

Called to Teach: Advocating for Literacy in a Climate of Political Division(1)

I have chosen this title for my talk today because I believe that too many literacy teachers, literacy teacher educators, and society generally are sliding slowly but ever so surely into cynicism and fear. In some sense, we seem to have lost our personal and professional moorings as teachers – the anchor of hope and the beacons of our profession – idealism and optimism.

(1)Parker Palmer in his book, *The Courage to Teach*, has caused me, after multiple re-readings of his work, to reflect upon my early sense of wonder and calling as a teacher. I don't remember exactly when the moment came that I felt called to teach. But I do remember a profound feeling that this was to be my life's vocation and avocation.

Frederick Buechner (1993) offers a generous and humane image of vocation as “the place where your deep gladness and the world's deep hunger meet.” Parker Palmer goes on to say that, “If a work is mine to do, it will make me glad over the long haul, despite the difficult days... If a work does not gladden me in these ways, I need to consider laying it down. When I devote myself to something that does not flow from my identity, that is not integral to my nature, I am most likely deepening the world's hunger rather than helping to alleviate it.”

I, like you, know that teaching literacy involves much more than instructing subjects, skills, concepts, and strategies. It is much more than testing, grades, management, or even a good lesson plan. It extends beyond simplistic or even complex applications of modern technology. Teachers who feel called to teach children to read realize that the act of teaching reading cannot be reduced to the simple sum of its parts. Teaching is composed of a lifetime of devotion to promoting the good of others through the denial of self. In short, teaching is ultimately a powerfully human endeavor of the heart and the head. (3)A poem authored by Brod Bagert in a book entitled, *Rainbows, Headlice, and Pea Green Tile*, brings home this point far better than I. In his poem, *The Answer Machine*, Brod relates how a veteran teacher, one who was wondering about her life and calling as a teacher noticed the light flashing on her answering machine, and remembered why she had spent a lifetime teaching children to read.

*She sat on the edge
Of a one-woman king-sized bed
And wondered if she could face another day.
Twenty-seven years in the classroom.*

*She tried not to think about it.
She tried not to remember her first-year-teacher dreams,
Dreams she had saved
Like the petals from a prom-corsage,*

*(4)But now her tomorrows
Were heartbeats in a restless sleep
And dreams didn't matter anymore.*

*So with a sigh no one else could hear,
She readied pad and pencil
And pressed the play-back button
On her answer machine..*

*(5)Hello Mrs. Stevenson,
This is Charlie MacWhite.
You probably don't remember me
But you taught me in the second grade,
I was the kid who still couldn't read.
Well I was thinking about you last night, I was reading Brown Bear to my
little girl
And it was strange
It was me saying the words...*

(6)But I kept on hearing your voice in my head...

*All these years
And your voice is still in my head.*

*Well I hope I didn't bother you,
But I just called to say you were right,
I did go to college,
And I did just fine,*

*(7)And I wanted to say thank you...
Thanks for everything.*

*She sat on the edge
Of a one-woman king-sized bed,
Put pad and pencil down,
And smiled.
Twenty-seven years in the classroom..*

*Children, Children what do you see?
I see a teacher looking at me.*

What are the hallmarks of effective literacy teachers? As I contemplated this question, I composed seven hallmarks of highly effective reading teachers. (8)

Hallmark 1: Highly effective reading teachers are knowledgeable. (Mention new book)

- *Content Knowledge*
- *Pedagogical Knowledge*
- *Assessment Knowledge*
- *Programs and Standards*

Teacher knowledge about various aspects, linguistic knowledge, children's literature knowledge, etc., of reading instruction has been shown in a variety of studies to predict their students' reading achievement.

(9) Hallmark 2: Highly effective reading teachers are excellent classroom managers. (Mention new book)

Classroom management refers to the ability of a teacher to productively organize, direct, and manage the classroom environment so that effective teaching and student learning is made possible (Snow, Griffin, & Burns, 2005). Excellent classroom management requires teachers to know and use a complex set of skills and strategies to accomplish such tasks as allocating classroom space across multiple uses, supplying and arranging classroom materials, clearly communicating expectations and rules within a positive classroom climate, employing effective instructional practices, effectively training students in classroom routines and procedures, and establishing a predictable and familiar daily classroom schedule (Morrow, Reutzel, & Casey, 2006; Reutzel & Morrow, in press).

(10) Hallmark 3: Highly effective reading teachers begin the teaching process by first assessing what students already know and can do.

Principle 1: Determine What Children Can Do, Not Just What They Cannot Do

Principle 2: Effective Assessment Informs Teachers' Instructional Decision Making

Principle 3: Document Students' Growth in Literacy over Time

Principle 4: Literacy Assessment Should Provide Insight into the Processes of Reading and Writing, Not Only the Product

Principle 5: Assess the Entire Context of Each Child's Opportunities to Learn to Read

(11) Hallmark 4: Highly effective reading teachers know how to adapt instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

There is an increasing tendency in some schools to engage in a "one size fits all" reading curriculum that will not reach all of the children (Raphael, Florio-Ruane, Kehus, George, Hasty, & Highfield, 2003; Tyner, 2004). The imperative to meet every student's needs in learning to read in today's increasingly diverse classroom environments is complex and challenging. It seems that the only way to adapt instruction to meet all students' needs is to pursue what is currently called "differentiating instruction" (Gregory & Chapman, 2002; Tomlinson, 1999).

(12) Characteristic 5: Highly effective teachers teach the essential components of reading using evidence-based instructional practices.

(13) Essentials to Teach:

- Oral Language Development
- Concepts of Printed Language
- Letter Name Knowledge and Production
- Sight Word Recognition
- Phonemic Awareness
- Phonics
- Fluency
- Vocabulary

- Comprehension

(14) Essentials to Teach:

- Resources or Supplies/Materials to be Provided:
- Provide access to a variety of interesting and appropriately challenging reading and writing materials to include both good literature and information books
- Provide access to supportive and assistive technologies for learning to read and write
- Provide adequate time and supplied for socio-dramatic, literacy enriched play in kindergarten
- Provide adequate time for reading and writing instruction
- Provide adequate time for reading and writing practice
- Provide extra time and expert help for those who struggle
- Reach out to and involve parents in interacting with their children around reading and writing

(15) Essentials to Teach:

- Selected Instructional Practices worth Modeling and Implementing:
- Reading and writing to and with children
- Make use of captioned–television to aid in reading practice
- Encourage viewing of educational television programming to increase world knowledge
- Model and encourage talk about texts to improve comprehension
- Connect literature study to content learning in other curriculum areas
- Create print rich, well organized, and highly interactive classroom environments
- Provide explicit instruction on reading and writing skills, strategies, and processes

(16) Characteristic 6: Highly effective reading teachers encourage real reading and writing opportunities every day.

I was not prepared for what was to come this stormy morning in February. It was early, well before the first bell rang, that Crystal shyly peeked around the open door frame leading into my first grade classroom. "Who is that

peeking into my room," I queried. No answer was forthcoming. I strolled purposefully toward the open door slowing as I came near. I quickly moved to the side and peeked around the door. Crystal was startled as I asked, "What are you doing here so early today?" "Nothin'" was the reply. She stood with arms tightly tucked behind her back. It appeared as if she was hiding something from me. "What ya got behind you," came my question. "A story," she said reticently. "Can I see it?" "I guess," she replied. Almost without hesitation she thrust the half sheets of roughly cut lined paper held together with three staples unevenly spaced across the top into my waiting hands. I looked at the title, "The Day My Mom Died." Instantly I knew this book was not just a story, but a deep seated offering of the heart. "Are you sure I should read this?" "Yes, I want you to." "Crystal, I think we should sit down for this, is that OK?" "Sure." I maneuvered my way back to my desk where I kept a supply of Kleenex tissues in a brightly decorated box. Instinctively, I reached for her tiny hand. "Shall we go sit on the rocking chair?" "OK," she replied. Next, I did what I had been told never to do. I sat down in the big rocking chair at the back of the room. I pulled Crystal up tight on my lap and curled my arms around her with the book in front of both of us. Before I began, I situated the tissue close at hand. "Now, I began. Are we ready?" "Uh, uh," she nodded weaving her head up and down. "I read the title aloud, The Day My Mom Died. I turned to the next page,(17) "When I was two years old and my brother was one, my Mom was getting sick." (18)"My Mom was getting cancer." My voice began to waver and my eyes began to fill with tears. Oh, no I thought. I can't bear to share these painful memories, with one of my dearest, and most tender young students. I was struggling to fight back the tears. The story continued, (19)"Cancer is a disease that eats your body." (20) "When my Mom was in the hospital, I kept on asking where my Mom was. My Dad said in this room." Next came the stab to my heart, (21)"Then one day, my Mom died." Oh, my heart was wrenching with pain for her. Tears coursed down my cheeks. I looked at her, she was also looking down with eyes near brimming over with tears. "Are you all right, Crystal." "Uh, uh," as she choked back waves of pulsating sobs. I continued, (22)"Her grave is in Nephi. (23)I love my Mom." As I read these words, my voice cracked. Deep within my abdomen a convulsion of sorrow ripped through my body. I began sobbing audibly while hurriedly turning to the final page. It read, (24) "But now I have a new Mom and I love her too." We just sat for a moment locked in emotion. I smiled wryly, and squeezed her. Crystal, thank you for letting me share that story with you. I am so happy you were able to write down how you felt. I will always deeply appreciate this moment together.

(25) *Characteristic 7: Highly effective reading teachers partner with other teachers, parents, and community members to ensure children's learning.*

Reading teachers in the 21st century no longer have the luxury of viewing effective outreach from the school classroom to the home as merely a good or even an important idea. In *Beating the Odds in Teaching All Children to Read*, Taylor, Pearson, Clark, and Walpole (2000) observed, “The 4 most effective schools made a more concerted effort to reach out to parents than the other schools. Efforts included conducting focus groups, written or phone surveys, and having an active site council on which parents served” (p. 2).

(26) Parker Palmer describes a culture of fear and disconnection brought on by embracing and nurturing a polarizing culture.

The culture of disconnection that undermines teaching and learning in our present educational climate is driven partly by *fear*. But it is also driven by our Western commitment to thinking in polarities, a thought form that elevates disconnection into an intellectual virtue.

We distort things this way all the time because we are trained neither to voice both sides of an issue nor to listen with both ears. The problem goes deeper than the bad habit of competitive conversation some of us have: tell me your thesis and I will find any way, fair or foul, to argue the other side! We fragment the world and reality into an endless series of either-ors. In a phrase, Parker Palmer, suggests that we “think the world apart.”

How can we escape the grip of either-or thinking? What would it look and feel like to “think the world together again?” Wouldn’t this require us to use our discriminatory logic where it serves us well but to develop a more capacious habit of mind that supports the capacity for connectedness on which good teaching depends? Take for example a contemporary issue such as the No Child Left Behind Act - the reauthorization of the 1964 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Do we take up sides on this issue, vehemently arguing for or against this legislation – thinking the world apart – rather than giving voice to both sides of an issue and to listening with both ears.

For example, on the positive side, who can argue with the intent of the new law? As Ernest Boyer once said in 1995 in relation to Goals 2000, “This is, I understand, an audacious, hugely optimistic proposition. Indeed, some of my friends upon hearing about the national goal dismissed it as wholly unrealistic. But my response to it was, “What did you expect the President to say, that by the year 2000, half the children will come to school ready to learn?” Dreams can be fulfilled only when they’ve been defined...” And now we have a new set of goals under NCLB. Who wants a child to be left behind? Who wants our most vulnerable and at-risk students to continue to be tracked only as an aggregate group mean without the insistence of disaggregating the data by subgroups? How can teaching ever be effective in the absence of adequate assessment which typically implies some type of testing? Who wants our children to be taught by poorly qualified teachers?

On the other hand, who wants schooling to be reduced only to academic achievement alone? Who wants our most at-risk children to be endlessly tested and labeled against an arbitrary benchmark or standard regardless of the school’s or the child’s efforts? Who wants highly qualified teachers who can only pass a paper and pencil test but who may not be able to teach in a classroom?

The divisive debate surrounding the implementation of NCLB has fostered a host of virulent strains of resistance – not toward the ideas and intents of the law, because these are virtually unassailable, but rather toward the implementation. Some have said, and I believe rightfully so, that NCLB is a law that was conceived of by Mother Teresa and implemented by Nazi storm troopers!

(27) Traditionally, most educators, including administrators and reading specialists, have not viewed engaging in politics as an integral component of their professional obligations. Given the high visibility that literacy has assumed as a focus for political and public debate, many of us have come to the realization that our past inattentiveness to the political world is untenable as a present or future position. As educators and teacher educators with responsibility for supporting teachers to create effective classroom literacy environments, many of us here today have a professional obligation to advocate for literacy issues in political arenas. Our collective knowledge of and experiences with literacy could be used by policy makers to inform political debates and perhaps effect policy decisions in positive ways.

However a desire to contribute is not sufficient; we must do so in ways that invite others to listen. Because this is a new discourse arena for many of us, we often might find ourselves feeling unsure as to the best way to proceed in order to positively impact opinions, policies, and legislation and wondering if it is possible for an individual to “make a difference.”

To frame my remarks today, I want to go back to a time in education that is no more. When I first began teaching in public schools in 1976 as a kindergarten teacher, yes, that’s right I was the original kindergarten COP, not Arnold, and things were quite different back then. I, like, many of my contemporary teacher cohorts were unaware that the pendulum of literacy instructional practice had swung back and forth between pedagogical and philosophical extremes for more than 200 years in U.S. educational history. During the years previous, debates about literacy policy and practice were largely confined to persons within the educational establishment. (27) But during the Ronald Reagan administration in the 1980’s, Secretary Terrell Bell’s blue ribbon panel issued a report on the state of education entitled, *A Nation at Risk* (1983). In this report, the state of public education was heralded as a threat to national security. With the publication of this report, public suspicions, again fed by an ambitious press possessed of a need for sensationalism, began to run high about the untrustworthiness of the educational establishment to police its own ranks and make changes based on data rather than on the winds of political change and fashionable but as-yet-untried and untested theories. (28) In the mid-1980s a landmark report entitled, *Becoming a Nation of Readers*, was issued to stem the rising tide of public doubts about the quality and quantity of knowledge in relation to effective reading instruction.

In the mid-1990s, President William Jefferson Clinton began an effort to make operational the plans of the meetings of the National Governor’s Conventions as embodied in the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* legislation (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). (29) President Clinton strongly supported and urged not only increased professional development in literacy education, but also a nationwide testing program in reading and mathematics to assess goal attainment. Simultaneously from within the congressionally funded testing service, the *National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP)*, 1994 data were released in 1995 showing a measurable decline in fourth grade reading scores across the nation. And, when these data were reported by the press, the culprit had been clearly

identified, at least for some, - a decade-long curricular flirtation with “whole language.”

The press was quick to seize upon these data as well as this particularized explanation for the downward trend in national literacy scores. A disgruntled public bolstered by a substantial contingent of equally discontented school educators and administrators contacted local, state, and national policy-makers to complain about the interminable debates within the literacy community about how to teach children to read and write. (30) Although acclaimed by some members within the literacy community as helpful dialog, many individuals internal and external to the literacy community wearied of the battle and sought common ground under the banner of “balanced reading instruction.” But this too, soon became the target of unrelenting criticism regard the “fuzziness” of who’s balancing what, how? In the meantime children at-risk for literacy problems were reportedly slipping through the cracks. As a consequence, politicians resolved that the fate of literacy instruction was becoming entirely too important to be left to the internal debates of educators and the educational system alone. Many foundations and government agencies arrayed data in the mid-to-late 1990s showing that failure to learn to read on grade level at an early age, often by third-grade or age nine, was clearly correlated with nearly every undesirable social, political, and economic malady (Fielding, Kerr, & Rosier, 1998).

Add to this unfolding drama another bitter internal battle among literacy researchers known as the research paradigm wars. (31) Proponents of quantitative and qualitative research paradigms fought bitterly over the philosophical and practical differences between these two approaches. (32) And from an external on-looker’s perspective reading the headlines of nationally distributed and regarded books, newspapers, and magazines, one was forced to conclude that literacy professionals not only didn’t know how to teach children to read.

The research paradigm war was exacerbated in the mid-1990s by focusing research on teacher attitudes and beliefs about literacy instruction and studying student motivation rather than literacy achievement at a time when literacy achievement, particularly among at-risk populations seemed to be slipping. (33) As a result, the next federally funded center, at the University of Michigan, for reading research reflected a clear focus on reading achievement – *The Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement* (CIERA). Taken together these elements combined in a way and at a point in history allowing the news media and press to portray the literacy house as a house divided and in total disarray. As a consequence,

many literacy researchers and literacy research publications were characterized by the press, politicians, and other opportunistic educators as unscientific and focused on tertiary issues unrelated to the concerns of the American public – mainly the concern about improving the reading achievement of their children.

By the late 1990s, public and political opinions had arrived at a point where literacy instruction was thought to be in dire need of reform by the public, press and policy makers alike. And this time, decisions about how literacy would be taught and which type of research would be valued would not be left to what was perceived as a contentious and ostensibly self-serving professional literacy community. (34) Reading reform as policy reform was first to take the shape of *The Reading Excellence Act*.

The Reading Excellence Act (1998) national legislation was funded and approved under President William Clinton's administration. It contained federal funding specifically targeted to underachieving and poverty schools where lagging reading achievement needed immediate attention. And within the halls of the U.S Congress the value and ability of the two research paradigms to answer questions about literacy instruction of public interest had also been decided as well. The research to be used to "reform" literacy education was to meet the demanding bar of "scientific" standards like those accepted within other highly regarded professional fields such as engineering, business, nursing, and medicine. (35) The clear evidence of the outcome of this political process would be revealed later in the reports of *Preventing Reading Failure in Young Children* (Snow, Burns, and Griffin, 1998) and (36) *The National Reading Panel* (2000). It was now clear that politicians and the public would no longer allow something as socially, politically, and economically powerful as literacy to be the sole property of the "educationists." To make matters worse, as we entered a new millennium, the U.S. government's chief testing agency, NAEP, issued its *2000 Reading Report Card* (37) showing a downward trend in literacy scores generally and a growing achievement gap between the top and bottom readers in the U.S. (38) More disturbingly, was the increasing achievement gap found among specific ethnic groups. And after examining these trends, government watchdogs began examining the relationship between federal funding for reading and the NAEP scores over several decades. The comparison showed that while investments had quadrupled in adjusted inflated dollars, reading scores had remained flat. (39)

With the election of George W. Bush in 2000 to the U.S. Presidency, literacy reform policy already well ensconced in bi-partisan efforts within the U.S. Congress was furthered with the passage of (40) Senator Edward

Kennedy's and President George W. Bush's joint efforts to reauthorize the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964* into the sweeping legislative reform of public education known as *No Child Left Behind* (2002). Within this legislation, the scientific reading research agenda and the assurance that early reading instruction would include attention to early, systematic, explicit phonics instruction was made law. It is important to note that the *No Child Left Behind* legislation was a strongly supported bi-partisan effort. It passed with one of the largest bi-partisan votes on record (Senate - 87 Yea's/10 Nay's/ 3 Non-voting; House – 381 Yea's/ 41 Nay's/ 3 Non-voting) since 1964. NCLB represents the will of the people as manifested through the acts of their elected representatives from 435 congressional districts and 50 states. Recent survey's conducted by a third party polling agency in October 2004 placed the public's view of NCLB very positive at 62%. Even among IRA members there are mixed views about the values and implementation of NCLB with as many IRA members expressing strongly agree or agree responses as strongly disagree or disagree responses to recent IRA survey. This significant new federal intervention into state and local education provided federal funds to states for *Reading First* grants along with a long menu of unfunded mandates to cement the educational reforms begun in the mid-to-late 1980s.

(41) Back home in my own state of Utah, which by the way is a no-contest republican state, the Utah Governor and State Legislature have been sounding resisting the mandates of NCLB. (42-47) Although Utah these policy-makers declare that state's rights are violated by NCLB, a closer look at their stated concerns may reveal a desire to avoid external scrutiny about Utah's "flexible" accountability system which provides no carrots or consequences, unqualified rural teachers who don't have preparation in the areas in which they teach, and a perennially under funded state education system with the lowest teacher pay, per student expenditure, and highest classroom sizes in the U.S. and Puerto Rico. NCLB is truly a two-edge sword. Few there be who can decry its intentions and purposes as foul or misguided, on the other hand, few there can be who do not recognize it's fundamentally unrealistic timetable, expectations, and unfunded mandates. (48-53)

Having ignored the unrelenting criticisms of the press, the mounting public outcry, and the gradual but steady gaze of politicians, the world of literacy education is now in a state of a "hostile" take over.

We find ourselves as a profession, in a sense, in a deep political and policy abyss looking up without a ladder. How did the literacy profession, one so deeply committed to democratic values as integral to schooling and

education, so completely distance itself from the very product of that democratic process itself by ignoring, even failing to acknowledge the desires of the public and its elected representatives in our debates, research, and dialog? Have we, as a profession, failed to learn one critical civics lesson taught so eloquently and well by Edmund Burke (Bartlett, 1919) in his Speech on the Conciliation of America. (54) He said, “All government, - indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, - is founded on compromise...” As a literacy profession, we must become quick studies in the art of compromise and political engagement. For example, let us resist some of the unrealistic mandates of NCLB by joining forces with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). Rather than trashing the entire NCLB law, we need to seriously examine its weaknesses and offer up measured responses in support to those recommended in a recent task force report of the NCSL that is going forward to the Congress, the Administration, and the U.S. Department of Education to leverage necessary changes in NCLB.

Having said this, I have personally endeavored since 2001 to become very much involved in local political matters potentially affecting education, but in particular early childhood education and literacy education. I have contacted my local legislative representatives and maintain a continuing personal contact. Furthermore, I have tried to involve myself with my local representative in literacy and educational issues in the state, and much to my surprise and pleasure, my local representative has made valiant efforts to keep me involved and informed as well. Together, Representative Fred Hunsaker of the Utah Legislature (55) and I have fashioned a list of suggestions for those who want not only to become engaged in the political process but who honestly want to learn the art of “compromise” and succeed, at least to some degree, in having a voice to shape the literacy policy of their local, state, and national governments. (56)

Suggestions for Successfully Engaging in the Political Process as Literacy Educators

1. Get to know your local, state, and national representatives. Obtain their contact information including e-mail, phone number, and business address.
2. Learn how to make positive constituent contacts with legislators. Invite a legislator to visit over lunch to offer your expertise, insights, and involvement. Help them see you as a resource to whom they may turn when in need of information.
3. Do not offend your legislators. Respect their time and intelligence. Inform yourself about issues and be prepared to offer informed opinions

that show a balance of interests. Come prepared to listen as well as to advocate your position. (57)

4. Become familiar with the legislative process (sequence of events) so that your contacts can be timely. The most effective time to advocate for literacy is just before or just after a bill has been introduced. The time to influence a new bill, legislation under consideration for first time, is before the bill is introduced.

5. Be a credible, non-partisan lobbyist that a legislator can trust. Always, always, always tell the truth and be absolutely trustworthy. Get your facts straight and be able to document your assertions. Offer to make available an *executive summary* of factual information for the use of your legislator on demand. (58)

6. Legislators are not miracle workers. Do not present problems without simultaneously presenting potential solutions and ideas. A high-impact message is concise, factual and clear.

7. Legislators are bound by laws and ethics. Do not offer gifts, services, etc. that would compromise their integrity.

8. Legislators do not only deal with educational issues. Many legislators deal with a wide range of issues including zoning, plumbing codes, natural resources, transportation, etc. You are the expert on education and must narrow the many issues to a concise list of only two or three priority issues for discussion and action. (59)

9. Put a face on the effects of legislation. Bring children, teachers, and parents who are affected by legislation (positive or negative) to advocate for your position on the issues. When asked to testify the same is also true, put a real face on the effects of legislation.

10. Remain in regular contact with elected representatives. Go out of your way to keep communications constant and positive. A “thank you” note goes a long way when a legislator has put in many long hours of service without adequate remuneration much like those of us who work in education! Ask to be put on their mailing or e-mail distribution list for upcoming issues, reports, and legislation that may impact educational funding, policy, or practices. (60)

In conclusion, In May 2003, Cathy Roller, *Director of Research and Policy for IRA* said in response to a discussion about the many policies that local, state, and federal governments were enacting:

- 1) We can vent.
- 2) We can circumvent.
- 3) We can invent.

(40) Here are a couple of the best current resources for your use in learning how to become politically engaged in literacy policy making. I commend them to you for your study and action.

Let us focus our best efforts on inventing a future for literacy education in which every child receives evidence-based reading instruction that recognizes the multiple uses for literacy among the diverse cultures, languages, and needs of all our children! (61)