Literacy Classrooms That S.O.A.R.

Introducing the SOAR Teaching Frames

New standards, including the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), require that your students engage with complex informational texts, use evidence in writing and research, discuss sophisticated disciplinary content, and work collaboratively to present ideas and communicate multiple perspectives. The integration of English language arts (ELA) standards within each content area raises expectations for your students' use of language to explain concepts and relationships that become progressively more abstract throughout schooling. Consequently, the new standards require you to use your subject-specific knowledge to help all students learn the academic language and skills of their respective fields and understand how to draw on the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of all your students to facilitate this. The standards also require a shared responsibility for students' disciplinary language and literacy development among all teachers at your school.

As teachers across the country implement these new standards, they are looking for instructional approaches to help them meet the challenges these standards bring. We created the Strategic Observation and Reflection (SOAR) Teaching Frames to help elementary teachers navigate the language and literacy development of their students in all content areas. When developing the SOAR Teaching Frames, we used the definition of *academic language* in the California English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework:

> Academic language broadly refers to the language used in school to help students develop content knowledge and the language students are expected to use to convey their understanding of this knowledge. It is a different way of using language than the type of English used in informal or everyday social interactions. (California Department of Education, 2014)

The SOAR Teaching Frames help teachers attend to the three features of academic language (vocabulary, syntax, and discourse) within sociocultural contexts for language use and do so in ways that respectfully encompass students' identities and social roles.

The frames offer teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators who are currently implementing new College- and Career-Readiness Standards a suite of tools that drive continuous improvement in teaching and learning. The tools can be useful for a variety of purposes: (a) informal or guided self-assessment of teaching practices, (b) peer-to-peer collaboration within learning communities to improve teaching, (c) site- and district-based professional-growth initiatives, and (d) formative and summative teacher assessment.

A RESEARCH-BASED APPROACH TO ELEVATING INSTRUCTION

Our work with schools and districts has shown us that instruction and student learning improve when an entire school is focused on a common set of high-impact instructional practices. This approach creates a common vision and language that promote collaboration and engage all teachers, instructional coaches, and principals in a focused dialogue on achieving those goals. More specifically, principals and instructional coaches need to understand how teachers develop their professional practice and use this knowledge to facilitate dialogue about teaching and learning (O'Hara, S., Bookmyer, J., Martin, R., & Newton, R., 2018). Research suggests that there is a need to focus the process of instructional improvement on a set of targeted, high-impact instructional practices (Fogo, 2011; Grossman, 2018; O'Hara, S., Bookmyer, J., Martin, R., & Newton, R., 2018; O'Hara & Pritchard, 2016; Pritchard & O'Hara, 2016; Windschitl, Thompson, & Braaten, 2011). Teachers and instructional coaches benefit from opportunities to engage with one another using a common language and vision of effective instruction that explicitly articulates the instructional shifts needed for improvements in learning. Consequently, professional-learning initiatives should provide teachers and coaches with time for deliberate practice of new instructional moves that are aligned with this vision (Fogo, 2011; Grossman & Davis, 2012; O'Hara, Zwiers, & Pritchard, 2014; Thompson, Windschitl, & Braaten, 2013).

Supportive colleagues, engaged principals, and sufficient resources are key to fostering the professional growth of teachers and instructional coaches. In addition, tools that support reflective practice within a community of peers elevate instruction for everyone (Curtis, 2013; Gronn, 2002; Hunzicker, 2013). Learning to enact a new instructional practice requires the ability to see and understand the underlying instructional moves required to implement that practice in the classroom. As such, professionals need tools and experiences that help them unpack instructional practices and distinguish stronger and weaker versions of the practices (Grossman, 2018; McDonald, Kazemi, & Kavanagh, 2013; O'Hara et al., 2018; Pritchard & O'Hara, 2016).

Based on this research, we designed the Teaching Frames to help teachers elevate their instructional practice and to provide tools for instructional coaches and principals in supporting them to do so. This body of research also informed the content of the Teaching Frames, which emerged from the research and professional development we have been conducting for more than 10 years. This work, and the results of our research, have shown us that the SOAR Teaching Frames for Literacy provide a unique approach for planning, implementing, and elevating instruction that significantly affects student learning. Having identified the practices that are most predictive of student growth, our team also developed a corresponding set of classroom vignettes and instructional strategies and tools to illustrate how these practices can be enacted in your classroom. The Teaching Frames are designed to help teachers support the disciplinary language and literacy development of all students, including students at different stages of language development. In addition, the strategies and tools that we have developed to accompany the frames are intentionally designed to support differentiation of both content and language. The classroom vignettes we use in this book to illustrate implementation of the frames are a compilation of different SOAR lessons we have observed in diverse elementary classrooms with a wide range of language abilities, cultural backgrounds, academic levels, and reading levels. As such, we created teacher and student profiles that represent the classrooms where we have observed SOAR practices implemented.

ELEVATING TEACHING PRACTICE IN SUPPORT OF NEW STANDARDS

Consider the following scenario. Ms. Rahim and Ms. Aguirre are colleagues. They both teach 5th grade with many English learners, and they often plan and reflect on lessons together. They have both been reading *There's a Boy in the Girls' Bathroom*, by Louis Sachar, with their class. As part of a new professional-learning project at their school, they have been using the SOAR Teaching Frames as the lens through which they plan, teach, reflect on, and elevate their teaching practice. Their current focus is on designing instruction to support their students to engage in discussions so that students build new ideas and deepen their understanding of disciplinary content. Ms. Rahim observes the implementation of a lesson by Ms. Aguirre, which is described in the vignette below.

Step Inside Ms. Aguirre's Classroom

Ms. Aguirre introduces the prompt students are to discuss: "Was it fair that Carla was removed from Red Hill School as a counselor and placed at the other school as a kindergarten teacher, or was it not fair?" The students are familiar with this activity. Ms. Aguirre asks the class, "How many details do

I want?" "Three," the class responds. She surveys the class for how many believe it was fair and for how many believe it was unfair. Students raise their hands. More students believe that it was unfair. As more students raise their hands for the unfair position, she explains that they will begin by writing evidence for the unfair position. Ms. Aguirre gives them 2 minutes to write three pieces of evidence from the book. When the 2 minutes are up, she asks them to shift their brains and think about the opposite side. She gives them 2 minutes to find three pieces of evidence for the fair position.

Next, she asks the students to stand up with their journal and pick a partner from a different table. Once the students have chosen partners, they decide who partner A is and who partner B is. She explains that partner A will argue to partner B that it was fair that Carla had to leave, and partner B will argue to partner A that it was unfair that she had to leave. Ms. Aguirre states, "You have to take turns going back and forth, and you're building your case. You're not just saying the same thing over every time you speak. You have to add something else so that by the end your case—your point of view—is built. Use evidence from the book to support what you're saying." She asks partners B to begin, and the pairs engage in the discussion.

That afternoon Ms. Rahim and Ms. Aguirre meet to discuss the lesson. They use the SOAR Disciplinary Discussions Teaching Frame to help them reflect on the lesson, plan for ways to improve upon the lesson, and elevate their instruction. The teachers agree that the prompt was a good one; it was open-ended and allowed for rich discussions. However, what they heard from students was more back-and-forth comments without building on one another's ideas. They discuss several ways they can elevate this lesson to make it better for Ms. Rahim to teach to her students:

- The teachers decide that one thing that would have helped students do a better job in their discussions would be sharing their evidence with other students to strengthen their ideas before they have a discussion with their partner.
- Ms. Aguirre thinks she should have modeled what she expected the discussion to sound like when introducing and citing specific evidence from the text for the students.
- The teachers decide that giving students written sentence frames for citing evidence from text instead of sharing them orally would offer the students more support for their discussion.
- During the SOAR professional-learning project, Ms. Rahim and Ms. Aguirre learned about explicitly teaching students conversation skills to use during a discussion and how important that is. They have taught the conversation skills, but they realize that in this discussion students would be relying more on the skills of fortifying and negotiating ideas. Therefore, they should explicitly say that and review those skills with students.

- Ms. Rahim wonders what strategies they could use to help students monitor their own discussions and take action to move the discussion forward if they are off-topic or stuck.
- Ms. Aguirre states that she believes she needed to monitor the discussion more carefully and provide targeted feedback in a timely way. Doing so would have facilitated deeper conversations, a building-up of new ideas, and a greater understanding of the issue.

Near the end of the conversation, Ms. Aguirre expresses that she did not feel there was enough new learning by her students as a result of their conversations: "I want to design my instruction so that students develop new and deeper understanding as a result of participating in academic conversations. I don't want the academic conversations in my class to be busywork where students are simply stating what they already know." Ms. Rahim prepares the elevated lesson as they discussed, with plans for Ms. Aguirre to observe.

Step Inside Ms. Rahim's Classroom

Ms. Rahim introduces the prompt they are to discuss: "Today we are going to discuss: Was it fair that Carla was removed from Red Hill School as a counselor and placed at the other school as a kindergarten teacher, or was it not fair? Please prepare for this discussion by taking out your novel and the graphic organizer that you completed yesterday where you wrote three pieces of evidence for the agree position and three pieces of evidence for the disagree position. I'm going to give you some time to meet with your reading partner and share your evidence for each side of the argument. You can ask clarifying questions to help your partner be clearer with his or her ideas and evidence."

When students have finished sharing, she brings the class back together. "What is the conversation skill that we will use and develop for this activity and why?" Xiomara shares her thoughts: "The conversation skill we are focusing on is Fortify. We are working on how to get better at explaining how the evidence from the text supports our position." Ms. Rahim says, "You are correct, Xiomara. Now let's review the prompts and responses for Fortify. First, let's do the hand signal. (Place your hand palm down as if putting an idea on the table and use the fingertips of the other hand to support the palm.) What do the fingers under your palm represent? Yes, the evidence. Now let's read the prompt starters. 'Show me where. How do you know? Where do you notice that?' And the responses are . . . ? 'In the text . . . , I know because . . . , An example is . . . .' Good! Today, I am distributing more specific sentence frames for you to use to help us focus on explaining how the evidence supports your position. Let's read them together."

- I agree/think that it was fair that Carla was removed from Red Hill School and placed at another school because . . . .

- I agree/think that it was not fair that Carla was removed from Red Hill School and placed at another school because . . . .
- An example in the text is . . . .
- I agree with what you said about . . . , but/and I also think . . . .
- I understand that you think . . . , but I think . . . because . . . .

"I am going to model for you how you will state your opinion and cite the evidence from the text using the sentence frames. 'I think that it was not fair that Carla was removed from Red Hill School and placed at another school because she was an excellent counselor. She really helped Bradley be a better person. An example of that was when she tells Bradley that "friends handle their problems by talking about them. That's why we've become such good friends, because we've learned to talk to each other." This shows how she is helping him understand what friends are.' Now, if you were my partner, what would you say next? Talk to your partner and decide how you can add on or build off of my idea." Students share, and Ms. Rahim explains how their responses add to her ideas.

"Before we begin our discussions, I want to remind you about monitoring your discussions and using the conversation skills. What you should monitor during the discussion is your use of sentence frames and how you are explaining the ways in which the evidence connects to the position. I will monitor and provide feedback during the discussion on how effectively you explain the ways in which the evidence supports your position."

Ms. Rahim listens to students' discussions. She hears two students discussing how it was not fair for Carla to be removed from Red Hill. Maegan says, "I think when Carla told Bradley's mom that she had heard a lot of horror stories about Bradley, but couldn't wait to meet him, shows she was a good counselor." Justin responds, "I agree." Ms. Rahim asks Justin if he could add to Maegan's evidence besides just saying he agrees. Justin says, "I remember that Carla added that she thought Bradley sounded charming and delightful, which would show she was open-minded and didn't depend on what others thought." Ms. Rahim: "Much better, Justin! That adds to what Maegan said. I took notes and will use them to give you individual, written feedback on your discussions. Please return to your seats and take out your journals."

These vignettes illustrate how these two teachers used a SOAR Teaching Frame to reflect on their instruction and to elevate their practice. The first vignette in the scenario provides an example of a lesson in which many students were engaged, on-topic, and participating in a conversation. However, when the teachers reflected, they believed the lesson could have been stronger. Ms. Aguirre believed that not enough new learning for her students resulted from their conversations. She wanted the conversations students engaged in to lead to new learning and a deeper understanding of the disciplinary content. We can see how the new ideas that both teachers generated

during their reflective discussion using the SOAR Teaching Frame led to an elevation of instruction seen in the Ms. Rahim vignette. For example, Ms. Rahim

- explicitly teaches the students about the conversation skills needed to engage in discussion and provides supports for students to use those skills,
- puts structures in place to ensure that all students participate in the discussions,
- reminds the students about monitoring their own discussions and provides supports for them to do so, and
- closely monitors the discussions and provides targeted feedback along the way.

We developed the SOAR Teaching Frames for Literacy to help teachers analyze their instruction and target the disciplinary language and literacy skills students need to successfully meet the expectations of new standards. The opening scenario is focused on the Disciplinary Discussions Teaching Frame, one of four Teaching Frames introduced in this chapter that form the basis for Chapters 2–5. Disciplinary Discussions is one of four High-Impact Practices that emerged from our extensive research as having significant potential to drive student learning as articulated in new standards like the CCSS and NGSS. In the sections below, we describe the SOAR practices and the associated SOAR Teaching Frames.

THE SOAR PRACTICES

We conducted an empirical study (O'Hara & Pritchard, 2016) using a Delphi panel technique (Steurer, 2011) to answer the question: Which instructional practices are most essential and provide the highest impact for promoting disciplinary language and literacy development for all students? The approach featured multiple rounds of survey analysis to develop group consensus around specific issues, in this case, taking instructional practices already identified in research literature and building consensus around those believed to have the most impact on student learning.

At the top of each of the four SOAR Teaching Frames is a High-Impact Practice that our research identified as driving student learning as articulated in the CCSS ELA and Anchor Literacy Standards. The four High-Impact Practices that we have identified appear in Figure 1.1. Below we describe these practices and the essential elements that comprise them.

- *Disciplinary Discussions:* This practice focuses on structuring, strengthening, and supporting *students' ability to engage in student-*

Figure 1.1. SOAR High-Impact Practices

to-student *disciplinary discussions*. Disciplinary discussions can
consist of face-to-face interactions, online dialogues, and written
conversations (Kazemi & Hintz, 2014; Zwiers & Crawford, 2011;
Zwiers, O'Hara, & Pritchard, 2014b). When implementing this
practice, effective teachers explicitly build students' conversation
skills and support the application of these skills through extended
opportunities to engage in discussions.

- *Disciplinary Interactions With Complex Text:* This practice focuses on
structuring, strengthening, and supporting student interaction with
complex text to develop academic language and disciplinary literacy
(Cummins, 2013; Fisher & Frey, 2014; Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2012).
When implementing this practice, effective teachers engage students
in an analysis of text to examine how language, text features, and/
or literary devices are used to convey meaning. Effective teachers
also provide opportunities for students to interact with complex
text to build academic language and disciplinary skills.

- *Disciplinary Uses of Evidence:* This practice focuses on structuring,
strengthening, and supporting *uses of multiple forms of evidence
in disciplinary writing and speaking* (Andrews, Torgerson, Low,
& McGuinn, 2009; Kibler, Walqui, & Bunch, 2015). When
implementing this practice, effective teachers foster students' ability
to analyze textual and oral evidence for relevancy, and they provide
opportunities for students to identify and use evidence to develop
and support claims.

- **Disciplinary Communication:** This practice focuses on structuring, strengthening, and supporting the quantity and quality of *students' oral and written output using academic language* (Bernabei & Reimer, 2013; O'Hara, Pritchard, & Zwiers, 2014). When implementing this practice, effective teachers provide opportunities for students to produce and fortify both oral and written communication.

The qualitative findings from the Delphi panel suggest that these essential High-Impact Practices alone, although central to effective disciplinary language and literacy instruction, do not get to the core of teaching. Effective teachers enact a set of instructional moves in support of these essential High-Impact Practices. We labeled these moves Cross-Cutting Practices, and they include Facilitating Acquisition of Academic Language, Fostering Metacognition for Disciplinary Learning, and Monitoring and Guiding Disciplinary Learning.

- **Facilitating Acquisition of Academic Language:** This practice focuses on structuring, strengthening, and supporting the acquisition and use of the language needed to participate in knowledge construction and disciplinary tasks. Disciplinary language has three distinct features: vocabulary, syntax, and discourse (August, Branum-Martin, Cardenas-Hagan, Francis, Powell, Moore, & Haynes, 2014; Cook, Boals, & Lundberg, 2011; Nagy & Townsend, 2012). When implementing this practice, effective teachers introduce and refer to the academic language demands of texts and tasks, and they provide opportunities for students to acquire and use the features (vocabulary, syntax, and discourse) of academic language.
- **Fostering Metacognition for Disciplinary Learning:** This practice focuses on the degree to which a teacher visibly enacts and deconstructs metacognitive processes and strategies that *foster students' metacognitive knowledge.* Examples of metacognitive processes include self-monitoring, self-assessing, self-questioning, and selection of strategies (Marzano & Heflebower, 2011; Schoenbach, Greenleaf, & Murphy, 2012). When implementing this practice, effective teachers visibly enact metacognitive processes and strategies they want students to use, and they deconstruct those processes and strategies so that students understand how, why, and when to use them.
- **Monitoring and Guiding Disciplinary Learning:** This practice focuses on how effectively a teacher monitors and guides the disciplinary learning throughout each task and the lesson as a whole, as well as adjusts and supports disciplinary tasks to meet the current needs of all students in the classroom. This practice also includes providing

feedback and *gradually removing supports to foster students' ability to work flexibly and independently* (Marzano, Yanoski, Hoegh, & Simms, 2013; Wiggins, 2012). When implementing this practice, effective teachers monitor learning and adjust instruction to meet student needs, and they provide feedback during lessons to promote disciplinary learning.

Finally, in preparation for enactment of High-Impact and Cross-Cutting Practices, teachers employ a Foundational Practice.

- **Designing Instruction for Disciplinary Thinking and Understanding:** This practice focuses on the design of lessons and learning tasks *to promote academic language and literacy* and support the target High-Impact Practices. This practice also focuses on how clearly and directly the teacher aligns disciplinary learning targets with the lesson's texts and tasks and *enables students to meet the demands of the disciplinary content academic and language* (Marzano et al., 2013; Wilson, Sztajn, Edington, & Myers, 2015). When implementing this practice, effective teachers set learning targets that are aligned with content standards and the target High-Impact Practice, they structure and connect tasks that support these learning targets, and they establish high expectations and maintain the intellectual rigor of classroom activities.

SOAR TEACHING FRAMES

To illustrate the interconnectedness of the practices, we organized them into Teaching Frames. Each Teaching Frame consists of a different High-Impact Practice supported by the Cross-Cutting and Foundational Practices, which are common across all frames. Each of the High-Impact and Cross-Cutting Practices has two elements, whereas the Foundational Practice has three (Table 1.1).

Together, the SOAR Teaching Frames for Literacy and their associated implementation rubrics (which we present in Chapter 6) form a framework for improving these eight essential practices in the elementary grades. This framework allows teachers to understand, enact, and reflect on the practices to elevate their teaching. In addition, the framework provides a common language so that teachers and instructional coaches can provide constructive and strategic feedback to their peers.

When implemented in the field, the SOAR Teaching Frames are typically introduced and implemented one at a time, starting with Disciplinary Discussions and bringing in new frames in the order indicated in Figure 1.1. Teachers with whom we have worked, from preservice through induction to

Table 1.1. The SOAR Teaching Frame Structure

HIGH-IMPACT PRACTICE *One of the four High-Impact Practices sits on top of each teaching frame.*	• Element 1 of the practice • Element 2 of the practice		
CROSS-CUTTING PRACTICES *The same three Cross-Cutting Practices repeat across each teaching frame.*	Facilitating Acquisition of Academic Language (FAAL) • Element 1 of the practice • Element 2 of the practice	Fostering Metacognition for Disciplinary Learning (FM) • Element 1 of the practice • Element 2 of the practice	Monitoring and Guiding Disciplinary Learning (MG) • Element 1 of the practice • Element 2 of the practice
FOUNDATIONAL PRACTICE *The same Foundational Practice sits at the bottom of each teaching frame.*	Designing Instruction for Disciplinary Thinking and Understanding (DI) • Element 1 of the practice • Element 2 of the practice • Element 3 of the practice		

in-service, spend time understanding each Teaching Frame and engaging in cycles of inquiry where they use that Frame for planning, implementing, reflecting on, and elevating instruction. The common language of the Frames allows groups of teachers to collaborate on these cycles of inquiry together, which enhances teaching and learning.

The Cross-Cutting and Foundational Practices repeat across each of the four frames. Our work has shown us that although most teachers understand the need to build academic language, foster metacognition, and guide learning and language use, more explicit attention needs to be paid to a connected enactment of these practices in order to support the end goal for students. For example, if your aim as a teacher is to have your students engage in a rich disciplinary discussion, build up new ideas, and construct new understanding, then you should facilitate their acquisition of the academic language they need to achieve that goal. You also should help them realize when a discussion is stalled or not on track and provide them with strategies to use to get the discussion back on track. Finally, you should carefully monitor and guide their engagement in a discussion and their use of academic language during that discussion. And when you plan for a lesson where students will be engaged in disciplinary discussion, you should think through the moves you can make during instruction as well as the materials and support you need to help your students be successful. The structure of the Teaching Frames, therefore, provides support for making teaching more intentional and for facilitating tighter connections among teaching practices to help students be successful.

Having identified the practices that are most predictive of student growth, our team next developed a corresponding set of videos and materials to illustrate what these practices look like when enacted in the classroom. We developed a platform (soarpractices.org) designed around the SOAR Teaching Frames to

- help teachers and administrators deepen their understanding of the SOAR practices by engaging in a series of online modules and accessing additional instructional strategies;
- allow teachers and administrators to use SOAR for self-reflection and for formative and summative teacher assessment, by providing interactive activities to deepen understanding of the SOAR rubrics; and
- scaffold professional learning for teachers in different grade spans (pre-K–2, 3–8, and 9–12) and across content areas (ELA, social studies, science, and mathematics) by providing them with access to additional video examples of the practices implemented in a range of classrooms.

FINDINGS FROM OUR WORK IN THE FIELD

We conducted a series of studies based on our SOAR implementation work in the field. We worked with very large, mid-sized, and small districts in urban, rural, and suburban settings. The contexts for the studies varied with respect to student and teacher diversity. For example, we worked in

- a large urban district with a high English learner population and a very diverse teaching force,
- a small suburban district with a high percentage of English learners and a less diverse teaching force, and
- a mid-sized district with a low percentage of English learners, a high percentage of English-speaking students who struggled with disciplinary language and literacy, and a teaching force that was primarily white and female.

The work was conducted with teachers at various stages in their careers, from beginning teachers to veteran teachers. We designed studies to investigate the impact of teacher use of the SOAR Teaching Frames to plan, implement, reflect on, and elevate instruction. In each context, the work we facilitated aimed to build capacity for improved disciplinary language and literacy development of all groups of students.

The central research questions that cut across these studies were as follows:

1. How did training and engagement with the SOAR Teaching Frames affect teacher practices?
   a. To what extent did teachers begin to adopt the language of SOAR?
   b. Was participation in the intervention associated with improvements in teachers' confidence to effectively plan for and teach disciplinary language and literacy?
   c. How did teachers' instructional practices change, if at all, as a result of the intervention, and to what degree were changes in instructional practices aligned with SOAR elements?
2. How did training and engagement with the SOAR Teaching Frames affect student outcomes?
   a. To what degree did students incorporate academic language into classroom tasks and activities?
   b. To what extent were metacognitive strategies utilized by students during classroom tasks and activities?
   c. How did student performance on standardized tests change, if at all, as a result of teachers' participation in SOAR?

We developed several SOAR-aligned instruments to capture changes in instruction throughout implementation of the model. These instruments were field-tested to establish their reliability and validity.

Change in Instructional Practice

Across all studies, analyses of growth on SOAR rubric scores indicated significant positive differences between treatment and comparison groups. The observed large effect sizes for all practices (.47–.60) indicated significant main effects attributable to the intervention. The Cross-Cutting Practice with the largest observed effect was Fostering Metacognition for Disciplinary Learning, which focuses on the degree to which a teacher visibly enacts and deconstructs metacognitive processes and strategies that foster students' metacognitive knowledge. We also found large effects on teachers' intentional actions for Monitoring and Guiding Disciplinary Learning and Facilitating Acquisition of Academic Language.

The results we found from the analyses of SOAR rubric scores parallel teachers' self-reported increases in their knowledge about academic language and literacy and in their ability to integrate language and content during instruction. Analyses of scores from self-assessment surveys across studies show a statistically significant impact on teachers' knowledge and use of SOAR practices. Specifically, the most significant shifts were found on teachers' ability to integrate language and content through discussion, implement in-the-moment teaching moves, and engage in metacognitive teaching.

Change in Student Outcomes

The impact of these instructional changes was evident in student outcomes over the course of the SOAR interventions. Results across all studies show that students significantly improved their disciplinary discussion and communication skills as a result of the intervention. In one study, for example, we found very large effects (d = 1.71) on a measure of students' ability to engage in discussions. This analysis showed that students significantly improved their ability to build up an idea and to use academic language appropriately in a discussion. Finally, significant differences were found across all studies between treatment students' performance on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) tests in math and ELA in comparison to their non-SOAR peers. The studies showed that these significant differences were also evident for subgroups, including students classified as English learners, students reclassified as English proficient within the prior 3 years, and students classified as English-only students.

CONCLUSION

This chapter describes essential instructional practices that drive student learning as articulated in the CCSS, NGSS, and state ELD standards as well as a framework for how these essential practices are interconnected in effective academic language and disciplinary literacy teaching. We designed this book to be a practical guide that will help you understand each of the SOAR Teaching Frames as well as to provide you with instructional strategies and tools for implementing the practices within each frame across content areas and grade levels. We also provide vignettes from actual elementary classrooms so that you can see what the SOAR Teaching Frames look like when implemented.

We are currently using the framework and corresponding support materials in professional-learning programs for teachers, instructional coaches, and instructional leaders in partner districts and schools across the United States. Consequently, the examples in the book come from a range of contexts. Findings from our work demonstrate that the SOAR Teaching Frames for Literacy provide a suite of powerful tools for supporting leaders', coaches', and teachers' adoption and enactment of these practices in their contexts, and ultimately for improving academic outcomes for all students.