

Copyright © 2021, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited

Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing scholarworks-group@umbc.edu and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

Chapter 5

Balancing Literacies: UDL/CSP–Infused Elementary Reading Instruction

Laurie Rabinowitz

Bank Street College of Education, USA

Amy Tondreau

Austin Peay State University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter outlines an approach to whole learner education in an elementary school literacy classroom by building upon the work of scholars in Disability Studies in Education (DSE) and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP). It begins by introducing the connections between whole learner education, DSE, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and CSP, demonstrating how these theoretical frameworks overlap and how they can be used in tandem to enhance the work already done in each field. After providing this theoretical background, the chapter outlines the components of a balanced literacy block in a third grade classroom, demonstrating how elementary school educators can work to meet the individual learning needs of developing readers in the various areas of balanced literacy (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension), while also attending to student identities and making instruction accessible to students with learning variations.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-4906-3.ch005

*Balancing Literacies***INTRODUCTION**

There's a busy hum of conversation on the rug. Students are gesturing animatedly with their partners, acting out a bit of the read aloud *Leila in Saffron* (2019) by Rukhasanna Guidroz. Students take on the roles of Leila and her Naani as the characters try on silk scarves in a rainbow of colors. Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker, the teachers in this third-grade co-taught classroom, move from partnership to partnership, listening in. Mr. Walker carries a clipboard and jots notes about which students are keeping their dramatizations grounded in the text, and which students are extending beyond the text. He pays special attention to the triads he and Ms. Yi have previously established to support their emergent bilingual learners (EBLs), Emile and Angela. Mr. Walker encourages these students to join in the conversations of their proficient language partners, offering a sentence stem to facilitate their participation.

Ms. Yi provides a one-minute warning for students to wrap up their conversations. Pointing to the co-created anchor chart on her easel, she reminds them that they can use tone of voice and body language to communicate their character's feelings effectively. A moment later, she begins a countdown from five to bring students back together, narrating as students turn their bodies from their partnerships to face into the center of the circle. Ms. Yi calls on a partnership she has pre-selected while circulating amongst students to share their interpretation with the class, asking other students to attend to the ways in which the partnership effectively conveys character feelings. Mr. Walker monitors student learning by noting which students volunteer to respond, and those who are able to effectively identify the strategies used by the selected partnership.

With a hand signal, students know that the minilesson is over. They look up at the pocket chart to note what center activity they will be engaging with for that day. Some students move towards the classroom library to begin book shopping from the genre, level, and student-generated bins, while a handful of others grab their pencils and head to the kidney-shaped table for a Collaborative Strategic Reading small group facilitated by Ms. Yi. Other students move to the corner of the room to begin recording their FlipGrid book reviews on tablets, and others settle in to focus spots with their independent reading books. Mr. Walker readies materials to begin assessing students' fluency one-on-one; once finished, he'll confer individually with students engaged in independent reading. Though there are a variety of activities happening at once, everyone in the classroom settles in to his or her work.

In this classroom, each student has ownership and choice. There are a variety of learners, and the teachers have identified the strengths and needs of each one. The educators intentionally design instruction to align to what they know about their students. How did the teachers get their third-graders to this point of independence

Balancing Literacies

and productivity? What teaching moves facilitated all these students being engaged? What are the theories of teaching and learning that underpin these instructional decisions? And, most importantly, how can other teachers cultivate similarly engaging classrooms? In this chapter, we seek to respond to these questions.

This chapter outlines an approach to whole learner education in an elementary school literacy classroom by building upon the work of scholars in Disability Studies in Education (DSE) and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP). By introducing the connections between whole learner education, DSE, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and CSP, this chapter demonstrates how these theoretical frameworks overlap and can be used in tandem to enhance the work already done in each field. After providing this theoretical background, the chapter outlines the components of a balanced literacy block in a third-grade classroom, detailing how to effectively utilize various co-teaching models. Then, the opening vignette is unpacked in detail, explaining the ways in which CSP and UDL support these exemplary instructional practices. This example demonstrates how elementary school educators can work to meet the individual learning needs of developing readers (i.e. phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension), while also attending to student identities and making instruction accessible to students with learning variations.

Connecting Whole Learner Education with the Cross-Pollination of CSP and UDL

According to Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development [ASCD] (2015), whole child education is guided by five tenets:

- *Each student enters school healthy and learns about and practices a healthy lifestyle.*
- *Each student learns in an environment that is physically and emotionally safe for students and adults.*
- *Each student is actively engaged in learning and is connected to the school and broader community.*
- *Each student has access to personalized learning and is supported by qualified, caring adults.*
- *Each student is challenged academically and prepared for success in college or further study and for employment and participation in a global environment.*

In putting these tenets into practice, ASCD (2015) has argued that a whole child approach to education should incorporate asset pedagogies, such as CSP, Culturally

Balancing Literacies

Relevant Pedagogy (CRP), and ethnic studies. In other words, whole child education should “empower students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 1992, p. 382). However, asset pedagogies often do not include students with disabilities. Scholars working in Disability Studies in Education (DSE), such as Waitoller and Thorius (2016), have argued that there is a need to account for student dis/ability as an identity in addition to race, ethnicity, language, and class, as well as how dis/ability may impact student learning profiles and instructional readiness (Tomlinson, 2017). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework that allows teachers to practically apply a DSE framework to their classroom environment, instructional design, and teaching practices, and pairs well with CSP.

In order to consider the cross-pollination of CSP and UDL, it is essential to begin with a clear understanding of both. Considering the origins and current understandings of these concepts helps to demonstrate how they work together to provide a foundation for whole learner education in the elementary school literacy classroom.

Culturally Relevant and Sustaining Pedagogies

Research in Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) came out of a larger body of literacy research on asset pedagogies conducted through the 1980s and 90s (for examples, see McCarty & Zepeda, 1995; Moll et al., 1992). Paris (2012) explains that during the 1960s and 1970s, education research had taken a deficit approach to the teaching of students from communities of color, wherein their “languages, literacies, and cultural ways of being” were seen as “deficiencies to be overcome in learning that demanded and legitimized dominant language, literacy and cultural ways of schooling” (p. 93). CRP, among other asset pedagogies, aimed to better support students from communities of color by honoring their home literacies in the classroom.

In the early 1990’s, Ladson-Billings began studying culturally relevant literacy by doing research on teachers who were considered effective by the parents of African American students. At the time, education research mostly focused on white, middle-class students and did not often reveal the social and cultural advantages that contributed to the academic accomplishments of those research participants. Instead, Ladson-Billings (1992) aimed to understand what supported African American student success specifically. She reasoned that by understanding the academic excellence of African American students, the education community could learn more about what could make students of all backgrounds successful in school. Ladson-Billings (1992) found that the essential components of effective pedagogy included, “developing conceptions of self and others that are based on accurate

Balancing Literacies

historical and social information; encouraging social relations that are communal, interdependent, equitable, and just; and developing conceptions of knowledge as socially constructed and open to intellectual challenge.” (p. 389). She observed teachers doing this work by honoring student background knowledge, centering oration as well as written literature, incorporating cooperative learning, and acting as politically charged individuals both in and outside of the classroom.

Through these studies of successful teachers of African American students, Ladson-Billings (1995) proposed a Culturally Relevant Pedagogy or “a theoretical model that not only addresses student achievement but also helps students to accept and affirm their cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate” (p. 469). She identified three areas of focus for teachers: academic success (instead of behavior and classroom management), cultural competence (instead of cultural assimilation), and sociopolitical consciousness (rather than school-based tasks with no out-of-school application). She wanted to help teachers in the process of linking the “principles of learning with a deep understanding (and appreciation for) culture” (p. 77) by establishing a pedagogy where teachers learn *from*, not just *about* marginalized students. According to Ladson-Billings (2014), CRP shifts, changes, and recreates “instructional spaces to ensure that consistently marginalized students are repositioned into a place of normativity - that is, that they become subjects in the instructional process, not mere objects” (p. 76).

More recently, education researchers Django Paris and Samy Alim have called for an advancement on this theoretical stance in the form of Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP). While similar to CRP, CSP seeks to “sustain- linguistic literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling” (Paris, 2012, p. 93). CSP builds on and extends CRP by calling for a focus on multiple identities and cultures that contribute to youth culture, emphasizing hybridity, fluidity, and complexity. Rather than focusing on one racial or ethnic group, this work responds to the changing demographics of U.S. schools by embracing global identities emerging from the arts, athletics, music, and literature. Another feature that sets CSP apart from CRP is a simultaneous commitment to “embracing youth culture’s counter hegemonic potential” while also “maintaining a clear-eyed critique of the ways in which youth culture can also reproduce systemic inequities” (Paris & Alim, 2014, p. 85). According to Waitoller and Thorius (2016), CSP includes supporting students in a process of critical reflexivity. In other words, students should be taught to reflect on their cultural practices to identify what is emancipatory and for whom and what is oppressive in those movements. While CSP works to incorporate multiple identities into its framing, it has been lovingly critiqued for not explicitly attending to disability identities (Waitoller & Thorius, 2016). In order for CSP to attend to

Balancing Literacies

this critique, it is essential to develop an understanding of how disability identity is both socially produced and individual to a person.

Universal Design for Learning as a Tool of Disability Studies in Education

Disability Studies in Education serves as a useful theory for conceptualizing disability. Unlike mainstream special education, DSE can help bring a social and political consciousness to the study of disabled individuals (Baglieri, 2017; Danforth & Naraian, 2015) by allowing for multiple and nuanced ways of understanding disability (Baglieri et al., 2011). From a DSE perspective, disability is historically, politically, socially, culturally, and medically situated (Baglieri et al., 2011). Both DSE and CSP attend to the relationship between power and identity categories. Annamma et al. (2016) have argued that in the past, scholars from outside of DSE might not concern themselves with research about individuals with disabilities and that DSE scholars have largely left racial categories unexamined in their work. While intersectional approaches to research and pedagogy that employ these two theories are rarely taken up, there is clear overlap in the ways that both frameworks discuss access, inclusivity, and the social construction of identity categories. Following Waitoller and Thorius (2016), we argue that DSE and CSP are more powerful in combination than they are separately, and teachers must implement both in order to create a learning environment that is truly inclusive.

DSE is an outgrowth of the activism of individuals with disabilities and their families (Ferguson & Nusbaum, 2012; Shakespeare, 2013) and borrows from scholarship in disability studies to extend political consciousness for individuals with disabilities into educational contexts. To challenge the historical marginalization of individuals with disabilities, early disability studies scholars used a social model for conceptualizing disability rather than one that stems from psychology and medicine (Baglieri, 2017; Shakespeare, 2013). A medical model (typically adopted by mainstream special education) assumes that a disability is a natural impairment within the individual in need of remediation; in the social model, disability is understood as the product of the social, economic, cultural, and political context (Baglieri, 2017; Riddell et al., 2001; Shakespeare, 2013). From a social model perspective, disability is distinguished from an impairment or physical limitation of the body (Baglieri, 2017; Shakespeare, 2013). In this line of thinking, the environment is comprised of barriers that limit access for particular types of bodies and minds. In turn, those barriers create disability categories. For instance, a schooling climate that conveys information solely via print text may in turn disable students who are not fluent readers. Adopting a social model for understanding disability has enabled

Balancing Literacies

individuals with disabilities, their allies, and scholars to conceptualize disability as a minority identity and, in turn, expose discrimination arising from barriers to access to physical spaces (e.g., school buildings), employment opportunities, and rigorous academic curriculum (Shakespeare, 2013).

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) serves as a tool for teachers to practically apply DSE to their classroom environment, instructional design, and teaching practices. UDL is based on nearly 30 years of neuroscience research and aims to support teachers in designing instruction that is both appropriately challenging and accessible for all learners. While UDL grew out of efforts to support the needs of students with disabilities, it has now come to be understood as a tool for supporting all students in a classroom with a variety of ability levels (Nelson, 2013). Given UDL's emphasis on designing instruction with learner variability at the forefront, Waitoller and Thorius (2016) contend that it serves as a form of asset pedagogy similar to CSP. Recent UDL teacher resources also cite foundational theoretical underpinnings across multiple asset pedagogies, including Understanding by Design, differentiated instruction, CSP, brain-based research, and full citizenship (Rapp, 2015).

Another connection point between UDL and CSP is that curriculum is purposefully designed to address the needs of diverse learners from the outset. This is in contrast to traditional curriculum development, which considers “typical” students first and then retrofits adaptations or differentiates for students of differing needs and goals (Rapp, 2015). Instead, both UDL and CSP forefront student diversity as a foundational pillar in curriculum design. This attention to access and personalized education also connects deeply to whole-learner education. According to Rapp (2015), at the heart of each of these asset theories “is a solid belief in the strengths and abilities of all students and an unwavering commitment to create classrooms that belong to everyone equally, all the time” (p. 2).

To implement UDL, teachers must go beyond consideration of the content they will teach to also attend to the learning environment and the resources that need to be available to support learning. According to Nelson (2013) the learning environment is comprised of the physical location of learning, access to flexible resources, and lesson design. While UDL is “an organized collection of big ideas that lead to providing options” (Nelson, 2013, p. 11), it is organized around three primary principles for designing curriculum. Instruction can attend to multiple means of *engagement*, *representation*, and *action and expression* that can support all learners, in particular those with dis/ability classifications (Center for Applied Special Technology [CAST], 2018; Nelson, 2013, Rose & Gravel, 2010; Meyer & Rose, 2002; Waitoller & Thorius, 2016). These UDL principles “map onto three groups of brain networks—recognition, strategic, and affective networks—that play a primary role in learning” (Hall et al., 2012).

Balancing Literacies

The first principle of a UDL is providing many different methods of *engagement* to activate the “why” of learning (the affective network). Teachers may recruit student interest in learning and keep them motivated by varying types of tasks and learning situations to match learner individuality. In addition, this principle centers social-emotional learning such as self-regulation and collaboration. For example, an educator might attend to student interest, highlight relevance to students’ lives, clarify the purpose of work, support students in persisting through challenges, and/or provide students with choice. The second principle of UDL is providing multiple means of *representation*. This principle is designed to activate the “what” of learning (the recognition network) for students. For example, a teacher might display information through both text and visuals and/or clarify vocabulary through comparisons or synonyms. Multiple modes of representation provide more students with access to the content and reinforce new information in multiple ways. The third principle of UDL is providing multiple means of *action and expression*. This activates the “how” of learning (the strategic network) for students. This is where executive functioning lives, including supporting students in setting goals, making a plan to achieve those goals, and monitoring their progress. The principle also encompasses the use of multiple tools and methods for practice and performance. For example, students might be able to choose their own method of response to demonstrate their learning, such as acting out a scene or creating a video rather than writing an essay. No matter how students respond, teachers support and guide their goal setting and progress monitoring. Through attending to all three of these principles, barriers to learning are reduced and access to content is increased for all students.

THE NEED FOR AN ELEMENTARY FOCUS

CSP and DSE scholars have called for increased attention to professional development and pre-service education that can support teachers in “improv[ing] the design and implementation of this blended pedagogy” (Waitoller & Thorius, 2016, p. 385). While this topic has been explored in higher education (Hanesworth et al., 2019), secondary education (Waitoller & Thorius, 2016), and middle school education (Coppola et al., 2019), its consideration at the elementary level is also necessary for educators and researchers alike. Too often, elementary students are viewed as unready or unable to engage in critical conversations and examinations of racism, ableism, heteronormativity, or other structural social issues, when, in fact, research suggests that young children are able to do this work, and beginning it early is beneficial for their lifelong learning (Blaise, 2009; Nager & Shapiro, 2007; Rogers & Mosley, 2006).

Balancing Literacies

Applying the cross-pollination of CSP and DSE theories to an elementary reading workshop makes possible an inclusive balanced literacy instructional approach that also attends to the need for structured intervention. Consideration of text selection and instructional methodology, as well as how the classroom teacher attends to dis/ability as both an identity position and a form of neurodiversity is essential to this form for instruction (Alim, et al., 2017; Valle and Connor, 2018). The following sections provide classroom teachers and teacher educators with a concrete example of what this work might look like with elementary school aged children.

Balanced Literacy in the Elementary Classroom

Balanced literacy is an instructional approach where teachers make data-informed instructional decisions, selecting from a variety of components, in order to best meet the needs of a diverse array of literacy learners in their classroom. This approach is already infused with UDL principles (Fisher et al., 2020) through its emphasis on balancing meaning-making alongside code-breaking instruction, teaching skills both in isolation and in context through different instructional practices. Throughout the course of a unit, an instructor using a balanced literacy approach might employ the following instructional structures: interactive read aloud, shared reading, guided reading, centers, minilessons, strategy groups, book clubs, individual conferences, independent reading, and word study (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996, see Table 1 for a description of each structure). Teachers who believe in balanced literacy often utilize a workshop approach to teaching, which provides a structure for instruction that incorporates several of these instructional components. Reading workshop involves a brief whole-class minilesson where the teacher demonstrates through think alouds with an authentic text, as well as a time for students to read independently while the teacher confers individually with students or provides small group instruction. Reading workshop lessons often include a mid-workshop check-in and a whole-class share to wrap up the instruction.

Each of the instructional structures of balanced literacy can be planned with content that purposefully responds to what teachers know about students as readers based on regular informal assessments such as work samples, anecdotal notes, checklists, and reading or engagement inventories, as well as more formal assessments. This is not to say that teachers must do all of these structures every day in their classrooms; these are strategies that can be selected and implemented as appropriate, based on the needs of the students; as can be seen in the opening vignette, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walked utilize several of these components, but not all of them. While all of these choices might seem overwhelming, teachers can build their repertoire of teaching strategies over time, challenging themselves to incorporate new practices incrementally.

Balancing Literacies*Table 1. Balanced literacy instructional structures (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Ohio State Literacy Collaborative, 2013)*

Balanced Literacy Instructional Structure	Description
interactive read aloud	The teacher introduces and reads aloud to the whole class or small groups. A carefully selected body of children's literature is used; the collection contains a variety of genres and represents our diverse society. Favorite texts selected for special features are reread many times. Instructional focus tends to be on vocabulary and comprehension.
shared reading	The teacher introduces and reads an enlarged text, or a small text of which each student has a copy. On refrains and on multiple readings, students join in to read chorally. Instructional focus is often fluency, concepts about print, and decoding.
guided reading	Students are grouped homogeneously based on reading assessments. The teacher selects and introduces a new text at students' instructional level. Students read the text independently, with the teacher listening in to prompt or reinforce strategic behaviors. Following reading, the teacher identifies explicit teaching points grounded and the text and observations of the students, directed toward expanding the students' systems of strategic actions.
centers	A literacy center is a physical area or station designated for purposeful learning. These task-oriented workstations are designed to allow students to practice literacy skills and strategies in the context of meaningful literacy activities. Content might include word work, fluency, or comprehension activities.
minilessons	Explicit lessons taught to a whole class or a small group. They are 5 – 15 minutes long and provide the opportunity to teach students one new strategy while protecting time for them to practice their repertoire of skills during independent work. A minilesson can take the structure of demonstration, inquiry, guided practice, or example and explanation. Minilessons are typically organized into units of study on particular genres or topic.
strategy groups	Small groups of students that the classroom teacher gathers together to work on a similar reading strategy. In these lessons each reader brings a self-selected text to the group so that they can practice a strategy at their independent reading level. These lessons last from 5-10 minutes.
book clubs	Small groups of students read the same text. The group works together, with teacher support, to set goals for the reading and thinking work they will do, as well as how the group will do their work. Clubs have designated times to meet to discuss their reading.
individual conferences	Individual conferences are one-to-one dialogues between a teacher and student to discuss a student's independent reading book. During a reading conference, a teacher asks a student to self-reflect on his/her/their learning and then they might work with a student to collaborate on setting a reading goal, compliment a student's strengths, identify a reading strategy to work on, assess a student's reading or coach into an area of need.
independent reading	Children read self-selected texts on their own or with partners. Children may choose to read texts on their levels and/or texts that appeal to their interests based on genre or topic. During independent reading students may practice previously taught reading strategies, work on their reading fluency, and build up reading stamina over sustained periods of time.
word study	The teacher provides explicit teaching to help students become flexible and efficient in solving words and developing new vocabulary knowledge. The content of word study instruction may include phonemic awareness, phonics, syllables, affixes and roots, as well as word learning and word consciousness strategies. Instruction might take place whole class, small group, or independently.

Co-Teaching in the Elementary Literacy Classroom

Given the realities of diverse student needs and state and federal mandates for supporting those needs, elementary reading teachers are more likely to collaborate with colleagues in the planning and delivery of instruction than they have historically. Initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI) and Early Intervention Services (EIS), as well as federal laws such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) of 2004 and the Office of Civil Rights guidelines for English Language-Learning students (ELLs) (2018), have created a mandate for teachers to collaborate with one another in increasingly complex ways. Schools are required to provide services to students who qualify for them (students with disabilities, emergent bilingual students, students who qualify for intervention), which also requires additional staffing in these high-needs areas.

In the opening example, Ms. Yi, a general education certified teacher, and Mr. Walker, a special education certified teacher, are both responsible for instruction in a collaboratively taught classroom. Co-teaching is a service delivery model for special education that affords students with disabilities the benefits of being educated alongside their general education peers and provides general education students with the benefits of being educated alongside their peers with disabilities. In this model, a special education teacher works full-time with a general education teacher to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum (Friend, 2016) and to design and implement individualized instruction. While full-time co-teaching as a service delivery model for special education is not currently common practice in all school districts, it is highly beneficial for students because it ensures that they do not lose access to the general education curriculum while they are being provided other services.

The role of the two adults in the co-teaching classroom can vary throughout the day. Friend (2016) suggests that there are six approaches to co-teaching that educators might consider rotating between. These include: station teaching; parallel teaching; alternative teaching; teaming; one teach, one assist; and one teach, one observe. Table 2 defines each of these approaches and provides an example of how each approach can be adapted for the elementary school balanced literacy classroom.

Formal co-teaching, however, is not the only educational delivery model where collaboration of multiple adults in the same classroom may take place. In addition to the classroom teacher(s), a variety of other professionals, such as a resource room teacher, an educational assistant, a reading specialist, a speech therapist, and/or teacher of emergent bilinguals (EBLs) may also be involved in reading instruction in a classroom. For example, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974 mandates that,

Balancing Literacies*Table 2 Co-teaching approaches (Friend, 2016)*

Approach	Definition	Balanced Literacy Example
Station Teaching	In Station Teaching, a class is split into four or more groups. Students rotate around the room to learn at various stations. Each teacher provides direct instruction at a specific station. This approach varies slightly from centers (as discussed above), as students visit all stations in this model, while in a centers approach, students might work in a targeted center to meet a specific need.	In a Station Teaching model, instruction could be set up to support students' fluency. One teacher might lead a strategy group to model scooping phrases from a read aloud text, then coaching students as they try out the work in their own independent reading texts. A second teacher might engage in a shared reading of a poem to emphasize expression, while also reinforcing sight words that students have previously studied. Other students may be engaged in reading a reader's theater script aloud in a group, utilizing a familiar anchor chart to guide their work. A final station might involve students recording videos of themselves reading a familiar text aloud on a tablet, listening to their recording back, identifying areas for improvement based on a fluency rubric, and rerecording their reading to meet their goals.
Parallel Teaching	In a Parallel Teaching model, a class is split into two groups. These groups can be academically heterogeneous or homogenous. In this approach, the content being taught is the same, but teachers may choose to vary the approach to teaching (e.g. one group might be more multi-sensory than the other). This approach to co-teaching allows teachers to reduce the student to teacher ratio while providing direct instruction as well as modify the form of engagement.	In a Parallel Teaching model, teachers might divide the class into two groups based on students' reading levels. Both teachers might model the same skill, such as character interpretation, using different demonstration texts, then invite students to try similar work on another section of the texts. Think alouds and prompts in each minilesson can be tailored to the features of the levels of texts students are likely to encounter in their independent reading. Students all receive similar strategy instruction, but are able to practice and apply the strategy in a text closer to their own instructional levels.
Alternative Teaching	In an Alternative Teaching model, a small group of students works with one teacher on one of the following: pre-teaching, re-teaching, enrichment or assessment. The larger portion of the class works with the other educator.	In an Alternative Teaching model, one teacher might arrange a small group of Emergent Bilingual learners to preview vocabulary for an upcoming read aloud using visual support while the rest of the class engages in an all-class lesson about dictionary strategies.
Teaming	In the Teaming approach, both teachers led instruction at the same time making direct contributions. Each teacher has a designated, predetermined role. For instance, one teacher might demonstrate a strategy while the other teacher asks probing questions and names the steps being modeled.	In a Teaming approach, one teacher might read aloud a text to the whole class pausing to think aloud a connection to that text. The second teacher might, then, model an alternative interpretation of the text as well as how to use language to disagree with a peer.
One Teach, One Assist	In a One Teach, One Assist approach, one teacher leads direction instruction to the whole class while the second teacher rotates around the classroom briefly conferring with students, answering questions, providing prompts, etc.	In a One Teach, One Assist approach, one teacher might lead an all-class minilesson, while the second teacher targets five specific students for reading conferences, taking notes about their strategy work.
One Teach, One Observe	In a One Teacher, One Observe approach to co-teaching, one teacher leads direct instruction to the whole class while the other teacher collects specific data about the instructional approach, a specific student, a group of students or the entire class.	In a One Teach, One Observe approach, one educator might lead an all-class minilesson while the second teacher records notes on student responses to partner-share questions. After the minilesson is over, the teacher who recorded the notes might arrange a small group of students to review concepts based on the data that was collected.

Balancing Literacies

No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin, by...the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional program. [20 U.S.C. 1703(f) (1974)]

While this statute does not specifically state the type of instruction or teaching methods that a school district should use to support EBLs, many states and local districts interpret “appropriate action” in such a way that an EBL teacher and general education teacher must collaborate (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016; National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, n.d.; Thomas et al., 2009, p. 163).

General education teachers, specialists, and support staff collaborations are often grouped into two categories: *push-in* and *pull-out*. *Push-in* services are interventions and/or supports provided in the regular education classroom, while *pull-out* services refer to those interventions and supports that take place in an alternate setting. For students with disabilities, decisions regarding which setting is best should be made collaboratively by those knowledgeable about the student and his/her/their needs, always selecting the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Even in schools where a more formal model of co-teaching is not currently in use, all education professionals can draw from the six co-teaching approaches to implement *push-in* services (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016). For example, an ELL teacher might use a co-teaching approach when supporting a group of students during a reading lesson in the general education classroom, or the speech pathologist and general education classroom teacher might implement a co-teaching model during a social studies lesson. A benefit to having two professionals in the classroom is that educators with larger class sizes can more easily manage small group instruction, which often means that the general education teacher can provide more intervention and differentiation for students in addition to the *push-in* services provided by the specialist. The co-teaching approaches above offer ideas for how to envision *push-in* services that can be effectively implemented in lieu of *pull-out* services. Co-teaching should not put an additional strain on school budgets; rather, it shifts the way that services already being delivered can be accomplished in more inclusive ways.

The strategic use of multiple adults in the classroom can support a UDL approach to balanced literacy instruction. Utilizing both adults in the classroom in purposeful ways allows each learner to be supported with access points to instruction and the opportunity for targeted learning from an educational professional. But, to educate a whole child, their cultural background must be honored and sustained in classroom instruction, as well. In favoring a *push-in* model for the delivery of instruction for EBLs and students with disabilities, educators subtly message to all students that everyone belongs in the classroom. This is an example of “hidden curriculum,” or the implicit norms, values, and ideologies that are taught in a school outside of

Balancing Literacies

formal content (Giroux & Penna, 1983). By insisting that all students are present in the classroom, have access to instruction, and participate in whole class lessons, students from all backgrounds learn that diversity in language and ability/disability are valuable in a community. In addition, given the overrepresentation of students of color in special education placements, when we segregate students with disabilities from general education, on a national scale, we are likely to be separating students of color from their peers (Harry & Klinger, 2006). Utilizing a *push-in* or co-teaching service delivery model provides an opportunity to disrupt these trends.

It is incumbent on all of the professionals engaged in literacy instruction to have a deep knowledge of CSP and how to implement this theoretical stance in their practice. When educators are collaborating, they cannot only consider access to the general education curriculum. They also need to attend to the ways that instruction is culturally sustaining across instructional settings and structures. While the structures of co-teaching are important to actualize CSP/UDL infused instruction, they must be combined with a shared instructional philosophy among every instructor and service provider.

A DAY IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING WORKSHOP

The previous several sections provide background for planning and implementing CSP/UDL infused reading instruction on any given day. Armed with a deep knowledge of their students as readers, writers, speakers, thinkers, and whole social and cultural individuals, teachers make intentional, responsive choices to tailor their instruction. To plan literacy instruction, teachers must consider their assessment data and knowledge of their students' talents and cultures, the content that they intend to cover, state-mandated standards, the potential role each professional may play, and which components of balanced literacy should be emphasized. To actualize this individualized instruction, thoughtful daily scheduling of the literacy block that is attentive to the role of multiple adults must take place.

Flowing the Literacy Block

Given all the potential possibilities for how a literacy block can be laid out, school administrators and teachers often rely on a formula for how daily literacy instruction should look. It can feel overwhelming to deviate from a set daily schedule, however, to truly meet the needs of a diverse classroom and educate the whole child, it is essential for teachers to utilize the full spectrum of instructional structures and co-teaching approaches in purposeful ways. Table 3 describes one day of literacy instruction in Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker's third-grade co-taught classroom, highlighting each component

Balancing Literacies

Table 3. Flow of the literacy block

Timing	Component	Literacy Content	Teacher Roles
20 minutes	Word Study	The class is split into three groups each focusing on a separate phonics or vocabulary . Group 1 is working on decoding long a vowel patterns including ay, ai and a-e. Group 2 is working on the inflected “ed.” Group 3 is digging into the meaning of the Latin prefixes “pre” and “de” and using those meanings to decipher the meaning of multisyllabic words.	Mr. Walker leads alternative instruction with Group 1. Ms. Yi leads instruction for the rest of the class. She alternates between Group 2 and Group 3. She launches the work with Group 2 as Group 3 works independently after reading directions on a task card provided by Ms. Yi. Ms. Yi answers questions and provides prompts to Group 3 as Group 2 finishes independent work.
10 minutes	Minilesson	Focusing on comprehension , through a teacher led demonstration and then guided partner work, the class is working altogether on identifying and interpreting character by acting out what a character does in a text.	Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker use a mixture of the one teach, one observe and one teach, one assist approaches. Ms. Yi leads the instruction while Mr. Walker observes, takes targeted notes on specific students and provides prompting to those students.
30 minutes	Centers: independent reading, book reviews, strategy lessons	Students refer to a pocket chart to determine which center(s) they will visit. One group of students engages in book shopping, picking out books for the week based on interest and readability. Once they have selected their texts, they begin reading independently to practice the teaching point from the minilesson and their repertoire of comprehension strategies. These students are also on the lookout for examples of language variety in their texts to add to a co-created translation chart. In order to practice comprehension skills, another group of students visits the technology center to record book reviews based on their independent reading. These students plan their review, including a concise text summary and an opinion of that text supported by evidence, then record their review to post for classmates to view and respond. Working with a teacher, one group uses Collaborative Strategic Reading to read a text on their instructional level. To focus on comprehension , they chunk text and monitor their own understanding of those chunks. A final group meets with a teacher for a fluency check-in. They read a text aloud while the teacher assesses with a fluency rubric, noting words read correctly per minute. After their assessments, the students practice a reader’s theater script.	Ms. Yi leads an alternative group using Collaborative Strategic Reading. Mr. Walker assesses students’ fluency skills one-on-one, then conferences with students one-on-one.

continued on following page

Balancing Literacies

Table 3. Continued

Timing	Component	Literacy Content	Teacher Roles
5 minutes	Share	The whole class gathers to revisit the read aloud text utilized in the minilesson. They advance their comprehension work by taking up a critical lens on the role of gender in the text. The teacher asks students to turn and talk about the following questions: what ways does this story reinforce stereotypes? How does it push-back against stereotypes? Students then revisit their independent reading books to identify examples of gender stereotypes.	Mr. Walker facilitates the Share. Ms. Yi records student responses on the Interactive Whiteboard. Both teachers circulate to prompt/support student partnerships and triads.
25 minutes	Interactive Read Aloud	Introducing a new read aloud text, the teachers work with the whole class on comprehension . Students notice patterns in character talk, thoughts, and actions to grow theories about the character. Mr. Walker models fluent expression as he reads aloud.	Mr. Walker reads the story aloud, while Ms. Yi pauses his reading to think aloud and ask questions to the class. Using this teaming approach which alternates between voices, the students can hear what is the language of the text and what is the language of a reader thinking aloud.

of balanced literacy and how the two teachers are delivering instruction. This is one example of how a block might be responsively organized, but it is important to remember that there are many other ways that it could be structured. While the content might change for different grade levels, units, and contexts, the structures below form a bank of options from which all teachers can draw.

UNPACKING THE EXAMPLE

For Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker's CSP/UDL cross-pollinated instruction to take place, there are several logistical decisions that happened prior to the teaching; these decisions were guided by their shared philosophical vision. First, it is non-negotiable that all students are present for literacy instruction. This means that any related services that students receive (such as speech and language services, occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.) do not take place during the literacy block. Language services for EBLs or gifted and talented programming must also be scheduled outside of this time. If scheduling is especially challenging, service providers *push-in* to the classroom to provide support, as discussed above, rather than pulling students out of the classroom. All students must have access to uninterrupted classroom literacy instruction.

In addition, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker utilize multiple forms of current data and assessments in order to make and re-make flexible groups for instruction. The use

Balancing Literacies

of grouping that is constantly changing and based on frequently monitored data ensures that student identities do not become restricted by a static label or category; it also avoids groups that are based on deficit discourses or assumptions about student abilities, such as “struggling readers,” “gifted students,” students with “no language,” or “SpEd kids.” In a CSP/UDL classroom, having all students in different, constantly evolving groups is the norm.

Finally, Mr. Walker and Ms Yi ensure that they each play an essential role in the delivery of instruction throughout the literacy block. Both teachers lead the whole class at different times, and both work with students in flexible small group and individual structures. The growth and success of all students in the classroom is a shared responsibility, and collaboration and co-planning are essential components. In fact, when co-teaching is done effectively, it is often hard to tell which teacher is a general education teacher and which teacher is the special educator.

With these foundational principles in mind, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker are able to implement a literacy block infused with CSP/UDL. As demonstrated below, each component of the literacy block has components of CSP/UDL woven throughout. In addition to Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker’s classroom examples, the sections that follow also offer some alternative concrete ideas for how these theoretical stances might be enacted in practice. The variety of options shared serve to demonstrate that there is no one “right” way to engage in CSP/UDL infused balanced literacy. These examples support consideration of how this work might look in different classroom contexts.

Word Study

Utilizing the *Words Their Way* qualitative spelling inventory (Bear et al., 2019), Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi determined that the bulk of their class is at the beginning of the Syllables and Affixes stage of spelling development, while a smaller group has gaps in their knowledge. The class is split into three groups, each focusing on a separate phonics or vocabulary skill. Mr. Walker leads alternative instruction with Group 1. These students are working on decoding and encoding Long A vowel patterns including *ay*, *ai* and *a-e*. This group has been working with these vowel patterns for a few weeks, and students have been gathering examples of Long A words from their families and communities. Students have brought in words they found through watching television, print ads, and in conversation with family members. Each word is written on an index card, and after sharing their words and where they found them with a partner, Mr. Walker guides students in working on a closed sort to note the different patterns used to spell the same vowel sound. In allowing students to explore words in their home environments and then bring those words into the classroom, Mr. Walker provides space for culturally sustaining connections between newly taught vowel patterns and previous understandings of words. Further, as students

Balancing Literacies

are sorting words on cards, Mr. Walker is considering the *action and expression* principle of UDL. In order to support students in the group for whom handwriting is a challenge, Mr. Walker has pre-written the words. This provides an accessible method to practice the phonics work.

Ms. Yi leads instruction for the rest of the class. She begins with Group 2, who are working on Syllable and Affixes by sorting words with the inflected ending *-ed* by its different pronunciations (e.g. walked, folded, and shined). She launches the work with Group 2, guiding their inquiry into the group of words with the questions: What do you notice about these words? How might you group them? As they discuss and sort the words, Ms. Yi highlights and honors the students' multiple pronunciations of phonetic patterns. For example, when a student reads the word "asked" as "axed," Ms. Yi uses the opportunity to refer students to the translation chart, a language tool consistently present in the classroom that supports an examination of the ways different forms of language can be purposefully utilized across contexts and relationships (see McCreight, 2016, pp. 24-27 for more information on creating translation charts in the classroom). In conversation with Ms. Yi, the students identify that some people pronounce the word "axed," while others use the pronunciation "asked." The students add this example on post-its to the co-created translation chart, and agree to sort the word into the category of *-ed* pronounced as /t/, noting that it fits into this category either way it is pronounced. Ms. Yi is careful to jot this example in her notes so that she can revisit the Old English verb "acsian" as the root of this common pronunciation of African American English Vernacular (AAVE).

Meanwhile, Group 3 begins their work independently, reading directions on a task card provided by Ms. Yi. This group is exploring the meaning of the Latin prefixes "pre-" and "de-" and using that knowledge to decipher the definitions of multisyllabic words. Ms. Yi has selected words that would be relevant to her students, based on her knowledge of who they are as individuals, both in school and outside of school. For example, she selects "preheat" for a student who helps with the cooking at home and is interested in becoming a chef. She selects "predict" and "preview" as words students will be familiar with from prior reading lessons. Finally, keeping in mind the student whose mother recently had a baby, she chooses the word "prenatal." Ms. Yi also pulls words from current content-area units, such as "decompose," "deciduous," "dehydrate," and "deforestation," from their science unit on forest ecosystems to make word work instruction more meaningful for students (Celic & Seltzer, 2013). As Group 2 moves to their own independent sorting, Ms. Yi joins Group 3 to answer their questions and provide prompts as they discuss potential word meanings. To address accessible *representation* of words, she color-codes the prefixes in one color and the root words in another. She also ensures that students are working strategically with partners who can support one another with decoding unknown word parts.

Balancing Literacies

Of course, there are many other ways that word work could be done in this classroom. For example, word work provides an opportunity to incorporate music. This provides a different means of *representation* for students who might benefit from rhythm and musical reminders to help them access stored information. Teachers might draw on <https://www.havefunteaching.com/> for phonics-based songs to augment instruction (Rapp, 2016, p. 139). Another alternative to consider is that students might work to create vocabulary webs of expertise (Jones et al., 2010, p. 73), in which students choose any topic they are an expert on and make a web of any language that connects to that topic. These words can be in any language or dialect and offers each student an opportunity to share his/her/their expertise with the class. Another way to provide students with multiple access points and to support EBLs in encoding English words is to make alphabet or phonics charts available in both English and home languages (Celic & Seltzer, 2013). EBLs may be prompted to identify letters or characters that represent a sound in both languages. To support students in seeing which phonics skills transfer across languages, an educator might ask students if orthographic representations (the written letters or symbols) for a sound are similar or different across the two languages.

Word study instruction might also draw upon the language profile of students' home languages to identify the sound system, writing system, dialectical variations, grammar, common "friends" or cognates, and other linguistic features including cultural background and history of the language. For example, Spanish speakers might note that *h* in Spanish is silent, while it's sounded in English, and Korean speakers might note that there are no blends or consonant clusters, while blends like *str* are very common in English (Funk, 2012, p. 131). Students who are speakers of a Chinese language might note that symbols represent ideas instead of sounds, while in English, symbols represent sounds instead of ideas (Funk, 2012, p. 45). For an overview of ten languages commonly spoken in the United States, see Alexander Funk's (2012) *The Languages of New York State: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. Regardless of what structures or content is implemented during word work, what is important to note is that language instruction is not a neutral domain. Language is inextricably entwined with identity and power. Consequently, addressing the role of culture, social class and race in language and making sure that instruction is accessible are integral parts of teaching word study.

Minilesson

Following the word work groups, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker use the Go Noodle Flow channel (<https://family.gonoodle.com/channels/flow>) to provide students with a yoga-inspired movement break. After the movement break, Mr. Walker calls students to the rug. He prompts students to set an intention for the minilesson. He asks that

Balancing Literacies

students consider the following questions: What will you do to focus today? How will you know if you are focused? The class whispers their intention to a partner after a silent minute of reflection. Mr. Walker reminds students that if they are not meeting their intention during the lesson, they may use the “Take-A-Break” center to get themselves back on track and then rejoin the class after the sand timer in the center runs out. The movement activity provides options for physical *expression*, and Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker also utilize this transition time to facilitate students’ self-regulation and appropriate goal-setting.

Ms. Yi takes the lead in facilitating the next portion of the instruction. In order to model for students how to identify and interpret characters through character actions, Ms. Yi refers to a familiar text previously read aloud to the students, *Leila in Saffron* by Rukhasanna Guidroz (2019). Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker intentionally select texts for whole-class lessons that provide positive, own-voices representation of students’ cultures and work to disrupt the single stories of marginalized groups (Adichie, 2009; Tschida et al., 2014) in this case, of Pakistani women. After making it clear what the teaching point of the lesson is and why it matters to her students as readers, Ms. Yi provides a model of what she learns about Leila in a scene from the beginning of the text, referring to an anchor chart that explicitly outlines the strategy she is demonstrating. For example, Ms. Yi highlights that a reader can notice what the character says, does, and thinks to learn more about the character’s traits. The anchor chart represents the strategy in both text and images to support student independence in referring back to it as a tool during their own independent reading later in the period.

After reviewing the steps of her own modeling, Ms. Yi invites the students to try the same strategy on a different scene from the text in which the characters of Leila and her Naani try on silk scarves in a rainbow of colors. Rather than asking students to simply discuss interpretations of character actions, this lesson is designed to engage students in multiple ways by offering an opportunity to act out pivotal moments in the text. The opportunity to act out moments in the text through physical action enhances student inferential reasoning as they are able to clearly visualize what is happening before they draw broader conclusions about why characters may behave in particular ways.

Throughout the minilesson, each turn and talk question is projected on the interactive whiteboard using the Dyslexie typeface (<https://www.dyslexiefont.com/>) which is designed to have increased readability for individuals with Dyslexia. By making questions available both orally and visually, as well as through a font that has increased legibility, Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi rely on the UDL principle of multiple means of *representation* to increase student access to the minilesson. Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker move from partnership to partnership, listening in. Mr. Walker carries a clipboard and jots notes about which students are keeping their dramatizations

Balancing Literacies

grounded in the text, and which students are extending beyond the text. He pays special attention to the triads he and Ms. Yi have previously established to support their EBLs, Emile and Angela. Mr. Walker encourages these students to join in the conversations of their proficient language partners, offering a sentence stem to facilitate their participation. Then, Ms. Yi leads a partnership share and sets students up to work independently.

At the close of the minilesson, Mr. Walker continues to promote executive functioning by prompting students to reflect back on the intention that they had set before getting started. He asks them to consider whether or not they met that goal and in what ways they could improve their strides towards meeting that goal in the future. He asks two students to share ideas for how to meet learning intentions the next day and adds those suggestions to a classroom reference chart labeled “How can I monitor my own literacy learning?”

With a hand signal, students know that the minilesson is over. They look up at the pocket chart to note what activity they will be engaging in for centers. Ms. Yi plays a selection of popular music pre-selected by the class as students transition from whole class instruction to centers. Through allowing students to choose their own transition music, they utilize the UDL principle of *engagement* by recruiting student interest and fostering a sense of classroom community.

Centers and Independent Reading

This is one of the busiest parts of the workshop. The students are divided into four groups based on Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi’s prior knowledge of the students and assessments of their abilities and areas for growth. Each group has a particular skill focus, as well as a schedule in which they meet with a teacher on some days and engage in independent practice and application of their learning on others. The pocket chart lets the students know if they will be working independently or with a teacher, where in the room they will work, and the length of time they’ll spend at a particular center. Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi utilize a sensory timer (e.g. <https://www.online-stopwatch.com/sensory-timers/>) to help students with the higher order executive functioning skill of time management (Rapp, 2015, p. 103). Sensory timers allow for a visual display time, provide students with an interesting visual to look at as they wait for peers to transition, and reduce the stress associated with count-down timers. Students can refer to the timer, displayed on the interactive whiteboard, throughout center time to support the development of their own internal clock and to plan their work or monitor their progress at their center.

During this time, the first group of students moves towards the classroom library to begin book shopping from the genre, level, and student-generated bins. Choosing from among texts written by professional authors and their peers, they

Balancing Literacies

pick out books for the week based on interest and readability. A diverse classroom library that provides both windows and mirrors (Sims Bishop, 1990) for all students is an essential component of a UDL/CSP-infused balanced literacy classroom. Providing positive, own-voices representation of students' cultures that disrupt the single stories of marginalized groups (Adichie, 2009; Tschida et al., 2014) is an intentional, ongoing process that can be guided by resources such as <https://blog.leeandlow.com/2014/05/22/checklist-8-steps-to-creating-a-diverse-book-collection/> and <https://choiceliteracy.com/article/curating-a-classroom-library/>. By allowing students choice of the texts that they read and ensuring that high-interest texts are available in the classroom library, Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi utilize the UDL principle of providing multiple means of *engagement* by recruiting student interest. To provide students with multiple means of *representation* of text, Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi provide options for perception by allowing students to read not only print texts, but also in digital formats. Students can choose from texts available on scaffolded digital reading environments (e.g. <http://bookbuilder.cast.org/> or the Epic! children's library app) that read aloud as needed.

Once they have selected their texts, the students in this group move to their focus spots (individually selected locations that match their sensory needs to optimize their success) to begin reading independently. They each take a bookmark from their reading folders that lists a co-created goal set during their individual reading conferences with their teachers. In addition to their individual goal, students know that they can practice the teaching point from the minilesson as well as their repertoire of comprehension strategies, drawing on classroom anchor charts to support their thinking. These students can also be on the lookout for examples of language variety in their texts to add to a co-created translation chart. Later in the lesson, Mr. Walker confers with some of these students, checking in on the students' goals and setting new ones as needed. The use of individual goal setting and teacher-guided check-ins aligned to those goals supports student planning and strategy development, a check-point found under the UDL principle of providing multiple means of *action and expression*.

At the same time as students prepare to read independently, a handful of students grab their pencils and head to the kidney-shaped table for a Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) small group facilitated by Ms. Yi. According to Klinger and Vaughn (1998) CSR is a process for teaching students comprehension strategies as well as working collaboratively in discussing texts. It comes from a special education research base and has been found to be effective in supporting teachers in meeting reading objectives found on Individualized Education Plans (Chang & Shimizu, 1997; Klinger & Vaughn, 1998). In using CSR, Ms. Yi begins by recalling the previously taught reading comprehension strategies: previewing, monitoring (known as "Clicking and Clunking"), getting the gist, and wrapping up (i.e. formulating and

Balancing Literacies

answering questions about the text) (Klinger & Vaughn, 1998). After reviewing these strategies through examples from a previous day's reading, students self-select roles to perform in CSR in their small group. Students take on responsibility for their own reading in the following roles: leader, clunk expert, announcer, encourager, reporter, and time keeper. The group then reads on their own with Ms. Yi providing prompts as needed.

A third group of students move to the technology center in the corner of the room to begin writing and recording book reviews on tablets. These students have selected a recently-finished independent reading book that they would like to share with the class. They work to plan their review, including a concise text summary and an opinion of that text supported by evidence. Writing tools and assistive technologies are available to these students, such as twist and write pencils, pencil weights, wrist straps, different writing utensil options, highlighted or raised line paper choices (Rapp, 2015, p. 120), as well as text to speech software to record their responses (<https://www.texthelp.com/en-us/products/read-write>). Students' planning for their reviews is flexible, and can be written, drawn, or storyboarded (Rapp, 2015, p. 140), allowing for different methods of response and navigation of the assignment. Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker also encourage students to complete their book reviews in any dialect, emphasizing that sharing their reading life is a personal, meaningful act while also encouraging students to consider their audience in a purposeful way. These elements of the assignment are outlined on a pie chart rubric for the students (Rapp, 2015, p. 145); this type of rubric provides students with a visual representation of how they can divide their time and effort while working on the assignment. This makes the expectations for the assignment explicit, but also supports the development of planning strategies and the capacity for students to monitor their own progress in their work. Once students have developed their reviews, they record them on tablets and post them to Flipgrid. This platform allows for their classmates to view the reviews and respond with videos of their own reactions, which might include their own responses to texts they've read, their intention to read a book a classmate recommended, or feedback on how the review itself was constructed and conveyed (Flipgrid, 2019). Allowing students to record their responses invites students to express their learning in a format other than a traditional written book report, incorporating multiple means of *action and expression* through different tools for communication, construction, and composition (CAST, 2018; Rapp, 2015, p. 135-136)

The fourth group of students meets to work on their fluency. Mr. Walker asks individual students to read aloud from a familiar passage to assess their progress since their last meeting. Mr. Walker utilizes grade level oral fluency norms (Hasbrouck, n.d.) and a fluency rubric (Rasinski, n.d.), and reviews this information with the students. He offers each student individual mastery-oriented feedback, which provides them with options for sustaining effort and persistence, as well as

Balancing Literacies

providing opportunities for self-assessment and reflection (CAST, 2018). As Mr. Walker reads with individual students, the other members of this group practice their fluency on familiar passages (including poems and song lyrics in addition to fiction and nonfiction passages just below their independent reading levels), kept in their reading folder. Students select whether they would like to record their reading on a tablet and listen back, or read aloud to themselves into a whisper phone. After all of the students have read with Mr. Walker, he moves to confer with students in the first group about their independent reading. Before he leaves, he sets the students in this fluency group up to practice a reader's theater script, which they will prepare to perform for the rest of the class.

Of course, these are only some of the centers that might be going on in this classroom on a given day. There are many alternatives that the teachers might implement, depending on the needs of their students, the unit(s) they are working on, and the resources available to them. On other days, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker might invite students' family members or other community members in to run a center, providing opportunities for them to tell a heritage story or share information about their occupation, culture, or language with students. As another alternative, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker could set students up to lead their own small groups during center time. This allows students to share what they are learning with their peers, further developing classroom community, and allows all students an opportunity to be positioned as knowledgeable experts. Teaching others invites students to synthesize their own learning, reflect on their own strategies, celebrate their own progress, and identify an authentic purpose for their work.

To bring all of the centers to an end, Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker make sure to provide students with a warning that they only have a few moments left before transitioning. This notification again allows students to develop personal coping skills and strategies for self-regulation.

Share

After the sensory timer on the interactive whiteboard indicates that the transition time is up, Ms. Yi calls on a student to pick an animal. Students then transition to the rug pantomiming the actions of a frog. The whole class gathers to revisit *Leila in Saffron* through a different lens: taking a critical look at the role of gender in the text. Mr. Walker asks the students to turn and talk about the following questions: In what ways does this story reinforce stereotypes? How does it push back against stereotypes? After a few moments of discussion, during which both Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi circulate to listen in and prompt student partnerships and triads, Mr. Walker pauses the students to add on to their conversations. He notes that many partnerships identified the ways in which Leila is characterized as "girly," playing

Balancing Literacies

dress up and liking sparkly scarves. Other students noticed that Leila is described as not being confident at the beginning of the story, but likes who she is at the end - a common storyline for girl characters. Other partnerships noted that Leila and her Naani were characters representing a culture they didn't read about often. As Mr. Walker calls on groups to share-out their thinking, Ms. Yi uses a T-chart on the interactive whiteboard to organize student responses into two categories: (1) reinforced stereotypes and (2) disrupted stereotypes. Using this graphic organizer provides a visual structure for representing the relationship between mainstream narratives and critical interpretations (Rapp, 2015). This method of recording student responses not only validates student thinking by putting it in writing, but also supports students in developing higher-order thinking by noting patterns across multiple points of view. After sharing these different student perspectives, Mr. Walker challenges the students to revisit their independent reading books to identify examples of gender stereotypes in those texts, as well.

As an alternative to this share structure, an educator could engage in a critical literacy share by encouraging students to identify a social issue in their independent reading text and explain to a partner how they may respond to this social issue in their own lives. For instance, students might identify examples of bullying in their realistic fiction novels and generate a list of action steps to engage in on the playground and in the cafeteria to support peers, or note issues of mental health in their texts and develop a morning mood check-in chart to include in the morning routine. All of this work is in support of the critical reflexivity tenet of CSP, as it encourages students to reflect on their cultural practices and identify what is emancipatory and for whom and what is oppressive.

Read Aloud

Text selection for read alouds in the classroom is an incredibly important part of literacy instruction. These texts become shared texts, able to be referred back to in minilessons, small groups, and conferences. Students can make connections or disconnections across texts by recalling read alouds in the context of their independent reading. Therefore, just as in the classroom library, it is essential that read alouds represent the range of student identities and experiences. Choosing diverse texts allows all students to see their race, (dis)ability, family structure, culture, gender identity, religion, or other identity positions represented in a positive way. It is even important to consider a range of emotions, so that students know their own emotions are welcomed and respected in the classroom. Mr. Walker and Ms. Yi select *Meena Meets Her Match* (2019) by Karla Manternachto to read aloud for its representation of a third grader with epilepsy as a whole individual. As the author describes the text, it is "not the story of a medical condition. It's the story of a child and all the

Balancing Literacies

ups and downs that she's dealing with. Epilepsy plays a big part in Meena's story, but it's not her entire story" (We Need Diverse Texts, 2019). There are many great resources to help support text selection; these are noted in the Additional Readings section at the end of the chapter.

As Mr. Walker prepares to read the first chapter of *Meena Meets Her Match* (2019), he offers students the choice to follow along with their own copies of the text as he reads. Considering the UDL principle of providing *multiple means of representation*, this option benefits students who need an alternative to auditory information. Continuing to address this principle of UDL, Mr. Walker provides options for comprehension by activating student prior knowledge. He asks them to recall their previous character study work used while reading the text *Leila in Saffron*. He also shows the class a video clip that introduces them to Epilepsy so that students have background knowledge on this disability before encountering pivotal moments in the story. Mr. Walker then begins to read the text aloud. When he gets to the first predetermined stopping point, Ms. Yi "thinks aloud" about how she notices Meena's internal thinking. Ms. Yi reminds students that internal thinking can reveal a lot about the character, referring back to the anchor chart from the minilesson, and shares her thinking that Meena might be a selfish character, someone who thinks about herself first instead of others. Ms. Yi adds that this is a theory at this early point in the text, and that she'll keep it in mind as they continue reading to see if her theory holds true or needs to be revised. Once Ms. Yi has finished her think aloud, Mr. Walker continues to read, stopping at the moment in the text when Meena asks her teacher what the prize is for having the best president portrait in the class. Mr. Walker asks students to follow Ms. Yi's example and think aloud about what this says about Meena's character traits. As Mr. Walker continues to read, Ms. Yi highlights Meena's difficulty concentrating and her scribbles on her portrait, ensuring that students connect this scene back to the video about epilepsy they watched before beginning the read aloud. After finishing the chapter, Mr. Walker asks students to summarize what they read with their partner and share their reactions. He then tells the class that they will think more about this chapter during reading the next day and sends students to their desks to take out their math notebooks to continue on with their daily schedule.

As with the other components of the reading workshop, there are alternatives for how to facilitate a CSP/UDL infused interactive read aloud. Mr. Walker could have highlighted different comprehension skills such as noticing author's craft or visualizing. He could also engage in critical literacy work by having an explicit conversation on the depiction of epilepsy in the text, or highlighting the section of the chapter where Meena reflects on not liking the colors of her skin, hair, and eyes. Another option could be to support students in monitoring for meaning. This might take the form of reciprocal teaching, setting students up in groups of four as

Balancing Literacies

summarizer, questioner, predictor, and clarifier, or by using a class read aloud notebook to model making an explicit plan to track the story elements and incorporating more frequent stops for comprehension checks and rereading (Pilonieta & Medina, 2009). The focus of interactive read aloud is driven by the teachers' knowledge of their students' skills and needs, and is entwined with all of the other reading instruction occurring in the classroom.

CONCLUSION

This chapter provided a detailed description of a 90-minute literacy block in a third-grade co-taught classroom that includes both students with and without disability classifications. This example shows how instructors can work to meet the individual learning needs of developing readers in balanced literacy, while also attending to student cultural identities and making instruction accessible for students with learning variations. However, it is important to note that this chapter provides a vision of aspirational teaching. There are many components to consider when building a classroom community that functions this way, and no one will be able to attend to all of these components all day, every day. It's important to tackle this work piece by piece, folding these practices into your repertoire and working toward goals, continually getting better and better at this work.

The teacher competencies identified by the New America report, *Culturally Responsive Teaching: A 50-State Survey of Teaching Standards* (Muñiz, 2019) are helpful for framing this process. This is, generally, personal work first, as *Competency 1: Reflect on your own cultural lens* indicates. After exploring one's own racial and ethnic identities, recognizing bias and structural inequities, and developing increased cultural competency, educators can work towards bringing this informed awareness to their teaching in purposeful ways. For example, it might be helpful to focus first on more inclusive and diverse text selection, then purposefully utilizing all adults in the classroom with various co-teaching models, then working to incorporate instruction in an appreciation of linguistic diversity. Ms. Yi and Mr. Walker had to engage in professional learning about UDL, CSP, co-teaching, language diversity, and other topics in order to inform their intentional planning for the instruction described above. Mistakes are, of course, inevitable, and it is useful to accept that this work will feel uncomfortable at times. Remember that it is better to feel like you are doing messy work and growing in your teaching rather than to avoid the work and make no mistakes.

Balancing Literacies**REFERENCES**

- Adichie, C. N. (2009). *The danger of a single story*. TED. https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?language=en
- Alim, H. S., Baglieri, S., Ladson-Billings, G., Paris, D., Rose, D. H., & Valente, J. M. (2017). Responding to “cross-pollinating culturally sustaining pedagogy and universal design for learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for dis/ability.” *Harvard Educational Review*, 87(1), 4–25. doi:10.17763/1943-5045-87.1.4
- Annamma, S. A., Connor, D. J., & Ferri, B. A. (2016). Touchstone text: Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and Dis/ability. In D. J. Connor, B. A. Ferri, & S. A. Annamma (Eds.), *DisCrit: Disability studies and critical race theory in education* (pp. 9–32). Teachers College Press.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2015). *The whole child approach to education*. <http://www.wholechildeducation.org/about>
- Baglieri, S. (2017). *Disability studies and the inclusive classroom: Critical practices for embracing diversity in education*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315642543
- Baglieri, S., Bejoian, L. M., Broderick, A. A., Connor, D. J., & Valle, J. (2011). [Re]claiming “inclusive education” toward cohesion in educational reform: Disability studies unravels the myth of the normal child. *Teachers College Record*, 113(10), 2122–2154.
- Bear, D., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (2019). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary and spelling instruction* (7th ed.). Pearson Company.
- Blaise, M. (2009). “What a girl wants, what a girl needs”: Responding to sex, gender, and sexuality in the early childhood classroom. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 23(4), 450–460. doi:10.1080/02568540909594673
- CAST. (n.d.). *CAST UDL book builder*. <http://bookbuilder.cast.org/>
- Celic, C., & Seltzer, K. (2013). *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. CUNY-NYS Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals. <https://www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Translanguaging-Guide-March-2013.pdf>
- Center for Applied Special Technology. (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2* [graphic organizer]. Author.

Balancing Literacies

Chang, J., & Shimizu, W. (1997). *Collaborative strategic reading: Cross-age and cross-cultural applications*. Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children Symposium on Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners, New Orleans, LA.

Coppola, R., Woodward, R. & Vaughn, A. (2019). And the students shall lead us: Putting culturally sustaining pedagogy in conversation with universal design for learning in a middle-school spoken word poetry unit. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 1-24.

Danforth, S., & Naraian, S. (2015). This new field of inclusive education: Beginning a dialogue on conceptual foundations. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 53(1), 70–85. doi:10.1352/1934-9556-53.1.70 PMID:25633383

Dyslexie FontB. V. (n.d.) <https://www.dyslexiefont.com/>

Ehrlich, H. (2014). *Checklist: 8 steps to creating a diverse book collection. The open book blog*. Lee and Low. <https://blog.leeandlow.com/2014/05/22/checklist-8-steps-to-creating-a-diverse-book-collection/>

Epic Creations Inc. (n.d.). *Epic!* <https://www.getepic.com/>

Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-380 § 204 Stat. 515 (1973-1974).

Ferguson, P. M., & Nusbaum, E. (2012). Disability studies: What is it and what difference does it make? *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 37(2), 70–80.

Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Akhavan, N. (2020). *This is balanced literacy, grades K-6*. Corwin.

Flipgrid. (2019). <https://info.flipgrid.com/>

Flow. (n.d.) <https://family.gonoodle.com/channels/flow>

Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all teaching*. Heinemann.

Friend, M. m. (2015). Welcome to Co-Teaching 2.0. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 16–22.

Funk, A. (2012). *The Languages of New York State: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. CUNY-NYS Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals. <https://www.cuny-nysieb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/NYSLanguageProfiles.pdf>

Balancing Literacies

Giroux, H., & Penna, A. (1938). Social education in the classroom: The dynamics of the hidden curriculum. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.), *The hidden curriculum and moral education* (pp. 100–121). McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Guidroz, R. (2019). *Leila in saffron*. Salaam Reads.

Hall, T. E., Meyer, A., & Rose, D. H. (2012). An introduction to universal design for learning: Questions and answers. In T. E. Hall, A. Meyer, & D. H. Rose (Eds.), *Universal Design for Learning in the Classroom: Practical Applications* (pp. 1–8). Guilford Publications.

Hanesworth, P., Bracken, S., & Elkington, S. (2019). A typology for a social justice approach to assessment: Learning from universal design and culturally sustaining pedagogy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 24(1), 98–114. doi:10.1080/13562517.2018.1465405

Harry, B., & Klingner, J. (2006). *Why are so many minority students in special education?* Teachers College Press.

Hasbrouck, J. (n.d.). *Screening, diagnosing, and progress monitoring for Fluency: The details*. Reading Rockets. <https://www.readingrockets.org/article/screening-diagnosing-and-progress-monitoring-fluency-details>

Have Fun Teaching Teacher Resources. (n.d.). <https://www.havefunteaching.com/resources/songs/>

Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2016). Co-Teaching ELLs: Riding a tandem bike. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 56–60.

Jones, S., Clarke, L. W., & Enriquez, G. (2010). *The reading turn-around*. Teachers College Press.

Klingner, J., & Vaughn, S. (1998). Using collaborative strategic reading. *The Council for Exceptional Children*, 30(6), 32–37.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Liberatory consequences of literacy: A case of culturally relevant instruction for African American students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 61(3), 378–391. doi:10.2307/2295255

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. doi:10.3102/00028312032003465

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the remix. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 74–84. doi:10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751

Balancing Literacies

Manternachto, K. (2019). *Meena meets her match*. Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.

McCarty, T. L., & Zepeda, O. (1995). Indigenous language education and literacy: Introduction to the theme issue. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1), 1–4. doi:10.1080/15235882.1995.10668587

Meyer, D. H., & Rose, A. (n.d.). Universal design for individual differences. *Educational Leadership*, 58(3), 39–43.

Moll, L. M., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. doi:10.1080/00405849209543534

Muñiz, J. (2019). *Culturally responsive teaching: A 50-state survey of teaching standards*. New America. <https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/reports/culturally-responsive-teaching/>

Nager, N., & Shapiro, E. K. (2007). A progressive approach to the education of teachers: Some principals from Bank Street College of education. *Occasional Paper Series*, 18.

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (n.d.). *What legal obligations do schools have to English Language Learners (ELLs)?* <https://ncela.ed.gov/faqs/view/6>

Nelson, L. L. (2013). *Design and deliver: Planning and teaching using universal design for learning*. Brooks Publishing.

Ohio State Literacy Collaborative. (2013). *Literacy collaborative framework for literacy lessons*. <https://lc.osu.edu/framework.html>

Online Stopwatch. (n.d.). *Sensory Timers- Relaxing Timers- Visual Timers*. <https://www.online-stopwatch.com/sensory-timers/>

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97. doi:10.3102/0013189X12441244

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85–100. doi:10.17763/haer.84.1.9821873k2ht16m77

Pilonieta, P., & Medina, A. (2009). Reciprocal teaching for the primary grades: “We can do it, too! *The Reading Teacher*, 63(2), 120–129. doi:10.1598/RT.63.2.3

Balancing Literacies

Rapp, W. H. (2015). *Universal design for learning in action: 100 ways to teach all learners*. Brooks Publishing.

Rasinski T. (n.d.). *Multidimensional Fluency Rubric*. http://www.timrasinski.com/presentations/multidimensional_fluency_rubric_4_factors.pdf

Riddell, S., Baron, S., & Wilson, A. (2001). Gender and post-school experience of women and men with learning difficulties. In B. Francis & C. Skelton (Eds.), *Investigating gender: Contemporary perspectives in education* (pp. 93–115). Open University Press.

Rogers, R., & Mosley, M. (2006). Racial literacy in a second-grade classroom: Critical race theory, whiteness studies, and literacy research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(4), 462–495. doi:10.1598/RRQ.41.4.3

Rose, D. H., & Gravel, J. W. (2010). Universal design for learning. In E. Baker, P. Peterson, & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed.). Elsevier. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00719-3

Shakespeare, T. (2013). The social model of disability. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 214–221). Routledge.

Sims Bishop, R. (1990). Mirrors, windows, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives - Gerontological Nursing Association*, 1(3), ix–xi.

Sokolowski, K. (2019). *Curating a classroom library*. Choice Literacy. <https://choiceliteracy.com/article/curating-a-classroom-library>

Texthelp Ltd. Company. (2019). <https://www.texthelp.com/en-us/products/read-write/>

Thomas, S. B., Cambron-McCabe, N. H., & McCarthy, M. M. (2009). *Public school law: Teachers' and students' rights* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Thorius, K. A. K., & Waitoller, F. R. (2017). Strategic coalitions against exclusion at the intersection of race and disability—A rejoinder. *Harvard Educational Review*, 87(2), 251–257. doi:10.17763/1943-5045-87.2.251

Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.

Tschida, C. M., Ryan, C. L., & Ticknor, A. S. (2014). Building on windows and mirrors: Encouraging the disruption of “single stories” through children’s literature. *Journal of Children’s Literature*, 40(1), 28–39.

Balancing Literacies

U.S. Department of Education. (2018). *Office of Civil Rights guidelines for English Language-Learning students (ELLs)*. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ellresources.html>

Valle, J., & Connor, D. (2019). *Rethinking disability: A disability studies approach to inclusive practices* (2nd ed.). McGraw Hill. doi:10.4324/9781315111209

Waitoller, F. R., & Thorius, K. A. K. (2016). Cross-pollinating culturally sustaining pedagogy and universal design for learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for dis/ability. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86(3), 366–389. doi:10.17763/1943-5045-86.3.366

ADDITIONAL READING

A Mighty Girl. (2012-2019). *A mighty girl book club*. <https://www.amightygirl.com/book-club>

Disability in Kidlit. (n.d.) <http://disabilityinkidlit.com/>

GrassROOTS Community Foundation. (2019). *1000 Black girl books resource guide*. <https://grassrootscommunityfoundation.org/1000-black-girl-books-resource-guide/>

Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain*. Corwin.

Latinxs in Kid Lit. Exploring the world of Latinx YA, MG, and children's literature. (n.d.) *Great resources*. <https://latinosinkidlit.com/great-resources/>

Lee and Low Books: About Everyone for Everyone (n.d.) *Resources for Educators*. <https://www.leeandlow.com/educators>

Love, B. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.

Paris, D. H., & Alim, S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.

Reese, D., & Mendoza, J. (n.d.) American Indians in children's literature. <https://americanindiansinchildrensliterature.blogspot.com/>

Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center. (n.d.) *Book dragon: Books for the multi-cultural reader*. <http://smithsonianapa.org/bookdragon/>

Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ACSD.

Balancing Literacies

We Need Diverse Books. (2019). *Where to find diverse books*. <https://diversebooks.org/resources/where-to-find-diverse-books/>

Wind, L. (n.d.) *I'm here. I'm queer. What the hell do I read?* <https://www.leewind.org/>

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Asset Pedagogies: Teaching that repositions the cultures, languages, and literacies of non-dominant communities, including working poor communities, indigenous communities, and communities of color, as resources and assets to value. These pedagogies work to move beyond supporting acquisition of dominant white middle class culture, language, and literacy skills and values to affirm and extend other ways of acting and being in schools.

Balanced Literacy: Balanced literacy is a decision-making approach where teachers make data-informed instructional decisions, selecting from a variety of components, in order to best meet the needs of a diverse array of literacy learners in their classroom. This approach balances meaning-making alongside code-breaking instruction, teaching skills both in isolation and in context, through different instructional practices.

Co-Teaching: Co-teaching is a service delivery model for students with disabilities that affords students with disabilities the benefits of being educated alongside their general education peers as well as with access to the general education curriculum. In this model, a special education teacher works full-time with a general education co-teacher to design and implement individualized instruction to meet unique learning needs and create access points to the general education curriculum.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP): An educational theory based on the work of Gloria Ladson-Billings that works to support students' achievement, students' cultural identity, and students' critical perspectives and practices to challenge inequality in education and the world.

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP): An educational theory based on the work of Samy Alim and Django Paris that builds upon the work of Gloria Ladson-Billings and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. CSP focuses on the multiple identities and cultures that contribute to youth culture, emphasizing hybridity, fluidity, and complexity. This work embraces global identities and supports students in a process of critical reflexivity, such as reflection on their cultural practices to identify what is emancipatory and for whom and what is oppressive in those movements.

Disability Studies in Education: A framework for conceptualizing disability that disrupts a medical understanding of disability by bringing historical, political, social, and cultural lenses to reread disability as an identity rather than solely an embodied impairment.

Balancing Literacies

Reading Workshop: An approach to teaching reading that involves a brief whole-class minilesson where the teacher demonstrates through think alouds with an authentic text and time for students to read independently while the teacher confers individually with students or provides small group instruction. Reading workshop lessons often include a mid-workshop check-in and a whole-class share to wrap up the instruction.

Universal Design for Learning: Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a decision-making framework to support educators in planning instruction that is both appropriately challenging and accessible for all learners. Based on 30 years of neuroscience research, UDL allows teachers to practically apply a DSE framework to their classroom environment, instructional design, and teaching practices.