private, written feedback about

Figure 1. Resources for Teachers

Instructional Leaders

A subscription to *Reading Teacher* and the International Reading Association's Book Club

Pressley, M. (1998). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching*. New York: Guilford.

Blair-Larson, S. M., and Williams, K. A. (1999). *The balanced reading program: Helping all students achieve success*. Newark, DE: International Reading association.

Kindergarten through Third Grade Teams

Ganske, K. (2000). *Word journeys: Assessment-guided phonics, spelling, and vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford.

Fountas, I. C., and Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

National Research Council. (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promoting children's reading success*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Fountas, I.C., and Pinnell, G.S. (1999). *Matching books to readers: Using leveled books in guided reading, K-3*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Kindergarten

Ericson, L., and Juliebo, M.F. (1998). *The phonological awareness handbook for kindergarten and primary teachers*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bear, D.R., Invernizzi, M., and Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (1995). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling instruction*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.

First Grade

Morris, D. (1999). *The Howard Street tutoring manual: Teaching at-risk readers in the primary grades*. New York: Guilford Press.

Strickland, D.S. (1998). *Teaching phonics today: A primer for educators*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Second Grade

Cramer, E.H. and Castle, M. (1994). *Fostering the love of reading: The affective domain in reading education*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Third Grade

Taylor, B.M., Graves, M.F., and van den Broek, P. (2000). *Reading for meaning: Fostering comprehension in the middle grades*. New York: Teachers College

their instruction. In that way I learned to differentiate my summer staff development efforts and focus them more and more on what individual teachers needed. I also had consistent contact via e-mail with the progress of the initiative. Unfortunately, though, much of that contact was retrospective. For example, after extensive work to assess children and understand their needs, building leaders would come to an impasse and then contact me. I would provide direction in working through the problem, but only after they had wasted time and reached frustration. I felt closely connected to the reform effort and to the people implementing it, but I was not in a position to work with them more often or to prevent problems and misunderstandings.

More importantly, though, there was extensive local support. The once-skeptical superintendent became a loyal advocate for the program. He was assisted by a "grant consultant" hired partially with REA funds. Her training and experience were in language development in a preschool setting; her first day of work and her first introduction to reading instruction and the REA model came on day one of the first summer institute. At the time, I was not confident that she would be effective, but I was wrong. She decided that she would teach herself everything she needed to know about reading instruction and that she would do it quickly. She devoured all the books I recommended, and she found others on her own. She made a commitment to shepherd the division through full implementation of the grant, and she has never wavered. She observed teachers, modeled new techniques, reviewed assessment data, led study groups, and hounded me mercilessly. It was she and the teachers in the buildings who dedicated themselves to instructional change who made the difference in this district. And luckily, because of the REA initiative, this district has built support capacity that will outlast the grant period. I will end my professional relationship with them, but the consultant and teachers will not.

Negotiating the context. There have been significant challenges in my work in this consulting context. Most of them have come at the intersection of state policy with the local REA initiative. This initiative (and perhaps all REA local grants) is enacted within a constantly shifting context at the state level. For example, state staff developers launched major efforts inconsistent with local needs and inconsistent with the REA model. This district, because of the grant consultant and the superintendent, won exemptions from these state initiatives, but only with considerable effort. Likewise, state policy makers launched new

assessment requirements that could have derailed local assessment efforts, but for the staunchness of the building leaders.

The intersection of REA initiatives and other state and federal initiatives has also been a concern. Our goal at the building level has been to include all students in extended, small-group reading instruction at instructional level every day, a goal theoretically consistent with all state and federal programs. However, special education requirements and Title 1 selection procedures have provided significant challenges in implementing this goal. Forethought by state educational policy makers on the implications for Title 1 and special education would have made it easier for this district to support all children.

A View from a Year: A Local Effort

This past year I have had a chance to put my money where my mouth is. After significant pressure from a local school district, I agreed to write and run a grant for a school both high in poverty and in Title 1 School Improvement Status. Because of my experience at the federal level, writing the grant was not a problem. Because of my experience in state-level activities, I had a definite head start on how to build knowledge and skills. But I still encountered many obstacles to full implementation of the REA reform that I envisioned.

Establishing a Knowledge Base

My full-time work in one school building provided me with a rich opportunity to build a knowledge base. In the summer, I ran two professional development institutes for the teachers, introducing assessment and instruction techniques and using videotaped examples to help teachers envision their work with students. During the school year, I meet with grade level teams to provide professional development for one hour twice each month during the school day and at least once each month after school. By June 2002, I had provided 52 different staff development hours; teachers and administrators at this building had collectively logged more than 1,000 hours in serious staff development. This professional development both drove the school reform effort and built capacity for the future in the building.

Developing a Consulting Role

My role as grant administrator was difficult to navigate. The basic challenge was the one that I wondered about as I worked at the federal level. I knew very little about the knowledge base of the teachers and administrators in this building, and I knew very

little about the characteristics of instruction there. The only data I had were on student achievement, and these data were old. Between the time that the grant was awarded and initial activities were begun, the school had logged impressive gains in the state achievement test for third graders, gains celebrated at the building and in the district. As I started my work at the building, then, I was met with some resistance. Some teachers felt that they had solved achievement problems and that grant activities were unnecessary and unfair punishment.

Working with building administrators also provided challenges. They had been reluctant to admit that the school needed REA; they had described my work as only slight adjustments to the instructional program that they had developed through the years. Administrators were greatly relieved at the achievement of their third graders in 2000-2001; they were delivered from the district hot seat. The assessments that I conducted for the 2001-02 cohort at

each grade level were distressing; 54% of third graders began the year reading below grade level. Although reform efforts had supported enormous growth in that cohort, it was possible that state level testing of these children would produce a lower passing rate than the previous year and, in the eyes of the building administrators, the year's reform would have been a failure. In fact, the children made enormous progress.

Working with the district administrators also proved challenging, if only for their lack of interest in the reform program. The district operated with site-based management, and the REA initiative in another building in the same district was different from our reform and neither actually were viewed as models for other schools, even within the district. Perhaps because the district administrators understood my level of commitment to and knowledge of the reform model, they never really spoke to me about it. This "trust" isolated me and prevented the district from learning lessons from my successes and failures.

Providing Support

In spite of this isolation, I was excited about my chance to provide individualized, ongoing support to teachers in this building. I observed all teachers formally and informally, and I provided extensive private, written feedback. At first this may have been uncomfortable

for teachers, but eventually I felt welcome in all classrooms. Teachers had questions, and their questions are specific. Because of my position, I was much better situated to explore questions with them, to provide additional teaching materials and readings, and to provide professional development in direct response to the instructional needs that we identified together. I was able to capitalize on individual teachers' strengths and differentiate for teachers as I nudged them to differentiate for children.

Data analysis has been a real motivator in this reform effort. At the beginning of the 2001-2002 school year, I provided a state of the state address, summarizing the school-level data we had collected, and using the

data to provide direction for our staff development. I updated that address at the end of each grading period, sharing with teachers what we learned about achievement in each cohort and how that could direct our efforts. For example, although our kindergarten cohort the previous year had

earned high marks overall in their knowledge of letters and sounds at the end of kindergarten, both their reading and spelling were very weak as they started first grade. The kindergarten team focused its attention on better contextualizing alphabetic knowledge in appropriate interactive reading and writing tasks. For first grade, our focus was implementing a more consistent and targeted small-group reading experience every day. For second grade, spelling achievement was out of sync with reading achievement, and we devoted additional time and resources to phonics and spelling instruction. In third grade, reading rate was inconsistent with reading level, so we worked to include additional time and resources to build fluency. Teachers responded very positively to this use of data to drive their work.

Negotiating the Context

I struggled with three specific aspects of the context at this building. Each had the potential to distract and potentially derail the building-level effort. The three areas of conflict were supporting the needs of second language learners, attending to writing achievement, and connecting with parents. I took personal responsibility for each of these struggles, and I enumerate them as someone who came into this reform with significant knowledge and experience and still made huge mistakes.

Working with the district administrators also proved challenging, if only for their lack of interest in the reform program.

Second language learners. I was naïve about the needs of second language learners in terms of both resources and instruction. As I wrote the grant proposal, second language learners were very rare in the district. As I implemented it, though, they were not. In my building last year, there were 19 second-language learners, almost all of them in kindergarten and first grade and almost all of them from struggling families. I had to significantly backtrack from my descriptions of reading development to switch attention from phonemic awareness, decoding, and vocabulary development for our kindergarten and first graders to broader development of language competency for our second language learners. In a small district with a relatively small number of second-language learners, there was no support for teachers of these students to learn about their cultures or their needs in language and literacy. I worked to support the teachers, but my own knowledge base was weak.

Writing achievement. Writing is not one of the dimensions of reading in the Reading Excellence Act, but it is surely a significant dimension of teaching and learning in literacy development. In the building where I worked, writing instruction was diffuse and of poor quality. I struggled to attend to professional development in both reading and writing and to stay in compliance with the grant I wrote and the REA model. For the state test, reading and writing are tested together. It would be possible, then, to achieve great gains in reading achievement and poor scores on this reading and writing test. I worked on integrating reading and writing in ways that maintained fidelity to the REA model and to sound teaching practices, but it was difficult.

Reaching out to parents. I made a huge error in my grant proposal in not including parents in the planning of the initiative. I did include parent activities, but they were planned without parent input and launched after the initiative was already funded and running. I had a few uncomfortable meetings with parents at the beginning of the year. The meetings started with hostility from parents at not being included in decisions that affected the structure of their children's education, but they ended with my apologies for that error and with parents welcoming me into the school community. I should have included parents in the planning from the very beginning.

A View to the Future

I have appreciated the opportunities that REA has given me to interact in the federal policy arena and to estab-

lish long-term relationships at the state and local levels. I am confident that my efforts to increase knowledge and skills will change some teachers' instruction and potentially increase student achievement. I also expect that I will have failed other teachers, both because of the limits of my own knowledge and because of my lack of understanding of their needs. I suspect that other REA initiatives will vary considerably in their impact on teachers and children in relation to the knowledge and skills of those who administered them and provided professional development. That said, we have an important opportunity to learn from REA and to use that knowledge to increase the quality of future large-scale efforts. Five lessons stand out for me.

1. Adult reading matters, and not only reading of the work of the National Reading Panel. In fact, I question the utility of those texts for most classroom teachers because they do not couch the research as it is relevant to teaching children at different ages and stages of reading development.
2. We need to keep refining the models that define the scope of our work. We should constantly monitor and integrate developments in the research base, especially as they pertain to the support of diverse learners and the relationship between reading and writing.
3. We need to locate and describe diverse models of effective practice in each state. These efforts need to include frank historical descriptions of the process and progress of the instructional change. Teachers and administrators in these sites need to be included in state-level efforts to support professional development.
4. We need to base reform efforts on analysis of both student achievement and teacher instruction. When a reform effort draws from a model, as in the REA model, we must first compare teacher knowledge and practice to that model so that reform efforts can build on what is known. Teacher surveys, interviews, and study groups could target reform efforts and provide more support from teachers.
5. We need to build capacity. Table 2 (page 45) summarizes my vision of a coordinated effort at the national, state, and local levels to do better for children. National policy makers could fund both research and dissemination efforts. Researchers could design assessments of both teacher instruction and student achievement. State policy makers could be proactive in their

efforts to coordinate various federal programs and support districts in advance of change. They could also describe the needs of their teachers and find and describe model schools. Teacher educators could continue to improve the knowledge base of teachers and reading specialists and also begin to train people specifically to conduct staff development. Those staff development specialists could provide continuous, integrated training for all in-service teachers. At the local level, administrators could be better stewards of resources, supporting continuous professional development and high quality instruction. Teachers and reading specialists could rededicate themselves to continuous learning and high quality teaching.

These common sense lessons are lessons that I have learned from REA at the multiple levels at which I have been involved. Common sense and political will are not always consistent, though. A sincere dedication to the work of teachers as they support the learning of our nation's children may help us all to move forward from our current positions. From wherever it is that we stand, what can we do to improve knowledge and skills for teachers and children in our nation's schools? Toward that end, I know that I have much to do. At this point, I have moved my work from the school to the university, but I stay connected to REA Reform, this time in Georgia. Hopefully, I will have learned from my own mistakes. I invite others to do the same.

References

- Bowman, B. T., Donovan, M. S., & Burns, S. (2000). *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Burns, M. S., Griffin, P., & Snow, C. E., (Eds.) (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promoting children's reading success*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Learning First Alliance. (2000). *Every child reading: A professional development guide*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Table 2. Building Capacity at the national, state, and local levels

Level	Actors	Actions
National	Policy makers	Fund research and dissemination efforts
	Reearchers	Design sensitive, reliable assessments of teacher instruction and student achievement tied directly to research-based models
State	Policy makers	Coordinate existing programs and new programs Describe the state of teacher knowledge and skills Find and describe model schools
	Teacher Educators	Develop a sound knowledge base for classroom teachers and reading specialists Develop a sound knowledge base for staff developers
	Researchers	Describe the state of teacher knowledge and skills in each state to inform teacher educators Find and describe model schools
	Staff Developers	Direct continuous education of in-service teachers
Local	Adminstrators and Principals	Allocate resources to support instruction and achievement Allocate resources to build capacity in knowledge about reading development Evaluate teachers and support professional development Interpret assessment data
	Reading Specialists	Teach teachers at the building level Teach students at the building level
	Teachers	Engage in continuous professional development Make sound instructional choices

Learning First Alliance. (1998). *Every child reading: An action plan*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Moats, L. C. (1999). *Teaching reading Is rocket science: What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implication for reading instruction*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Reading Excellence Act of 1998. (1998). PL. 105-277. [Online]. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/REA/legis.html>

Snow, C. E., Burns, S. M., and Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

- U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *Start early, finish strong: How to help every child become a reader*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Walpole, S. (1999a, October). *Johnson School: Design and redesign of a reading program*. Paper presented at the U.S. Department of Education's 1999 Regional Conference on Improving America's Schools, Tampa, FL.
- Walpole, S. (1999b, November). *Balanced literacy: Making it work in a real school*. (1999, November). Paper presented at the U.S. Department of Education's 1999 Regional Conference on Improving America's Schools, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Walpole, S. (2000, September). *Using data to drive instructional decisions*. (2000, September). Paper presented at the Virginia Reading Research Forum, Roanoke, VA.
- Walpole, S. (2001a, May). Systematic phonics instruction and expert comprehension instruction. In J. Conaty (Chair), *The new federal reading programs: What they mean for teachers, schools, and administrators*. Symposium presented at the International Reading Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Walpole, S. (2001b, December). *Choices in the reading program: Time, team, text, and task*. (2001, December). Paper presented at the Georgia Department of Education's REA Best Practices Institute, Savannah, GA.
- Walpole, S., & Henderson, J. (2000, March). *School capacities and characteristics that support high quality reading instruction: A view from Johnson School..* (2000, March). Paper presented at the National Institute for Literacy's Reading Research and Best Practices Institute, Philadelphia, PA.

The Michigan Reading Association shall comply with all federal laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the state of Michigan. It is the policy of the Michigan Reading Association that no candidate or applicant for a position or office in this organization shall, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, creed or ancestry, age sex, marital status, or disability, be discriminated against, excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any program or activity for which the Michigan Reading Association is responsible.

The president of the Michigan Reading Association, together with the Executive Committee, shall ensure that federal and state regulations are complied with and that any complaints are dealt with promptly in accordance with the law.

Call for Manuscripts

Spring 2004: Developing local, global, and affective knowledge about reading

(Manuscripts must be received by November 1, 2003. Electronic submissions are encouraged.)

In her discussion of balance in the reading program, Fitzgerald (1999) has talked about the importance of developing students' local knowledge about reading (e.g., phonological awareness; word level knowledge, vocabulary knowledge), global knowledge about reading (understanding, interpretation, response, metacognitive knowledge), and affective knowledge about reading (love of reading, positive attitudes toward reading, motivation and desire to read). Please share with us the ways in which you develop these kinds of knowledge about reading in your grade level.

- Manuscripts should not exceed 2,500-3,000 words.
- Author's name, mailing address, telephone number, FAX number, e-mail address, and professional affiliation should be on a separate cover page. The author's name should not appear in the manuscript.
- Three members of the editorial review board will review all manuscripts.
- Manuscripts must be received by November 1, 2003. Decisions will be reached within four months for this issue.
- If a manuscript is accepted for publication, its author must provide a computer disk copy of the manuscript, preferably in MS Word.
- Charts, graphs, drawings, and high quality photographs pertaining to article topics will be appreciated. Photographs from a digital camera can be submitted digitally.
- Send either: a) an electronic e-mail attachment; or b) six copies of the manuscript, a disk with your submission, and two self-addressed stamped envelopes to:

Linda Pavonetti, Co-editor
Michigan Reading Journal
Oakland University, Department of Reading
Rochester, MI 48309-4494
e-mail: pavonett@oakland.edu