

**A Case Study of a School-based Literacy Initiative: Teachers' Experiences with Placing
Children at the Centre**

Hoda Ahmed

Thesis submitted to the University of Ottawa
in partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts in Education

Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

© Hoda Ahmed, Ottawa, Canada, 2024

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	iii
INTRODUCTION TO MA THESIS BY ARTICLE	1
SITUATING THE RESEARCH	2
PARTICIPANTS AND ETHICS	3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	4
IMPLICATIONS	4
A CASE STUDY OF A SCHOOL-BASED LITERACY INITIATIVE: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES WITH PLACING CHILDREN AT THE CENTRE	5
INTRODUCTION	5
CONTEXT.....	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
<i>Multiliteracies</i>	8
<i>Balanced Literacy</i>	10
<i>Structured Literacy</i>	10
<i>Curriculum Reform</i>	12
<i>Professional Development</i>	12
METHODOLOGY	13
PARTICIPANTS AND RESEARCH SETTING.....	13
DATA COLLECTION	14
ANALYSIS	15
<i>Research Question 1: What was the impetus for this change?</i>	15
<i>Research Question 2: How did this initiative unfold and what were the teacher's attitudes towards the process?</i>	16
<i>Research Question 3: What do teachers see as the next steps and implications of their experience?</i>	19
DISCUSSION	20
CONCLUSION	22
CONCLUSION TO MA THESIS BY ARTICLE	24
REFERENCES	25
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	31
INTERVIEW GUIDE - TEACHERS	31
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOCUS GROUPS	33
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT TEXT	34

Abstract

This case study of one Nova Scotian school examined teachers' experiences with undertaking a literacy change initiative. Interviews and focus groups with 15 teachers revealed that teachers' initial participation in the initiative stemmed from collecting student data that demonstrated students were struggling with decoding and a lack of systematic phonics instruction. The teachers discussed challenges they faced as a result of shifting their practice and the need for further professional development and collaboration. The findings of this case study have implications for other schools seeking to implement changes to teaching practices, and achievement outcomes, and highlight the importance of supporting teachers in providing time and resources to collectively put in place instructional strategies that are aligned with students' educational goals.

Introduction to MA Thesis by Article

This case study examines teachers' experiences with a literacy change initiative of an elementary school. New Glasgow Academy (NGA) is a Pre-Primary to Grade 8 school located in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia. At the invitation of the school principal, Dr. Ruth Kane and I were invited to interview staff at the school to document their involvement with this shift in practice. Over a period of four days, staff shared their understanding of literacy, previous literacy practices and addressed specific changes and challenges that arose from the process. The findings of this case study could have implications for other schools seeking to implement similar changes to teaching practices.

Positionality

I am undertaking this research from a teacher-researcher perspective considering my "personal experience and professional beliefs" (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 55). Completing my initial teacher training had left me with a limited understanding of how to teach children to read. As part of my teacher training, discussions of phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary instruction and morphology were limited. Instead, the focus of our language training centered on planning engaging units of inquiry in Language and using authentic and diverse texts. As important as I believe the use of rich texts are, I felt as though I was missing the necessary tools required to support students in decoding and comprehending these texts. As an elementary teacher, my ongoing professional development (including two Reading Additional Qualifications) did little to fill what I felt were significant gaps in my knowledge.

It was in my first year of teaching that I uncovered the challenges in programming a responsive and comprehensive literacy program. I recall feeling overwhelmed trying to incorporate all the elements of reading instruction for my primary students, many of whom were coming to English as a second or third language. At the time, I was blissfully unaware of the reading wars and hesitant to engage in the debates, seeing advantages of both structured and balanced literacy theories. Since then, the schools I have taught in began to implement structured literacy, ahead of Ontario Ministry requirements, leaving an interesting gap between the curriculum and classroom practices and expectations. With the new Language curriculum now released, it has been a challenge to meet all learning expectations in an engaging and authentic manner.

Situating the Research

Literacy reform is a particularly rich and contested area, due to the abundance of research and conclusions which are “inconclusive...contradictory or distorted” (Preston, 2022, p. 7). The current discourse surrounding literacy instruction is characterized by a conflict between structured and balanced literacy approaches. This debate, often referred to as “the reading wars”, has a long history and political dimension, as legislative bodies impose structured literacy practices in curriculum and assessment.

The roots of this reading debate can be traced back to Rudolf Flesch’s 1955 publication, *Why Johnny Can’t Read*. Flesch criticized the sight word method of reading and instead advocated for explicit phonics instruction as a means to equip learners with decoding skills (Durán & Hikida, 2022). The latter being reading the whole word, or sight word method and the former involving teaching letter-sound correspondence. Similarly, Jean Chall, a pioneer of reading research, unpacked the history of literacy instruction in her 1967 book *Learning to Read: The Great Debate*. The author questioned the efficacy of the meaning-based “look-say” approach to reading instruction and instead endorsed a “code-based” methodology, which involved blending parts of words together during reading (Chall, 1967; Semingson & Kerns, 2021).

The science of reading (SOR) or structured literacy advocates believe that approaches like whole language and balanced literacy are flawed and contribute to illiteracy and poor reading outcomes (Petrilli, 2020; Stone, 2019). SOR is “a vast, interdisciplinary body of scientifically based research about reading and issues related to reading and writing” (The Reading League, 2021, p. 6), which “combine[s] the strengths of whole-language and skills instruction...creat[ing] instruction that is more than the sum of its parts” (Allington & Pressley, 2023, p. 7). Conversely, balanced literacy scholars caution against a one-size-fits-all approach to reading instruction and instead suggest that the principles of the science of reading can be reconciled with the implementation of balanced literacy (Allington & Pressley, 2023).

The continuous back-and-forth arguments between advocates of structured literacy and proponents of balanced literacy has left teachers navigating through a complex landscape in search of what best suits their students. This ongoing debate, often characterized by contrasting ideologies and methodologies, presents educators with a daunting task of deciphering the most effective approach to literacy instruction. On one hand, structured literacy proponents emphasize the importance of systematic phonics instruction and decoding skills. On the other hand,

balanced literacy advocates highlight the significance of incorporating a range of literacy strategies and fostering a love for reading. As a result, teachers find themselves in a position where they must critically evaluate and adapt instructional practices to meet the diverse needs of their students. This process requires thoughtful consideration, professional knowledge, and a willingness to adapt to meet the needs of students.

Participants and Ethics

Participants in the current study were educators within the case study school who engaged in the change initiative within their Primary to Grade 5 classrooms. Educators included Reading Recovery and Learning Support staff as well as the school leadership team and regional consultants including the: school principal, Coordinator of Student Services, Student Services Consultant for Chignecto Central Regional Centre for Education (CCRCE), Speech Language Pathologist; and School Psychologist. Each of these participants had been engaged in the planning and implementation of the literacy program initiative and were able to speak to their own direct experience of the initiative.

Permission to conduct this research was obtained by the CCRCE and additional ethics approval was obtained by the University in Ottawa Research Ethics Board in May 2022. Potential participants (teachers and leaders, advisors) collectively developed the research questions and asked us to conduct this case study. Thus, they were all aware of the purpose of the study and understood what would be involved and were expecting an invitation to participate. The participants were recruited through an email invitation sent from the Principal investigator, Dr. Kane to each member's email address as recorded on the school website.

To avoid the sense of coercion for teacher participants to participate in the research, at the beginning of the interview the facilitator took time to ensure that the teacher is comfortable participating in the research. The principal was not advised of who did or did not participate.

To limit social repercussions and allow for different viewpoints on the culture of the school, individual interviews provided the space for educators to air their views even if contradictory to others. Additionally, focus groups where tensions or conflicts arose were facilitated by Dr. Kane with established protocols that ensured respectful dialogues, welcoming opposing views and with the goal of understanding competing perspectives. Focus groups concluded with a round of ensuring everyone had the opportunity to share and feel that their perspective was heard.

Research Questions

The core goal of this single case study is to understand the literacy change initiative from the teachers' perspective. The research questions for this study are: What was the impetus for this change? How did this initiative unfold and what were teachers' attitudes towards the process? And lastly, what do teachers see as the next steps and implications of their experience?

Implications

The study examines the current debates around literacy which tend to be increasingly polarized across education systems. Literacy has also been a space within schools which accounts for a significant portion of a school budget to purchase commercial literacy programs, reading levelled books, teaching resources. Yet aside from the different camps — what is critical is that the ability to read significantly alters a child's future life opportunities. In this case study, there is an opportunity to understand how one school initiated, planned and implemented a school change literacy program with the goal of achieving more equitable outcomes for children. Documenting the procedures and experiences of such a change may assist other schools faced with similar challenges.

A Case Study of a School-based Literacy Initiative: Teachers' Experiences with Placing Children at the Centre

Introduction

Research suggests that 95% of all children can be taught to read by the end of Grade 1 and children are most likely to develop reading fluency through effective, comprehensive, and systematic early instruction from well-informed and well-supported classroom teachers (Hasbrouck, 2020; Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2022; Moats, 2020). This case study was conducted at a time of transition in language instruction across different jurisdictions.

Increasing demands for a paradigm shift in literacy practices are reverberating across Canada and the United States. In 2019, the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) began an inquiry into students' experiences with reading challenges and reading instruction as practiced in the province. The inquiry found that Black and Indigenous students, were underachieving with respect to reading—and a total of 26% of Ontario students in Grade 3 were not meeting the provincial standard in reading (OHRC, 2022). *The Right to Read Report* comes amidst a confluence of multiple critical factors, including heightened political motivations to implement a "back to basics" approach, subpar outcomes in provincial standardized assessments, and the pervasive impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The scope of the Right to Read inquiry centers on early reading, specifically at the word-level as those skills “are a foundation for good reading comprehension” (OHRC, 2022, p. 9). Ultimately, the inquiry resulted in 157 recommendations and action items for the Ministry of Education, school boards, faculties of education and educators. Encouraging self-identification, honouring Indigenous languages, and providing evidence-based instruction and intervention were some of the key recommendations.

The inquiry also recommended a revised Language curriculum be brought forth to remove the three-cueing and similar strategies for reading, replacement of levelled readers in favour of systematic decodables and phonics instruction and a complete removal of references to balanced literacy in curriculum documents and Ministry publications. The Ontario Language curriculum was revised in late June 2023 and brings phonics instruction and structured literacy into focus (Casey, 2022; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2023). Critics of the inquiry suggest that the OHRC overgeneralized their findings and theorize that concerns about reading achievement are misguided as Ontario students outperform students from the United States and United

Kingdom on international assessments (Cummins, 2022). Furthermore, the inquiry's emphasis on the English language neglects the experiences of Franco-Ontarian students. This erasure was compounded as the initial French language translation of the report contained multiple errors and inaccuracies (Minor-Corriveau, 2022). Additional concerns about the inquiry findings relate to structured literacy's focus on isolated skills, in many cases at the expense of cultural richness, lived experience and representation. This is particularly concerning as Black and Indigenous students are most often on the receiving end of deficit narratives (Milner, 2020; Vaughn et al., 2020).

The inquiry's influence reached beyond Ontario, in part due to the large public interest as well as the comprehensive nature of the inquiry, involving researchers from across the country, faculties of education and school boards from across the province. The many narratives of students and families regarding the hopeless cycle of illiteracy they find themselves in was deeply concerning for educational leaders, educators, families, and students. Nova Scotian families, whose children experience reading difficulties, are working to form support and advocacy groups (Bennett, 2022; Rankin, 2022). While their requests to initiate a provincial inquiry have proven unsuccessful, they continue to propose curriculum reform, taking inspiration from Ontario.

The specific school in Nova Scotia that is the focus of the current study presents a compelling site for analysis, as the Nova Scotian curriculum expectations are based on balanced literacy. The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DOEECD) is responsible for establishing the curriculum expectations and provides guidance to Regional Centres for Education. In 2021, the DOEECD produced a Responsive Literacy document for Primary to Grade 3 students in which educators were directed to focus on including phonemic awareness and phonics. The document calls for small group, "focused" and "personalized" instruction. Eligible students in Grade 1 receive Reading Recovery instruction as part of tiered intervention supports (DOEECD, 2021, 2021b).

Considering the above changes, this qualitative case study examined how the shift from one reading approach to another was initiated, implemented, and sustained at the school in question. Specifically, the focus of the research was on understanding how a change of this nature occurred.

Context

At New Glasgow Academy (NGA), in Nova Scotia, teachers are committed to supporting children to learn to read, yet over recent years, fewer than half the students in NGA met the instructional reading levels expected for their grade level. At NGA, approximately 58% of Grade 1-3 students are simply not meeting curriculum benchmarks in literacy (Dyslexia Canada, 2023). Across the province, African Nova Scotian, and Mi'kmaq students experience a large achievement gap in many subject areas, including literacy (Mitton & Murray-Orr, 2021). Despite the aspirations of students and parents, and the work of teachers and achievement gap funding, many students are not learning to read.

This case study of a literacy change in one Nova Scotia school aimed to understand how this shift in practice was experienced by the school's staff. More specifically, this study examined the experiences of teachers with respect to the initiation and adoption of a new literacy instructional approach that was supported by leadership. Through interviews and focus groups with teachers, this study examined one school's efforts in improving literacy outcomes. Interviews were used to investigate teachers' understandings of and approaches to professional learning and teacher knowledge and to provide insight into their motivation and decision-making process. The findings of this case study could have implications for other schools seeking to implement changes to teaching practices and achievement outcomes.

New Glasgow Academy (NGA) is a Pre-Primary to Grade 8 school in northern Nova Scotia which, at the time of this research (2022) serves 588 children and their families. NGA has 31 classroom teachers, 6 learning resource teachers, 13 educational assistants and 6 administrative and custodial staff. The school leadership team is comprised of a principal and two vice-principals. The school receives Achievement Gap funding to support African Nova Scotian students (84 children), who comprise approximately 15% of the school population, and an additional 29 children (5%) self-identify as Indigenous. The child poverty rate of the New Glasgow community is 29%, but anecdotally, staff report that the geographic area served by NGA has a higher proportion of affordable housing than areas of the town not served by NGA.

At NGA, educators were actively involved in a yearlong process of continuous professional development, during which they collaborated closely with student support specialists, such as speech-language pathologists (SLPs) and psychologists, with the aim of refining their curriculum and instructional methods. This concerted effort to improve teaching

practices and adapt the curriculum was undertaken to enhance the overall educational experience for their students. The professional learning that staff participated included regular lunch and learn workshops provided by the student support staff, SLP and psychologist; stand-alone workshops provided by subject-matter experts and regular grade level professional learning communities (PLC) meetings. Regional literacy mentors were not a part of the initiative at the time of this research (2022). Further professional development was explored by some educators who took it upon themselves to explore structured literacy resources including workshops, podcasts and books.

The core goal of this single case study is to understand the literacy change initiative from the teachers' perspective. The research questions for this project are: What was the impetus for this change? How did this initiative unfold and what were teachers' attitudes towards the process? And lastly, what do teachers see as the next steps and implications of their experience?

Literature Review

This literature review begins by examining the primary literacy approach taught in Canadian Teacher Education programs, namely multiliteracies, and its impact on teachers' literacy practices. Furthermore, this review considers the two main approaches to reading instruction—balanced literacy and structured literacy—aiming to identify their similarities and differences. Lastly, the review delves into the role of professional development and teacher capacity in undergoing a shift or change in practice.

Multiliteracies

Multiliteracies, an approach to literacy pedagogy developed by the New London Group, challenges normative literacy practices and instructions (Cazden et al., 1996). Under a multiliteracies framework, literacy and literacy instruction must adapt to “the context of our culturally and linguistically diverse and increasingly globalized societies” (Cazden et al., 1996, p. 60). The emphasis or focus of learning shifts from “teaching and learning to read and write in page-bound, official, standard forms of the national language” to considering the “plurality of texts”, including digital, mass, and multi- medias (Cazden et al, 1996, p.61). Multiliteracies reframes dialectal, cultural, and societal differences and considers these differences equally valid to the standard (Cazden et al., 1996).

Decoding the written word and comprehending the meaning are crucial skills needed for engaging in new literacies (Westby, 2010). With respect to assessment and literacy instruction,

assessments that focus on decoding or alphabetic knowledge fails to capture the totality of multiliteracies (Jacobs 2013). Multiliteracies threads experiencing (considering in-school and out-of-school experiences of learners), conceptualizing (learners developing a metalanguage), analyzing (examining and critically questioning texts and purpose) and applying (using knowledge to understand the complex real world). The pedagogy of multiliteracies combines authentic (relevant, student led) and didactic (authoritative, teacher led) learning into a new 'reflexive learning' that is active and collaborative (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009).

A multiliteracies pedagogy can support inclusion and withstand reducing literacy to pen and paper tasks or resists increasing calls to 'return to basics'. Through a multiliteracy approach, there is space for all literacies and addressing the needs of all learners (Drewry et al., 2019). Moreover, a multiliteracy framework is not limited to English or alphabetic languages, it is a flexible framework that can be applied to different languages and social/cultural contexts. New and developing technologies prompt changes to the process of meaning-making and modes of communication (Sang, 2017).

Multiliteracies is a prominent pedagogy in Canadian teacher education programs and yet teacher engagement and understanding of the pedagogy is restrained by curriculum and provincial assessment practices (Lauwo et. al, 2022). The Nova Scotian curriculum calls for multiliteracies to be "integrated [into] literacy practice in a seamless way" and makes explicit connections between multiliteracies and new and developing technology integration into student learning" (DOEECD, 2014, p. 106). The Ontario Human Rights Commission's, (OHRC), Right to Read inquiry focused on word-level or foundational reading skills and abilities, finding that educators overlooked these skills in favour of "an almost exclusive focus on contextual word-reading strategies and on socio-cultural perspectives on literacy" (OHRC, 2022, p. 7). Several educators who spoke to the commission expressed concerns that their school board's sociocultural and culturally responsive approach to literacy instruction was viewed as fundamentally at odds with an emphasis on foundational reading skills.

In 2020, Nova Scotia's Department of Education, the province where this case study is situated, published an amendment to their Phonemic Awareness Continuum to include phonological and phonemic awareness (DOEECD, 2020b). The department assessment documents and materials maintains links to and references about balanced literacy for Primary to Grade 6 students suggesting a tension between curriculum and literacy approaches (DOEECD,

2020). Given *The Right to Read Report* findings and the shift to structured literacy in Ontario and parts of the United States, there is growing pressure on other provinces to follow a similar course of reform.

Balanced Literacy

The term balanced literacy emerged from California in 1996; the approach was originally meant to address skills and meaning in separate instructional blocks. Balanced literacy has since developed into the teaching of five components of “effective reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary instruction, fluency and comprehension” (Bingham & Hall-Kenyon, 2013, p. 16). Balanced literacy, as conceived, was meant to represent a happy medium between the competing reading approaches (whole language and phonics). Through this instruction students would receive “systematic instruction in the graphophonic elements of written language, embedded within thematic units that build student knowledge and capitalize on interests using authentic and engineered texts” (Fisher et al., 2023, p.189). Balanced literacy “recognizes that each child is unique with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, with diverse lived experiences, and varied strengths, teachers design responsive instruction tailored to each learner’s needs within a balanced literacy framework” (Kelly & Thomas, 2020).

Balanced literacy also aims to balance direct instruction with discovery learning; creating a mix of spontaneous and planned instruction; whole group and small group learning; children selected, and teacher-selected texts. There is teacher-led direct instruction, student-led learning, and independent practice (Frey et al., 2005; Guo et al., 2023). Still, there is a focus on phonics and phonemic awareness, building student awareness around words and understanding that they “are composed of separate sounds (phonemes) that are blended to[gether] [to] produce words”. (Pressley, 2006, p.112).

Determining a single definition for balanced literacy is challenging as no two classrooms will balance learning in the same manner. Curriculum expectations in Nova Scotia support and are based on teachers’ use and understanding of balanced literacy instruction and teaching practices. Educators are expected to instruct, assess, and evaluate students using this framework.

Structured Literacy

The focus of the science of reading (SOR) or structured literacy (SL) is the promotion of evidence-based practices; one definition states that it is “a corpus of objective investigation and accumulation of reliable evidence about how humans learn to read and how reading should be

taught” (Goodwin & Jiménez, 2021, p.8). According to Gough and Tunmer, the Simple View of Reading is the product of decoding and vocabulary comprehension. Their formula is $R = (D) \times (LC)$, where (R)= reading, (D)= decoding and (LC) = linguistic comprehension. Linguistic comprehension here refers to interpreting sentences and speech given the words and "each variable ranges from 0 (nullity) to 1 (perfection)” (Gough & Tunmer, 1986, p 7.). If either the linguistic comprehension or decoding are absent, there is no reading taking place.

The term structured literacy is an "umbrella term used by the IDA [International Dyslexia Association]" and refers to evidence-based literacy instruction that includes “all aspects of spoken language into the teaching of reading, spelling, and writing (Cowen, 2016). All components of SL are taught explicitly and systematically, building up from the basic to complex: phonology, sound-symbol association, syllables, morphology, syntax, semantics” (Cowen, 2016). SL involves regular reviewing of previously taught concepts, decodable texts (texts that are focused on phonics patterns that have been explicitly taught), and corrective feedback and as a literacy approach is aligned with SOR. Through this approach, readers are taught to sound out the words (International Dyslexia Association Ontario, 2020). SL is positioned as the evidence-based antidote for the difficulties students experience under balanced literacy instruction. Unlike in whole language and balanced literacy, in SOR and SL, readers are not taught to make use of three-cueing strategies, but to sound out words (International Dyslexia Association Ontario, 2020).

With increasing public attention and legislation to implement "the science of reading" or structured literacy there are questions about what constitutes evidence or scientifically based practices. For marginalized and racialized students, SOR may ignore the root causes of the reading achievement gap including poverty, segregation, and the deliberate underfunding of education (Terry, 2021). Similarly, structured literacy practices like the use of universal screeners are normed using monolingual English language speakers and risks misrepresenting the abilities of multilingual learners (Herrera et al., 2022). The proliferation of SOR curriculum materials along with legislation of screeners and programs, is perceived by researchers as contributing to the growing of privatization and villainizing and de-professionalization of public education. (Gabriel, 2020).

Simply including SOR in teacher education is unlikely to solve reading difficulties as “preservice (and in-service) teachers will likely require extensive support, far beyond what is

generally available in training and induction programs...and that focusing simply on giving teachers more exposure to SOR content is an insufficient treatment of a deeply complex but ultimately solvable problem” (Hindman, 2020, p. S201). Similar to balanced literacy, there are misconceptions about what SL entails, possibly stemming from its widespread and rapid adoption across numerous English-speaking educational systems.

Curriculum Reform

Shifting curriculum or teaching practices can be a fraught and political process. The process of undertaking educational change requires incorporating the needs and inputs of various stakeholders. The curriculum, primarily determined at the governmental level, establishes the goals or ultimate student outcomes for each subject area. The implementation and subsequent results are determined at the school and individual classroom level. Tensions in reform occur when top-down changes are imposed on educators from upper leadership. This approach to curriculum reform often “fail[s] to foster ownership and commitment from those who matter most, teachers and school leaders” (Poulton, 2020, p. 35).

The role of teachers in educational reform is critical as “not only are teachers active agents in reform, but their actions influence actions and interactions at the school, district and societal levels” (Datnow, 2020, p. 435). Without a clear plan, communication, and a willingness to collaborate, or explain the *why* and *support the how*, there is the risk of teachers viewing the ongoing literacy curriculum changes as just another pendulum shift. Implementing a change on a large scale presents many challenges, including ensuring that the changes are sustainable and continue in the long term.

Professional Development

Teachers require a strong foundational knowledge of evidence-based reading instruction practices to be able to effectively teach their students. Simply put, they cannot teach what they do not know. Teacher education programs are accused of failing to properly train preservice teachers in reading instruction, partially because of a lack of required reading courses, but also because of instructors not having the required knowledge themselves (Pittman et. al, 2019). The lack of teacher subject knowledge also affects experienced educators who overestimate their language abilities (Cunningham & O’Donnell, 2016; Moats & Lyon, 1996). Building teacher capacity or knowledge through effective professional development can be implemented through

informal structures, collaboration with colleagues, or through formally structured workshops and courses (Desimone, 2011).

Effective professional development is content focused; involves active learning; supports collaboration between colleagues; models effective practice; makes use of coaching and expert support, and is sustained overtime (Bates & Morgan, 2018). In the context of school reform, teachers have an important role. Teachers must understand the phonology and importance of phonemic awareness, have knowledge of morphology, grammar, and text features, have the ability to differentiate, engage their students and provide explicit and systematic instruction to a diverse group of learners (Moats & Brady, 1997). Unsurprisingly given the heated nature of the reading wars, literacy professional development and learning may be influenced by individual educators' positions on the issue. Similarly, there is a perception by some that science of reading is either the latest pendulum shift or nothing new (Goldenberg, 2019) and thus might contribute to teacher lack of enthusiasm for professional development.

Professional learning communities (PLCs) are scheduled opportunities for teachers to collaborate as a grade or leveled team. This form of collaboration supports teachers emotionally and professionally through "decreased isolation, the development of supportive relationships, and increased understanding of content knowledge as well as pedagogical approaches" (Weddle, et al., 2019, p. 326). PLCs are only one part of professional development and work best when school leaders foster "a high trust environment where it is safe for teachers to change practice and innovate" (Harris & Jones, 2010, p. 189).

When examining this school based literacy change, it is essential to consider the educators' perspectives and feelings concerning this professional development. Understanding what these educators' knowledge base was prior to their professional development can provide valuable insights into the potential benefits and challenges of similar initiatives in other contexts.

Methodology

Participants and Research Setting

I visit New Glasgow Academy at the invitation of the principal investigator, Dr. Ruth Kane, in the week of May 23rd, 2022. During the four-day visit, I assisted in interviewing 16 teachers from Grades Primary (Kindergarten) through to Grade 5 (including Learning Support Teachers, Early Literacy Support and Reading Recovery teachers), three members of the literacy

initiative leadership team (including the principal, school psychologist, and speech-language pathologist), and two members of regional Student Services team. To understand and be able to document the experiences of teachers (including learning support and Reading Recovery teachers) educators were invited to participate in individual interviews and focus group interviews—these conversations captured how they experience the change together and with the students in their classrooms.

Planning documents and artefacts from the classroom were also requested if educators felt they could illustrate or enhance understanding of their experience of the change initiative. Combined we conducted 15 one-on-one interviews and four focus group interviews. All sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed for later content analysis.

Data Collection

Participants are asked open-ended questions as part of semi-structured interviews and focus groups. This approach to interviewing is flexible and conversations are guided by a series of questions (Magaldi & Berler, 2020). A purposive sampling technique is used to include classroom teachers, leadership team members and regional officers assigned to the school e.g., school psychologist, reading specialist, who can "inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study" (Cresswell, 2013, p. 156).

Using a content analysis approach, themes and ideas from the interview and focus group transcripts captured key ideas beyond a non-frequency approach. The transcripts and recordings from 9 teacher interviews and 3 focus groups were entered into NVivo to assist with the organization of the data. This approach was selected as it is reflective and allows for flexibility (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007). The data was prepared by transcribing recorded interviews. An initial analysis of data was done with Dr. Ruth Kane to prepare an executive summary for the DOEECD and CCRCE. The further coding of the data was done by me which involved listening to interviews and reading transcriptions three times. Subsequently, the data was coded broadly to capture all relevant information. The process also then involved returning to the data to determine if the kept the "research aim and question[s] clearly in focus" (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017, p. 96). After this analysis, 8 initial codes were identified in NVivo (past literacy practices, balanced literacy, impetus for change, professional learning, collaboration, changes in literacy practices, structured literacy, and tensions). The analysis then involved revisiting coded items and condensing codes and organizing them to form 4 themes that were

relevant to answering the research questions. Using this methodology and returning to the data collected was a means to limit bias influencing the findings.

Analysis

Research Question 1: What was the impetus for this change?

This research question and resulting theme seeks to identify the motivation behind educators adopting this change in practice and focuses on the reading difficulties observed by educators.

Theme: Reading Difficulties

When asked why teachers undertook this change in literacy practices the responses varied among educators, yet a common theme emerged—students were not meeting the expected reading outcomes and teachers are concerned and wanted to better understand why. Before the school-wide shift in practice took place, guided reading was the central to reading instruction in all classes. Despite their efforts and planning, challenges persisted, prompting teachers to seek out alternative approaches. During interviews, a lower elementary teacher expressed that she felt her students were not progressing, "It felt like last year it was taking forever, and I just assumed it was because I was new to [teaching] the grade, but it was across the board when I started talking to other teachers. What we're doing is not working, kids can't read". This belief was reiterated by all participants who noticed persistent gaps in students' decoding abilities regardless of age group. When asked how the initiative unfolded, teachers' responses varied. Some teachers were uncertain about how the shift was initially introduced. Others attributed it to informal discussions with colleagues as they struggled to understand what was wrong, or to professional development opportunities offered by school administrators. For one group of educators, a professional development presentation on Scarborough's Reading Rope—a model that demonstrates skilled reading as being the product of word reading and language comprehension, was key in making the connection between what was working and what was not, "We had a meeting, they were showing the Reading Rope, and [I said] this is a piece that we are missing...we are addressing the comprehension piece, that's where our conversation started, [the question was] what can we do better"?

Incorporating structured literacy and phonics instruction presented as a challenge for participants within the Nova Scotian context of mandated balanced literacy instruction. Some educators discreetly incorporated it into their classrooms, concerned with the possibility of facing scrutiny of the regional literacy department leads and mentors. One teacher emphasized

this struggle, stating, "We aren't teaching sounds explicitly; we weren't teaching letter sounds, vowel teams sounds, or anything like that. [The school] had stacks of various phonics programs or resources in a room that I was told [by a literacy mentor] not to use". Teachers agreed that developing their own understanding of teaching the English language and how children learn to read is important, emphasizing that, "While resources, [books, kits] are a [helpful] tool, developing our understanding was critical". Another teacher commented, "I noticed a lot of the science of reading stuff online and started saying this is where the problem is, I don't know where the kids are stuck." Teachers' Professional Learning Community (PLC) discussions become a space for teachers to collectively discuss the question of "What are we doing?", laying the foundation for changes to begin.

Research Question 2: How did this initiative unfold and what were the teacher's attitudes towards the process?

This research question and resulting themes investigates how teachers began their learning and how their practices changed and their experience with the implementation.

Theme: Professional Development and Collaboration

With respect to their past professional development, teachers expressed frustration at how their initial teacher training left them ill prepared to teach students how to read, with one upper elementary teacher revealing, "The only literacy course I took in university was how to write a lesson plan". Another shared that their training was limited to, "[watching] a video of someone doing a running record". Teachers developed their own professional knowledge through lunch and learns, social media, and by conducting independent research. With the guidance of support staff, teachers were able to assess students' literacy skills using screeners and analyze this data to determine where to begin instruction. The data collection brought clarity, with one teacher expressing, "It was like 'oh this makes so much sense'". The support provided became invaluable for many teachers, who expressed that without it, they would be overwhelmed and no longer willing to participate in the change in practice.

Some teachers expressed hesitation in deviating from reading methods they were comfortable with. For upper elementary teachers, used to teaching comprehension skills like text connections, the shift towards structured literacy presents a challenge, "[Students] do get a bit of phonics in Primary and Grade 1, if the teachers are willing to go out on their own, because it's technically not sanctioned by the board. It's just not carried up through the older grades, you're

heavy into guided reading in Grades 3 and 4 and that is the significant portion of your reading instruction”. These upper elementary teachers encountered unique obstacles, with wider ranges of student ability, unpredictable classroom dynamics and student behaviors preventing some from fully implementing the shift. Additionally, some upper elementary and lower elementary teachers report that their own lack of understanding of the phonics component and how to transform this knowledge into engaging instructional activities for students was challenging and they reported that they required more time to become familiar with the material.

Collaboration with colleagues, leaders, paraprofessionals and clinicians resulted in teachers feeling vulnerable and demanding a high level of trust among the educators. At NGA, professional learning was presented as a group effort. Some educators jumped right into the changes, while others approached the shift more cautiously. School leaders and support staff came together to share their own vulnerabilities and wonderings and in so doing established a culture where questions were encouraged. A teacher conveyed this sense of comfort, stating, "If [another principal] came to me and said I had to start doing this [focusing on structured literacy], I would have my back up. That wasn't the case; there was a team of administrators to support teachers. Because I've never been made to feel bad about this". Teachers shared information and resources as one participant highlighted, "What I have been sharing with people is [the book] *Shifting the Balance*, podcast episodes, TikTok [videos], and Facebook groups". Participants reported the value in having thought partners and team members that they could reflect with, "If I was doing this on my own and someone gave me the books [about structured literacy/science of reading], I would have probably given up by now". At the heart of the literacy change was a sense that the teachers felt that they were in this change effort together and the principal and support staff were learning alongside the classroom teachers. The professional development was not imposed from above or a central authority, but rather it was generated in response to teachers' own questions and conversations with each other as they wondered how they could better support children's reading.

Theme: Change in Practice

Prior to engaging in a school-wide shift in practices, phonics instruction was considered taboo by some teachers, with only a few discreetly teaching phonics in their classrooms. As the shift became a school-wide endeavor, teachers expressed that this perception changed. Prior to

participating in the official school-wide shift, some proactive teachers had collected their own data and began using it to reset their practices, particularly in small group settings.

For one teacher, knowing that this would be a collective effort encouraged buy-in: "When it became a school-wide initiative, I was like "I'm in"." This commitment led teachers to conduct a more in-depth study of the structure of the English language and a realization that students, as a whole, lack fundamental skills, particularly with decoding and encoding consonant-vowel-consonant words. Consequently, this teacher, and others adjust their guided reading practices, moving from level-based groups to needs-based skill groups. Other educators began implementing a strategic incorporation of decodable books and passages aligned with the specific skills being addressed, a change from the previous practices of using levelled texts. Another teacher shared that they did the same, however they found the planning and resourcing decodable texts to be time consuming. Teachers reported that through this change their teaching became more focused, intentional, and systematic and they gathered momentum through working in collaboration.

As part of the shift, decoding skills became a core focus, with teachers emphasizing the critical role that phonics plays in developing effective comprehension. Reflecting on her experience of the shift, one teacher noted, "We still have to read with kids, you still have to work on comprehension, but they can't work on comprehension if they can't read." This realization prompted experimentation within guided reading groups, where one teacher revealed, "For a month and a half, I had two groups—one, a guided reading group, traditionally structured and then [the other] a phonics group. [The students] were getting double [the exposure]". The objective was clear: equip students with the necessary decoding skills to navigate texts effectively, while not doing away with the other components of effective literacy instruction.

The integration of phonics is not confined to specific lessons or activities; it permeated throughout the daily routine, as another teacher articulates, "Phonics was built into the day, pointing out vowels and sounds, responding to students' needs... providing just-in-time learning but being intentional about it." Teachers shifted their practices during centres and small group instruction and guided reading centers, where students manipulated sounds and words with tools like whiteboards and magnetic letters. When students read aloud, teachers reported that they began to cover the picture and no longer immediately provide the word to a student who was

struggling, but instead encourage students to sound out words and engage in explicit conversations about their reading process.

Despite the seemingly seamless evolution for some teachers, others are tasked with making substantial changes to their instructional practices. One teacher reported that while she/he was open to making changes, she/he felt tested, "I feel like my own capacity as a teacher has been challenged". Reflecting on the broader challenges, a teacher acknowledged, "If we end up developing a literacy plan for phonics, you absolutely cannot throw this at a teacher; I am struggling this year." Despite these difficulties, these teachers shared that they saw the value in implementing structured literacy practices, reflecting on their teaching practices and examining student data. Through moving through the change process together teachers appeared to gain confidence that they were building the new program as they themselves lived it. They each moved according to the pace of their own professional learning and confidence in the new approaches and in response to the needs of their students.

Research Question 3: What do teachers see as the next steps and implications of their experience?

This research question and resulting theme explores the challenges that teachers faced during the change initiative, their struggles and what they believe their next steps are.

Theme: Tensions and Future Goals

Teachers reflected on their transformative journey, acknowledging both the progress they observed and obstacles they faced. A prevailing hope shared by participants for the future was a reduction in negative student behaviours as new routines were established. One teacher expressed, "I'm hoping that next year it is less chaotic in my classroom." This aspiration aligned with the broader goal of fostering an environment conducive to effective reading instruction. The support from leadership was invaluable in navigating external challenges about the instructional shift. Teachers felt empowered, having permission to do "what works" in the words of one teacher, "to get the kids reading". Additionally, teachers hoped to include families in the instructional change, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts beyond the classroom. Looking towards the future, teachers shared a collective hope for continued progress. They anticipated applying structured literacy principles to writing and embracing assessments that focused on observations and reading engagement. A lower primary teacher eloquently captured

the sentiment, "Now they're learning to read, years down the line they're going to be reading to learn."

The complexity of language acquisition and the overwhelming nature of the English language were noted by teachers. They cautioned against excessive reliance on phonics, emphasizing the need for a balanced approach. Striking this balance, they admit, can be difficult due to time constraints and the deviation from the curriculum. Teachers recalled the initial secrecy around implementing phonics, reflecting a cautious approach to deviating from established practices.

Time constraints emerged as a consistent tension, including the time required to screen students, examine their data, plan for instruction and resource needed materials, often personally purchased out of pocket by teachers in order to supplement the learning. This limitation became a critical consideration in managing the teachers' hesitations with respect to the shift. In response to this concern, the leadership team provided release time to teachers, allowing them to screen students, while someone taught their class and collaborative learning time with grade level partners. The challenge of implementing small group instruction within age-based cohorts posed another tension. Early career teachers and upper elementary teachers shared that they found it difficult to address the diverse needs within a class.

A teacher emphasized the necessity of adaptability, stating, "When things aren't working, you have to shift, try something else, you can't keep doing the same things over and over again if they're not working. You have to be open to change". For many of the teachers interviewed, the shift in instructional practices also prompted a reevaluation of traditional assessment methods and provided a structure to support students achieving mastery of foundational skills.

Discussion

I really believe this type of change with literacy really has to come from bottom up. I no longer believe in the top-down trickle effect. People need to listen to people on the front lines. (NGA Teacher)

According to Moats & Brady (1997), teachers must understand the phonology and importance of phonemic awareness, have knowledge of morphology, grammar, and text features, have the ability to differentiate, engage their students and provide explicit and systematic instruction to a diverse group of learners. When professional development is imposed on teachers

in a top-down manner, teachers' resistance may be attempts to “recover a sense of agency or capability” professional development (Musanti & Pence, 2010, p. 76). Unsurprisingly given the heated nature of the reading wars, literacy professional development and learning may be influenced by individual educators' positions on the issue. Similarly, there is a perception among some that science of reading is the latest pendulum shift or nothing new (Goldberg, 2019).

The findings reveal that the shift in practice at NGA is a collaborative, supported effort but nonetheless a challenging endeavor. Teachers demonstrate a commitment to professional growth and the catalyst for change stemmed from a collective awareness of students' reading difficulties, leading teachers to explore alternative approaches, notably focusing on elements of their reading instruction that they believed were missing— a focus on decoding. While undertaking this shift, the teachers at NGA realized that they need to develop a strong foundational knowledge of evidence-based reading instruction practices to be able to effectively teach their students. Simply put, they come to the collective realization that they cannot teach what they do not know, so they need to find ways to collectively (and individually) enhance their own knowledge and skills.

The change that took place at NGA were driven by the participants who took ownership of the initiative. This case study is an example of “the arrow of change [moving] in an upward direction, rather than only in a downward direction” (Datnow, 2020, p. 435). In contrast, larger, district-wide top-down literacy curriculum reforms in the United States failed despite being well funded, focused on professional development (including the use of literacy coaches) as the initiatives did not take into consideration the instructional classroom component and individual school cultures (Fullan, 2007).

Support for teachers came in the form of a community of peers. The collaboration aspect of the change initiative was not perceived by participants as imposed from the top down or as part of “contrived congeniality” but rather a natural part of the culture created by the school staff and administration (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018, p. 21). Similar studies found that the use of PLCs and team planning supported teachers through curriculum reform and implementing structured literacy changes (Duffy et al., 2024; Thomas et al., 2019).

Literacy focused professional development has the ability to “change teachers' mental models of reading development and teaching, increase teacher knowledge about teaching literacy, change teaching practice and meaningfully enhance student literacy outcomes” (Kim &

Snow, 2021, p. 11). However, when teachers do not have devoted in-school time for professional learning, they were less likely to complete literacy professional development or engage in the learning (Fairman et al., 2020).

According to many participants interviewed, the administrators and staff created a culture of safety in being vulnerable, fostering high levels of trust and shared responsibility among administrators and teachers. The leadership team shared an awareness of the challenges their staff faced in teaching reading and explicitly sought to understand the challenges and allow the teachers to drive the professional learning required. Rather than imposing the professional development on the teachers, the administration team became co-learners with the teachers ensuring opportunities and spaces for conversations about how best to teach children to read. This co-constructed approach allows for the learning to be multi-directional and supports teacher agency (Datnow, 2020). Structurally time was set aside for teachers to work and learn together, to spend time with support staff to implement and understand children's assessments and co-construct teaching and learning activities to address identified needs. Time was identified as a critical resource for any school-wide literacy change – as it enabled teachers to learn and plan together.

The professional development process highlights the need for ongoing support and resources, especially for junior teachers navigating the complexities of the shift. Time constraints, family involvement, and cohort-based small group instruction are described by teachers as important considerations moving forward. While this research provides valuable insights into the complexities of implementing a shift in literacy practices, it presents a case-study of a single school site. The participants who agreed to take part in the interviews and focus group are limited in number and present their own perspectives. These findings can inform other schools and leaders who are facing growing calls to change reading and literacy instruction.

Conclusion

The goals of this article were to understand if and why teachers felt a shift in literacy practice was needed, to document their experiences of this school-wide shift and to understand what challenges they faced on this collective journey. Teachers felt that their students were missing out on a key piece of instruction that would permit them to succeed. In this process of shifting literacy practices, both organic and school-level initiatives played crucial roles.

Some of the teachers came to shift their practices on their own, ahead of the curve, others were empowered to begin this work when it became a school-wide initiative and there was professional development put in place to support them engage in new ways of collectively thinking about teaching reading. Throughout the shift, teachers we interviewed felt supported by leadership that recognized the necessity of this change, even in the face of conflicting curriculum guidelines and external voices that may not have aligned with their innovative approaches. This support fostered a culture of collaboration and continuous learning, enabling educators to navigate challenges and refine their practices effectively.

Conclusion to MA Thesis by Article

In September 2022 the DOEED created a document that outlines the six pillars of effective reading instruction. Effective literacy instruction “requires a balance between systematic teaching of the alphabetic code, linguistic features, and the application of this knowledge in continuous text” (DOEED, 2022). Explicit whole and small group learning is included in this document. Critics suggest that the six pillars do not go far enough in developing critical literacy skills and that problematic elements of balanced literacy including cueing and levelled texts remain (Sampson, 2023).

One key concern that emerged from the calls for literacy reform is the potential for a pendulum shift in literacy instruction, where structured literacy gains traction only to possibly revert back to a balanced literacy approach over time. My own personal experiences with implementing the new Language curriculum inadvertently led to an overemphasis on phonics in my teaching. This came at the expense of other essential components of literacy education, including a love of reading. When faced with an overwhelming number of resources and no time to properly master the material myself the default became drill and kill.

Conversely, there is a risk that students may lack sufficient direct instruction in phonics and struggle to independently navigate literacy tasks, especially among older learners who have experienced disruptions in their education due to the pandemic. The response of educators at New Glasgow Academy to the needs of their students serves as a notable example of addressing these challenges. By identifying areas where students lacked explicit and systematic instruction, educators at NGA proactively closed gaps and implemented consistent approaches to ensure that students developed the foundational skills necessary for continued learning. The data collected by teachers and support staff drove the instruction and shift in practices. Critically, teachers were able to collaboratively learn and plan. Moving forward, it is imperative for educators to feel supported and empowered in making similar changes in different school settings. The educators in this case study centered the learners in this process and through collaboratively professional development built out a literacy program that served the students in front of them.

References

- Alligton, R., & Pressley, M. (2023). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (5th Edition). Guilford Press.
- Bates, C.C., & Morgan, D.N. (2018). Seven elements of effective professional development. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(5), 623–626.
- Bennett, P. (2022, March 26). Nova Scotia wedded to 'ineffective' reading aids for elementary kids. *Saltwire*. <https://archive.ph/OGDF9>
- Bingham, G. E., & Hall-Kenyon, K. M. (2013). Examining teachers' beliefs about and implementation of a balanced literacy framework. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 36(1), 14–28.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Casey, L. (2022, February 8). Ontario to revamp approach to literacy in schools. *CTV News*. <https://toronto.ctvnews.ca/ontario-to-revamp-approach-to-literacy-in-schools-1.5799524>
- Cazden, C., Cope, B., Fairclough, N., Gee, J., Kalantzis, M., Kress, G., Luke, A., Luke, C., Michaels, S., & Nakata, M. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard educational review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Chall, J. (1997). *Learning to Read: The Great Debate*. McGraw-Hill.
- Cope, W., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). Multiliteracies: New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies*, 4(3), 164–195.
- Cowen, C. D. (2016). What is structured literacy [Non-Profit]. International Dyslexia Association. <https://dyslexiaida.org/what-is-structured-literacy/>
- Cummins, J. (2022). Ontario Human Rights Commission Right to Read Report: Sincere, passionate, flawed. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 16(1), 85–92.
- Cunningham, A. E., & O'Donnell, C. R. (2016). Teachers' knowledge about beginning reading development and instruction. In *The Oxford Handbook of Reading*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199324576.013.26>
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th Edition). Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.

- Datnow, A. (2020). The role of teachers in educational reform: A 20-year perspective. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(3), 431-441.
- Desimone, L. M. (2011). A primer on effective professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(6), 68-71.
- DOEECD. (2014). *English Language Arts: Guide*.
<https://curriculum.novascotia.ca/sites/default/files/documents/curriculum-files/English%20Language%20Arts%204-6%20Guide%20%282014%29.pdf>
- DOEECD. (2021). *Reading continuum P-3*.
<https://curriculum.novascotia.ca/sites/default/files/documents/resource-files/Reading%20Continuum%20P-3%20%282021%29.pdf>
- DOEECD. (2021b). *Responsive Literacy in the P-3 Classroom: Supplemental resource*.
<https://curriculum.novascotia.ca/sites/default/files/documents/resource-files/P-3%20Literacy%20Learning.pdf>
- DOEECD. (2020). Assessing literacy P-3. Retrieved from
<https://curriculum.novascotia.ca/sites/default/files/documents/resource-files/Assessing%20Literacy%20P-3.pdf>
- DOEECD. (2020b). Amendments to the developmental phonemic awareness continuum P-3. Retrieved from <https://curriculum.novascotia.ca/sites/default/files/documents/resource-files/November%202020%20Amendments%20Phonics%20Continuum%20P-3.pdf>
- DOEECD. (2022). Six pillars of effective reading instruction. Retrieved from
<https://curriculum.novascotia.ca/sites/default/files/documents/resource-files/Six%20Pillars%20of%20Effective%20Reading%20Instruction.pdf>
- Drewry, R. J., Cumming-Potvin, W. M., & Maor, D. (2019). New approaches to literacy problems: Multiliteracies and inclusive pedagogies. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(11), 61–78.
- Duffy, M. A., Mazzye, D. L., Storie, M., & Lamb, R. L. (2024). Professional development and coaching in the science of reading: impacts on oral reading fluency in comparison to national norms. *International Journal of Instruction*, 17(1), 533-558.

- Durán, L., & Hikida, M. (2022). Making sense of reading's forever wars. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 103(8), 14–19.
- Dyslexia Canada. (2023, December 9). Spotlight Episode 3: Re-culturing literacy instruction in a Nova Scotia school [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved September 23, 2023, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mrZfAbhT2cQ&ab_channel=DyslexiaCanada
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115.
- Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 7(3), 93-99.
- Fairman, J. C., Smith, D. J., Pullen, P. C., & Lebel, S. J. (2022). The challenge of keeping teacher professional development relevant. In *Leadership for Professional Learning* (pp. 251-263). Routledge.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2023). Veteran teachers' understanding of "balanced literacy." *Journal of Education*, 203(1), 188–195.
- Frey, B.B., Lee, S. W., Tollefson, N., Pass, L., & Massengill, D. (2005). Balanced literacy in an urban school district. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(5), 272–280.
- Fullan, M. (2007). Change theory as a force for school improvement. In *Intelligent leadership: Constructs for thinking education leaders* (pp. 27-39). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.
- Goldberg, M. (2019, October 21). Making changes that last: The end of the pendulum? *Reading Rockets*. <https://www.readingrockets.org/blogs/right-to-read/making-changes-last-end-pendulum>
- Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7(1), 6–10.
- Guo, L., Wang, J., Lee, J., & Lesley, M. (2023). Examining the differentiated impacts of balanced literacy: An analysis of reading comprehension skills. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 1–15.
- Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Solidarity with solidity: The case for collaborative professionalism. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 100(1), 20-24.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2010). Professional learning communities and system improvement. *Improving schools*, 13(2), 172-181.

- Hasbrouck, J. (2020). An update to the National Reading Panel report: What we know about fluency in 2020. *The Reading League Journal*, 1(3), 29-31.
- Hindman, A. H., Morrison, F. J., Connor, C. M., & Connor, J. A. (2020). Bringing the science of reading to preservice elementary teachers: Tools that bridge research and practice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55, S197-S206.
- International Dyslexia Association Ontario. (2020). Submission to the Ontario Human Rights Commission's Right to Read inquiry. IDA Ontario.
<https://www.idaontario.com/wp%20content/uploads/2020/04/IDA-Ontario-Submission-to-the-OHRC-Right-to-Read-Inquiry-%20March-2020.pdf>
- Jacobs, G. (2013). Designing assessments: A multiliteracies approach. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(8), 623–626.
- Kelly, K., & Thomas, P. (2020). Failing balanced literacy is failing readers.
<https://furman.app.box.com/s/pmz2www1h4i6yidade39bgg2y9t7onr5>
- Kim, Y. S., & Snow, C. (2021). The Science of Reading Is Incomplete without the Science of Teaching Reading. *The Reading Journal*, 2(3), 5-8, 10-13.
- Lauwo, M. S., Accurso, K., & Rajagopal, H. (2022). Plurilingualism, equity and pre-service teacher identity: Centring [linguistic] diversity in teacher education. *TESL Canada Journal*, 38(2), 113–139.
- Magaldi, D., & Berler, M. (2020). Semi-structured interviews. *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, 4825-4830.
- Milner, H. R. (2020). Disrupting racism and whiteness in researching a science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S249–S253.
- Minor-Corriveau, M. (2022, May 2). Le droit de lire: L'intégrale des 3 articles parus dans Le Voyageur La Voix du Nord. *Michele Minor Corriveau*.
<https://micheleminorcorriveau.com/en/le-droit-de-lire-lintegrale-des-3-articles-parus-dans-le-voyageur-la-voix-du-nord/>
- Mitton, J., & Murray-Orr, A. (2021). Identifying the impact of culturally relevant pedagogy: Evidence of academic risk-taking in culturally and economically diverse Nova Scotia classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 44(4), 1084–1115.
- Moats, L. C., & Lyon, G. R. (1996). Wanted: Teachers with knowledge of language. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 16(2), 73-86.

- Moats, L. & Brady, S. (1997). Summary of position paper, Informed instruction for reading success: Foundations for teacher preparation. International Dyslexia Association. <https://www.readingrockets.org/topics/professional-development/articles/what-teachers-need-know-informed-reading-instruction>
- Moats, L. (2020). Teaching reading is rocket science: What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do. *American Federation of Teachers*, 1-29.
- Musanti, S. I., & Pence, L. (2010). Collaboration and teacher development: Unpacking resistance, constructing knowledge, and navigating identities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(1), 73-89.
- Ontario Human Rights Commission. (2022). *The right to read: Public inquiry into human rights issues affecting students with reading disabilities*. <https://www.ohrc.on.ca/sites/default/files/FINAL%20R2R%20REPORT%20DESIGNED%20April%2012.pdf>
- Ontario Ministry of Education. *The Ontario curriculum, grades 1-6: Language*. (2023). Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Petrilli, M. (2020). Put "whole language" on trial. *Education Next*, 20(2), 86–87.
- Pittman, R. T., Zhang, S., Binks-Cantrell, E., Hudson, A., & Joshi, R. M. (2020). Teachers' knowledge about language constructs related to literacy skills and student achievement in low socio-economic status schools. *Dyslexia*, 26(2), 200-219.
- Poulton, P. (2020). Teacher agency in curriculum reform: The role of assessment in enabling and constraining primary teachers' agency. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 40(1), 35-48.
- Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (3rd Edition). Guilford Press.
- Preston, T. (2022). A look back: A chronicle of Kappan's coverage of the reading wars. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 103(8), 5–7.
- Rankin, A. (2022, November 22). Children are struggling unnecessarily: N.S. reading curriculum failing too many kids, say parents, experts. *Saltwire*. <https://www.saltwire.com/atlantic-canada/news/children-are-struggling-unnecessarily-ns-reading-curriculum-failing-too-many-kids-say-parents-experts-100798121/>
- Sampson, A. (2023, March 4). Nova Scotia's new learning-to-read plan still doesn't go far enough, say critics. *Canadian Broadcast Corporation*.

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/nova-scotia-s-new-learning-to-read-plan-still-doesn-t-go-far-enough-say-critics-1.6767977>

- Sang, Y. (2017). Expanded territories of “literacy”: New literacies and multiliteracies. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(8), 16–19.
- Semingson, P., & Kerns, W. (2021). Where is the evidence? Looking back to Jeanne Chall and enduring debates about the science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(S1), S157–S169.
- Stone, L. (2019). *Reading for life: High quality literacy instruction for all*. Routledge.
- The Reading League. (2021). *Science of reading: Defining guide*.
<https://www.thereadingleague.org/what-is-the-science-of-reading/defining-guide-ebook/>
- Thomas, D. P., Emery, S., Prain, V., Papageorgiou, J., & McKendrick, A. M. (2019). Influences on local curriculum innovation in times of change: A literacy case study. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 46, 469-487.
- Vaughn, M., Parsons, S. A., & Massey, D. (2020). Aligning the science of reading with adaptive teaching. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S299–S306.
- Weddle, H., Lockton, M., & Datnow, A. (2019). Teacher collaboration, differing expectations, and emotions in school improvement: “It’s always take, take, take”. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 4(4), 325-343.
- Westby, C. (2010). Multiliteracies: The changing world of communication. *Topics in Language Disorder*, 30(1), 64–71.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

Interview Guide - Teachers

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview concerning your school's journey to improve student well-being and achievement through literacy. Your participation in this interview supports our research by examining how teachers' experience and perceive change. The purpose of this interview is to discuss how implementation of new literacy practices have impacted you and your teaching practices.

Overview: During the interview you will be asked a few questions. My name is [investigator's name] and I will be speaking with you today. I will be taking notes during our discussion. This interview will last approximately 30-60 minutes and with your consent it will be audio recorded to ensure accuracy. Any comments that you make today will be kept confidential. Information that identifies you will not be included in the final study. Only myself and my co-investigator will know your identity and throughout the research project in any documentation or reports participants will be assigned pseudonyms or referred to by the generic term of "educators".

You are free to end the interview and to leave at any time and please feel free to only answer the questions that you are comfortable answering.

Before we begin, I would like to remind you that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions that I will be asking. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Note: the sub-questions are to be used as prompts and follow-up as needed but the goal is to begin a conversation and the participant is welcome to expand on those elements that resonate with them the most.

Interview Questions:

1. Can you tell me a little about your journey as a teacher, when and where you began your career and how you came to be a teacher here at NGA?
 - a. What grades have you been teaching since being at NGA
 - b. Has your role always included teaching literacy/language arts?
 - c. How do you see your role as linked to student inclusion and well-being?
 - d. In what ways do you see literacy, inclusion and well-being being connected if at all?

2. Thinking of your role as a classroom teacher, where does teaching literacy fit?
 - a. Is it something that you focus on across the curriculum or teach as a subject?
 - b. Are there aspects of teaching literacy that have really excited you during your career as a classroom teacher?
 - c. Are there aspects of teaching literacy that have proved challenging over your career?

3. Could you describe your previous literacy practices and programming, prior to the new transition?
 - a. What did you most enjoy about teaching literacy/language arts in the past?
4. Can you describe your current practices in literacy teaching and learning?
 - a. How are the two approaches different?
 - b. How are you feeling about the change?
5. Can you talk to me about why such a transformation necessary?
 - a. What were the motivations for a change in programming?
6. How was the transformation introduced to classroom teachers?
 - a. What role did you have in deciding about changes to literacy programming or practices?
 - b. Can you talk me through the ways in which the changes were rolled out across your grade levels?
7. What do you think is the most important change you have made in your teaching practices?
 - a. What learning, or un-learning was required on your part to make this change happen?
 - b. From your perspective, what were the least challenging aspects of implementing a shift in literacy practice?
 - c. What were the most challenging aspects?
 - d. How did you navigate the challenges?
 - i. What supports or resources assisted you in navigating the challenges you faced?
8. In your opinion, what made this school-wide shift in practice possible?
9. In what ways (if at all) do you think the shift in practice has improved students' achievement?
 - a. Can you perhaps show or talk to me about what that looks like in terms of student activities?
10. In what ways (if at all) do you think the shift in practice has had an influence on students' well-being?
 - a. Can you give me some examples?
 - b. What does this look like in your day-to-day classroom interactions?
11. When seeking guidance or clarification regarding structured literacy concepts and practices, who might you speak with or seek assistance from?
12. What do you think is the next step for you in your journey as a literacy teacher?
 - a. What practices or resources do you hope to incorporate in your classroom going forward?

13. If you were asked by a teacher or administrator in another school about the key conditions to ensure a successful change in literacy program in a school, what would you recommend she give attention to?

Interview Guide Focus Groups

Focus Group Guide - for both Teachers and Leadership Team Focus Group

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this focus group concerning your school's journey to improve student well-being and achievement through literacy. Your participation in this focus group supports our research by examining how members of your school navigated a major transformation in practice.

This focus group is structured as a discussion session based on some core questions seeking to better understand your school context, and the participants experiences of the shift in practice brought about by the school-based change to literacy.

Any comments that you make today will be kept confidential. Information that identifies you will not be included in the final study. Only I, and the other focus group participants will know your identity and responses. We ask that you do not repeat any information discussed in this focus group with others.

You are free to leave at any time and please feel free to only answer the questions that you are comfortable answering. Before we begin, I would like to remind you that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions that I will be asking. Does anybody have any questions before we begin?

Note: the sub-questions are to be used as prompts and follow-up as needed but the goal is to begin a conversation and the participant is welcome to expand on those elements that resonate with them the most.

Interview Questions:

- 1) How would you describe your school culture and community?
- 2) When you think about your experience of this literacy program change, what opportunities and/or challenges come to mind?
 - a) What role (if any) did collaboration play in engaging in this transformation in practice?
 - b) What role (if any) did mentorship play in engaging in this transformation in practice?
 - c) How did students respond to the changes in your literacy program?
- 3) What conditions or considerations do you think are important for other schools looking to implement a similar change?

Appendix B: Recruitment Text

Greetings [[personalize to name](#)]

We are researchers from the University of Ottawa who have been asked to conduct a case study of the New Glasgow Academy's (NGA) 2021-2022 literacy initiative. I understand that you have been involved in the initiative as a [identify role e.g. classroom teacher, speech therapist, administrator etc.].

We are visiting NGA from Tuesday 24th May to Friday 27th May and would very much appreciate the opportunity to speak with you about your experiences of this initiative.

We would invite you to participate in the research study in two ways:

An individual interview where we would discuss your experience of the initiative, how it has influenced your day-to-day practice, and any thoughts you might want to share related to opportunities and challenges arising from the initiative.

In addition to the interview, we invite you to participate in a focus group with up to four of your colleagues, to engage in conversations around the experiences of the initiative, opportunities, and challenges, and what you collectively learned from the experience.

You can choose to participate in just the one-on-one interview or just the focus group, or both. The two formats typically generate different conversations so we are hopeful people will be interested in sharing their experiences in a way that is most comfortable for them.

I attach the **Consent Form** for the project which explains what you can expect, should you agree to participate, in more detail. At the end of the consent form is a link to a secure portal through which you can register for the individual interview and the focus group at a time to suit during our visit to New Glasgow Academy. Both will be scheduled during the school day and class coverage will be provided. Should you prefer to speak with us after hours to ensure the school administration does not know of your participation, we can meet over Zoom after school hours at a time of your choice.

We are very much looking forward to the opportunity to meet with you and understand better your experiences of the literacy initiative and your insights into this school-based program change.

Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me directly through return email.

Sincerely

Ruth Kane
Ruth Kane, PhD
Faculty of Education