

Course Title: VoyagerU Targeted Course: Content Integration

Instructor: Dr. Tim Ham

Course Description:

VoyagerU's targeted Content Integration course focuses on integrating reading skills into social studies and science instruction. This course teaches participants to design effective, integrated lessons to use throughout the instructional day.

Course Objective/Goals:

Participants will:

- Understand how cross-curricular learning impacts student achievement
- Make content “come to life” through graphic organizers, technology, and other instructional reading elements
- Maximize academic content without compromising language arts instruction
- Apply content integration techniques at all instructional levels

Course Outline: (Please Attach)

Continuous Improvement Cycle

The Content Integration course follows an instructional model that facilitates continual learning and improvement. Participants complete coursework through personalized learning based on their individual needs and the needs of their students. Following the Four-Step learning model, educators:

1. **LEARN** about effective classroom instruction
2. **PLAN** their learning path and focus on areas of improvement
3. **DELIVER** classroom instruction applying new strategies
4. **REFLECT** on observational feedback and collaborate with peers

Content Integration is separated into three sections: (1) Learn About, (2) Lesson Delivery 1, and (3) Lesson Delivery 2. In each section, participants learn about content integration by completing interactive activities that fall within the LEARN, PLAN, DELIVER, and REFLECT sections of the continuous improvement cycle.

Section Activities

Learn About – In the **Learn About** section, participants complete activities to LEARN about content integration and REFLECT on current knowledge, as well as new information learned in the course. Activities in this section include:

- *Introduction to Content Integration* – LEARN the research base behind content integration.
- *Using Content Integration* – LEARN the four components of content integration needed to improve delivery of integrated lessons in reading and the content areas.
- *Self-Assessment* – REFLECT on current knowledge of the four components and rate knowledge on a scale of 1-5. Based on this assessment, participants will choose two components they feel they need to work on during **Lesson Delivery 1**.
- *Collaboration Activity* – REFLECT on learned material and share with a peer or group.

Discussion boards allow additional opportunities to reinforce materials and collaborate.

- *Unit Survey* – REFLECT on unit experience.

In the second and third sections, **Lesson Delivery 1** and **Lesson Delivery 2**, participants complete activities that fall within all four parts of the continuous improvement cycle. Activities include:

• *Content Activity* – LEARN and complete two interactive activities from the four components of content integration:

1. Vocabulary

2. Text Types

3. Graphic Organizers

4. Comprehension Strategies

• *PLAN Activity* – Participants complete an interactive activity to learn about the PLAN process, practice using a sample lesson, and incorporate feedback.

• *Lesson Observation Activity* – LEARN about the importance of peer observation and how to give and receive constructive feedback.

• *Design a Classroom Plan* – Participants synthesize learnings and design a two-week classroom PLAN, DELIVER instruction according to plan, and practice for lesson observation.

• *Lesson Delivery Observation Report Form* – After participants DELIVER a lesson, they REFLECT on their observations and identify how much they have grown during the unit.

• *Self-Assessment* – REFLECT on what was learned in **Lesson Delivery 1**, and rate their knowledge of content integration. Participants decide which two skills they will work on during Lesson Delivery 2.

• *Collaboration Activity* – REFLECT on **Lesson Delivery 1** and discuss what was learned, including current articles about content integration, with peers.

• *Course Summary* – REFLECT on **Lesson Delivery 2** and watch a short video to summarize the continuous learning cycle that was completed.

• *Unit Survey* – REFLECT on what was learned in **Lesson Delivery 1** and **Lesson Delivery 2**.

Method of Evaluating Student’s Performance:

1990pts – 1791pts = A

1790pts – 1592pts = B

1591pts – 1393pts = C

1392pts – 1194pts = D

1193pts and below = F

***Required log documenting 10 hours of instructional application.**

Textbooks and/or Other Materials:

Voyager Expanded Learning, LP will provide text and materials.

Bibliography:

Florida Center for Reading Research:

<http://www.fcrr.org/FCRRReports/guidingquestions.htm>

Gibb, G.S. and Wilder, L.K. (2002). Using functional analysis to improve reading instruction for students with learning disabilities and emotional disorders. *Preventing School Failure*, 46, 152-157.

Kame'enui, E., Francis, D., Fuchs, L., Good, R. H., O'Connor, R., Simmons, D. C., et al.

(2002). *An analysis of reading assessment instruments for k-3* (Report). Eugene: Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement, College of Education, University of Oregon. Information also gathered from, US Dept of Education. No Child Left Behind.

http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing_jhtml?src=pb

Lyon, G.R. (2002). Researching “What Works.” Presentation at the 2002 Education Leaders Council Conference. September 2002

Moats, L.C., (2000). *Whole language live on: The illusion of balanced reading instruction*. Progressive Policy Institute: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Neuman, S. B. (2002). *How can I help children get ready for reading?* Center for Improvement of Early Reading Achievement: U.S. Department of Education.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Neuman, Susan B., Copple, Carol, and Bredekamp, Sue. (2000). *Learning to Read and Write: Developmentally Appropriate Practices for Young Children*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Brody, Sara. (2001). *Teaching Reading: Language, Letters & Thought* (2nd ed.). Milford, NH: LARC Publishing.

Peregoy, Suzanne, & Boyle, Owen. (2000). *Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for K–12 Teachers* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Cummins, J. (1999). Alternative paradigms in bilingual education research: Does theory have a place. *Educational Researcher* 28 (7), 26-34.

Fitzgerald, J. (1999). About hopes, aspirations, and uncertainty: First grade English-language learners' emergent reading. Journal of Literacy Research 31 (2), 133-182.

Van den Branden, K. (2000). Does negotiation of meaning promote reading comprehension? A study of multilingual primary school classes. Reading Research Quarterly, 35, 426-443.

Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P.D., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade reading instruction in low income schools. Elementary School Journal, 101, 121-165.

Symons, S., MacLatchy-Gaudet, H., Stone, T. D., & Reynolds, P. L. (2001). Strategy instruction for elementary students searching informational text. Scientific Studies of Reading, 5, 1-33.

Stasz, C., & Stecher, B. M. (2000). Teaching mathematics and language arts in reduced size and non-reduced size classrooms. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22, 313-329.

Nye, B., Hedges, L. V., & Konstantopoulos, S. (2000). The effects of small classes on academic achievement: The results of the Tennessee class size experiments. American Educational Research Journal, 37, 123-151.

National Reading Panel (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups. Washington DC: National Institute of Child Health and Development.

Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson, P.D., & Barr, R. (2000). Handbook of reading research, Volume III. Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.