



Foundational and Emergent Questions:
**Smart People Talk About
Adolescent Literacy**

*A Report by the Steering Committee
of the National Adolescent Literacy Coalition*

September 2007

Acknowledgments

National Adolescent Literacy Coalition wishes to gratefully acknowledge The Kellogg Foundation for its generous grant in support of the creation and development of NALC.

Additionally, we wish to thank Tom Rudin, senior vice president of Advocacy, Government Relations, and Development at the College Board, for his understanding of and commitment to the importance of advocacy and collaboration in the area of adolescent literacy, and for his continuous support of the National Adolescent Literacy Coalition.

Contents

National Adolescent Literacy Coalition Foundational and Emergent Questions: Smart People Talk About Adolescent Literacy

Acknowledgments	2
Background: The Adolescent Literacy Imperative	6
Sidebar: Recent Reports on Adolescent Literacy	6
Consensus and Conflict in the Field of Adolescent Literacy	8
Educational Triage or Comprehensive Care?	10
One Big Literacy or Many Little Literacies?	11
Hurry Up and Wait	13
Next Steps	14
References	15
Appendix A	16
Appendix B: NALC Steering Committee	16
Appendix C: NALC Participating Organizations	17
Appendix D: Participants at NALC’s October 2006 Summit in Oak Park, Illinois	18

Foundational and Emergent Questions: Smart People Talk About Adolescent Literacy

September 2007

by the Steering Committee of the National Adolescent Literacy Coalition

In February 2007, *Reading Today*—the bimonthly newspaper of the International Reading Association (IRA)—confirmed what many educators probably suspected already: Adolescent literacy is an “extremely hot” topic. In fact, the paper’s eleventh annual survey of leading experts revealed adolescent literacy to be the hottest of all the topics that IRA members care about, including perennially important issues such as preschool literacy instruction, adult literacy, reading fluency, the teaching of vocabulary, and the assessment of student reading skills.

Truly, the field of adolescent literacy has come into its own over the last few years, as evidenced not just by expert opinion but also by the publication of a number of major policy reports and research reviews (see box, page 4); the development of many new commercial teaching materials and programs for middle and high school students reading below grade level; the emergence of various state initiatives designed to improve literacy instruction in the middle and high school grades; the creation of Striving Readers, a federal program supporting reading instruction and research focused on students in grades 6–12; and the ongoing efforts of various prominent organizations—such as Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Alliance for Excellent Education, the International Reading Association, and the National Governors Association—to promote improvements in adolescent literacy research, classroom practice, policymaking, and teacher education and professional development.

Not only is there a growing sense that America’s adolescents *need* better literacy instruction, but it has also become clear that the schools *can* provide it, if they put into practice what is already known about effective reading and writing instruction in the upper grades. The research on adolescent literacy is not yet as extensive as the knowledge base on early reading, but it does provide clear, unambiguous guidance for policy and practice, giving school reformers every reason to believe that new investments in this area will pay dividends (for useful syntheses of the research, see Biancarosa and Snow, 2006; Graham and Perin, 2007; and Torgesen et al., 2007).

Amidst all this ferment, the National Adolescent Literacy Coalition (NALC) has an important role to play. Created in 2004, NALC is an informal association that brings together many and varied groups and individuals working in this field, creating opportunities for them to share information, discuss new developments in research and policy, debate priorities for school reform, and talk through strategies for improving classroom instruction on a wide scale. Most important, NALC aims to host the kind of open, informal, ongoing dialogue necessary to maintain the strong, cohesive adolescent literacy movement that now exists.

As a non-dues-collecting organization governed by a rotating steering committee, NALC does not fund research projects or pursue a narrow policy agenda. Rather, its main purpose is to offer—through its meetings, Web site, and occasional reports—useful and timely information to its members. In particular, it provides opportunities to discuss emerging points of confusion and/or conflict within the adolescent literacy movement, so that members can avoid major rifts by addressing any scholarly or political disagreements as soon as they arise.

In that spirit, the present report identifies three major sources of tension that have begun to emerge from within the field of adolescent literacy and that will need to be resolved if the field is to continue to offer clear, consistent recommendations for improving reading and writing instruction in grades 4–12.

Background: The Adolescent Literacy Imperative

In one sense, the current level of attention to adolescent literacy is just an extension of efforts over the last few decades to improve reading instruction in the earlier grades. Now that the so-called “reading wars” of the 1990s have cooled down, and now that major new investments in early literacy instruction have been secured—most notably the \$1 billion-per-year federal Reading First program, enacted in 2001—it would seem only logical to take the next step and extend those efforts into the middle and high school grades.

But if adolescent literacy has finally become a hot topic, it isn’t just because grades 4–12 happen to come after grades K–3. Nor is it just because the field has been lucky enough to attract influential champions, such as Carnegie Corporation of New York (which commissioned many of the publications listed to the right). More fundamentally, the current emphasis on adolescent literacy has to do with Americans’ increasing sense of anxiety about the economic and civic health of the nation.

Recent Reports on Adolescent Literacy

- **The Neglected “R”: The Need for a Writing Revolution** (The National Commission on Writing, 2003)
- **Reading Next: A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy** (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004)
- **Creating a Culture of Literacy: A Guide for Middle and High School Principals** (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 2005)
- **A Governor’s Guide to Adolescent Literacy** (National Governors Association, 2005)
- **Reading at Risk: The State Response to the Crisis in Adolescent Literacy** (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2005)
- **Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals about College Readiness in Reading** (ACT, 2006)
- **The Next Chapter: A School Board Guide to Improving Adolescent Literacy** (National School Boards Association, 2006)
- **Standards for Middle and High School Literacy Coaches** (International Reading Association, 2006)
- **Principles of Adolescent Literacy Reform: A Policy Research Brief** (National Council of Teachers of English, 2006)
- **Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools** (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2007)
- **Double the Work: Challenges and Solutions to Acquiring Language and Academic Literacy for Adolescent English Language Learners** (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2007)
- **Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: A Guidance Document from the Center on Instruction** (Center on Instruction, 2007)
- **Literacy Instruction in the Content Areas: Getting to the Core of Middle and High School Improvement** (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2007)
- **Informed Choices for Struggling Adolescent Readers: A Research-Based Guide to Instructional Programs and Practices** (International Reading Association, 2007)

Since it was first administered three decades ago, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, or “the Nation’s Report Card”) has shown no progress in the literacy skills of America’s middle and high school students and only modest growth at the elementary level. As measured by the NAEP, roughly two-thirds of eighth- and twelfth-graders read and write below a proficient level, and half of those students lack even the most basic literacy skills needed to succeed in school. Those figures did not change between 1974 and 2005. What did change were the larger social and economic realities that serve as the backdrop to those NAEP scores. Judging by the ominous tone of a number of recent high-profile reports—such as *Rising Above the Gathering Storm* (National Academy of Sciences, 2006), *Tough Choices or Tough Times* (National Center for Education and the Economy, 2006), and *America’s Perfect Storm: Three Forces Changing Our Nation’s Future* (ETS, 2007)—the country is fast approaching one of the most pivotal moments in its history, and as never before, education will play a key part in deciding its future. At stake is whether this will continue to be a broadly prosperous and relatively egalitarian society, or whether it will become less wealthy overall and ever more sharply divided into the haves and have-nots, with very large and rapidly growing segments of the population—particularly persons of color and the rural poor—finding that they no longer have a realistic chance of achieving a standard of living that bears even a passing resemblance to the American Dream.

Not since 1983’s *A Nation at Risk* have education reformers sounded such urgent, impassioned warnings about America’s future. Compared with that earlier call to arms, however, the present reports build upon a far stronger knowledge base, including analyses of labor market trends, demographic projections, and research into the reading and writing skills of students and adult workers. Taken together, those trends appear to point toward a not-too-distant future in which, as the ETS report puts it, “there will be tens of millions more adults . . . who lack the education and skills they will need to thrive in the new economy” (p. 21), leading to unemployment and poverty on a scale that will profoundly reshape the country’s character. Previous gloom-and-doom predictions about education and the economy may have turned out to be false alarms, acknowledge the report’s authors, but this time the winds really do seem ready to blow as hard as the forecasts predict: “We can’t hope to ride this one out. If we continue on our present heading and fail to take effective action, the storm will have a number of predictable and dire implications for future generations, with consequences that extend well beyond the economic realm to the ethos of our society” (p. 7).

Fundamentally, it is literacy—even more than skills in math and science—that will divide winners from losers in this scenario. And literacy here means not just the basics of reading and writing and oral communication, and not just the ability to comprehend and produce simple, straightforward documents, but also the kinds of advanced skills that only a fraction of the nation’s students were expected to have a generation ago. In order to succeed in college and work—or just to manage the everyday demands of life in an increasingly diverse and media-saturated society—young people will have to be able to read and write in many different styles and for many different purposes, guided by an acute awareness of the context at hand and the need to adapt their language to fit that context. They will have to be able to communicate effectively to many audiences, to do so using all sorts of media, and to make sense of all kinds of written materials, from technical manuals to textbooks to the terse, grammarless prose of e-mail and instant messages.

Foundational and Emergent Questions Smart People Talk About Adolescent Literacy

The common sense of what it means to be a well-educated, “literate” American has undergone several dramatic changes over the last two hundred years (Myers, 1996; Kaestle et al., 1989), and it appears to be changing again today. As late as the Civil War, one needed only to be able to sign one’s name to be considered a literate person. In subsequent decades, people were considered literate if they were familiar with certain canonical texts (such as the Bible, the Constitution, and the classics of ancient Greece), whether or not they could read and write skillfully. It wasn’t until the early part of the twentieth century, when school enrollments skyrocketed, that most Americans began to equate literacy with the reading and writing skills one learns in the classroom, particularly the ability to decode and get meaning out of the written word.

That particular conception of what it means to be literate has held sway for generations now, but it too shall pass. The ability to read and comprehend at a third-grade level—so much the focus of recent policy debates and school reforms—is swiftly becoming not the mark of a literate individual but, rather, a *prerequisite* for becoming truly literate.

Within a matter of years, the idea that basic reading and writing skills make one literate will come to seem as quaint as the notion that literacy means the ability to quote Homer or merely to sign one’s name. The question is, what will it take to help the public schools keep up with the times?

Consensus and Conflict in the Field of Adolescent Literacy

The enactment in 2001 of the federal Reading First program—which has, since then, provided roughly a billion dollars per year for elementary reading instruction, professional development, and research—suggests that literacy reformers can have major impacts both on federal and state policy and, in turn, on the practices of individual teachers and students. But recent history also shows just how fraught with conflict and complexity literacy reform can be, and just how much hard work, negotiation, and compromise it takes to get large-scale literacy programs and initiatives off the ground, much less to ensure that those programs and initiatives translate into real changes at the classroom level.

After years of furious debate over the relative merits of whole language and phonics instruction in the early grades, reformers should not underestimate the dangers of scholarly and political discord, and they should take care to preserve the remarkable spirit of consensus that now describes the field of adolescent literacy, both among researchers and among those advocating changes in policy and practice. Not only do recent reports and research studies on adolescent literacy share an extraordinary degree of consistency, but so too do a range of prominent state literacy projects (such as Just Read, Florida! and the Alabama Reading Initiative), middle and high school reform models, and the new Striving Readers legislation introduced in both the U.S. House and Senate in March 2007. For example, consensus reigns on the need for:

- literacy instruction to continue past the third grade and to extend throughout the K–12 curriculum;
- adolescent literacy instruction to be differentiated according to students’ particular needs, as informed by careful diagnostic and formative assessment;
- dedicated, high-quality interventions for adolescents reading below grade level;
- much more attention to reading instruction in the academic content areas;

- much more attention to writing instruction in all grades and academic content areas;
- much more attention to the distinct literacy needs of adolescent English language learners and students with disabilities;
- greater numbers of experienced and effective teachers working with middle and high school students who have weak literacy skills;
- much stronger professional development in literacy instruction for all middle and high school teachers;
- state and federal accountability systems that include measures of analytic reading and independent writing, creating positive incentives for teachers to focus on these skills;
- more and better reading materials for adolescents who read below grade level, particularly texts that will interest those students without proving too difficult and frustrating for them to read;
- more flexibility in scheduling and time in school, so that teachers can devote more time and attention to literacy when they deem it necessary; and
- adolescent literacy instruction that aligns more closely with the reading and writing demands of college and the workforce.

The current level of activity in the field of adolescent literacy suggests that educators, researchers, and policymakers have been strongly persuaded of the need to improve reading and writing instruction at the secondary level. However, while the field does now enjoy a rare degree of consensus on a number of core recommendations for policy and practice, debate and disagreements are inevitable. In order to bring such disagreements to light, NALC's steering committee decided in the fall of 2006 that it would be useful to convene a summit, giving literacy experts and representatives of member organizations an opportunity to take stock of current efforts to improve middle and high school reading and writing instruction and, if needed, to recommend ways to keep those efforts on track, resolving any points of tension that might threaten to divide the field.

Rather than specifying a narrow theme for discussion, and rather than choosing speakers to address the gathering, the steering committee decided that it would be more in keeping with NALC's goals to encourage an open-ended dialogue, starting with a broad, guiding question (see Appendix A) but assuming no fixed list of topics. In order to be productive, however, meetings do require at least some structure, and so the steering committee elected to use the Open Space protocol, which calls for a facilitator (who guides members through a process of unearthing and prioritizing issues of interest generated from the group) and note-takers (who document the conversations). The summit took place over a day and a half on the campus of Dominican University in Oak Park, Illinois, with more than 50 participants. (For a complete list of participants, see Appendix D.)

The following pages describe the three themes that seemed to provoke the most interest, uncertainty, and/or tension among participants at that event. This is a fairly subjective account, based on the NALC steering committee's review of notes from the meeting. It does not offer a scientifically rigorous analysis of the proceedings. Rather, it provides a useful prompt to further dialogue among researchers, reformers, and policymakers working to improve adolescent literacy instruction.

1) Educational Triage or Comprehensive Care?

Today, it is commonly agreed that the typical American adolescent requires a much higher level of reading and writing proficiency than most students needed a generation ago.

More specifically, reformers argue that it is not enough for the average student to be able to decode written texts fluently and accurately and to comprehend the literal meaning of the reading materials assigned by their teachers. Students must also be able to read and write academic and nonacademic texts of various kinds—from historical documents to lab reports to college applications and business letters—and to do so skillfully, with command of various styles, text structures, vocabulary, and content. Ideally, they should be able to read critically and write persuasive, independent texts of their own, for a range of purposes, across diverse contexts, and with diverse interlocutors.

Reformers often call upon schools to embrace these ambitious goals for reading and writing instruction, and they often argue that most or all students are capable of developing such skills and deserve opportunities to practice them, not only to prepare for college and the workforce, but also to develop themselves as individuals and citizens. Further, and as described above, many pundits and a number of high-profile reports go so far as to suggest that the nation's ability to compete in the global economy is at risk. It is imperative, goes this line of thinking, that the public schools help far greater numbers of students to develop these sorts of high-level skills.

On the other hand, among reformers there is now an equally strong emphasis on helping struggling adolescent readers—usually defined as those who read two or more years below grade level—to catch up in the basic literacy skills (especially reading fluency and basic comprehension) that should have been mastered by the third grade.

These two emphases—teaching high-level skills and helping struggling readers to catch up in the basics—do not necessarily contradict one another. However, discussions at the Oak Park meeting revealed some unresolved tensions as to the ways in which they go together.

For example, it is sometimes argued that schools can and should teach advanced, content-area reading and writing skills in *tandem* with literacy intervention programs for low-level readers. Some experts hold that all students, no matter how rudimentary their literacy skills, should be encouraged to read critically, write persuasively, advance and defend their own arguments, and learn how to read and write the kinds of texts assigned in the academic disciplines. Thus, students might be required to participate in a literacy intervention program one period (learning how to read and comprehend simple, nondisciplinary texts, for example) and then spend the next period in a regular chemistry class (being guided as they try to make sense of difficult passages in a grade-level textbook).

Then again, some experts appear to believe that literacy skills should be viewed developmentally. In other words, students should be taught first to read simple texts with fluency and comprehension, and only then should they move on to more difficult, content-area texts.

The question on the table is whether the teaching of higher-order literacy skills can and should be fully integrated with literacy interventions for low-level struggling readers, and if so, how? Should

advanced intellectual work be woven into the teaching of basic skills, or do struggling readers have a hierarchy of needs, such that teachers' first priority should be to do triage, so to speak, attending to basic skills first? If students are still in the process of mastering basic reading fluency and comprehension, then should their teachers emphasize alternative ways to engage them in academic content, such as by showing movies and reading the textbook aloud in class, or should they do the often painstaking work of showing them how to make their way through disciplinary texts that appear, at least at first, to be too hard for them?

Further, to what extent are the answers to these questions constrained by limited resources? Practically speaking, must educators choose between providing basic skills instruction and teaching higher-level skills, particularly reading and writing in the academic content areas? Can schools and districts invest both in interventions for low-level readers *and* in improved content-area reading instruction, or does more investment in one part of the reform agenda mean less investment in the other? If the schools make a concerted effort to help the lowest performing readers to catch up, does this mean that they're dooming the American economy by failing to produce the highly skilled workers that are so desperately needed? And if the schools dedicate more resources to cultivating the advanced skills that business leaders are calling for, does this mean that they're dooming the least fortunate kids to educational failure?

2) One Big Literacy or Many Little Literacies?

Since at least as far back as the 1970s, literacy reformers have argued that content-area teachers ought to share in the responsibility to teach reading to middle and high school students, specifically by teaching them generic strategies they can use to better comprehend all sorts of texts. Thus, many thousands of math, history, science, English, and other teachers have been encouraged to show students how to question the author, use graphic organizers, and engage in various pre- and postreading exercises designed to help them better understand difficult reading materials, whatever the subject area.

In recent years, however, another line of reasoning has exposed an implicit assumption buried within the argument for teaching reading in the content areas, namely the assumption that reading is a generic skill that, once learned, can be applied to any number of particular settings, from math class to English to biology to the reading of tax forms. To put it another way, advocates of teaching reading in the content areas have tended to assume that reading is like playing baseball; once you learn the rules and master the basic skills, you can play anywhere, from Boston to Los Angeles to Tokyo to Havana.

By contrast, it has become very common in the last 10 or 15 years for scholars of literacy to describe reading not as a single, transferable skill but as a loosely bound collection of skills, many of them context-specific. Here, reading is analogous not to baseball but to cooking: whereas a good baseball player can succeed in any league, a good short-order cook from Boston would be lost behind a Tokyo sushi bar, and an experienced sushi chef would be lost in a Cuban restaurant. In other words, people may be wrong to assume that reading is the same in all content areas; in fact, the different academic disciplines require very different literacy skills. The ways in which historians read archival documents differ quite markedly from the ways in which biologists read lab reports, literacy critics read novels, mathematicians read proofs, and so on.

Foundational and Emergent Questions Smart People Talk About Adolescent Literacy

Along with this renewed attention to the *different* forms of communication that go on in different contexts and content areas, some have argued that the teaching of reading and writing is best handled by content-area experts themselves. Rather than asking a single literacy instructor (whether an English/language arts teacher, reading specialist, literacy coach, or other individual) to help students become better readers and writers *in general*, each content-area teacher should teach students how to read and write effectively *within* the given discipline.

Yet, within the field of adolescent literacy there currently appears to be a good deal of indecision as to how to balance these two versions of reading instruction. Lately, for example, the appointment of literacy coaches has become an enormously popular reform strategy, and those coaches tend to be defined as generalists, ostensibly having no particular content area. It is as though literacy coaches were analogous to baseball coaches—it doesn't matter where they go, whether to coach for the math department or to coach in social studies; baseball is baseball, and reading is reading.

On the other hand, some would argue that generalists don't know enough about the particular disciplines to work effectively with content-area teachers.

For example, consider the *Standards for Literacy Coaches* (published in 2006 by the International Reading Association). That document has done much to help clarify the role of the literacy coach, and it brings the content-area associations together around a shared definition of the skills and dispositions that literacy coaches must have in order to work with teachers in the various academic disciplines. Yet at the same time, the document gives each content-area association several pages in which to show that its own forms of reading and writing are distinct. In other words, the document reveals within itself a crucial, unresolved tension: It calls for literacy coaches to work in all of the disciplines, but at the same time it also suggests that literacy coaches are not likely to know enough to work in more than one content area—they might know a lot about teaching kids how to read and write about literature, say, but this doesn't make them competent to help math teachers provide instruction in how to read and write in algebra.

The field of adolescent literacy appears to be caught for the moment in this conundrum, unable to decide how to balance these two competing ways of defining literacy. It might be possible to have it both ways, defining reading and writing both as generic skills that should be taught by generalist literacy instructors and as the differing forms that reading and writing take in different disciplines, and that are best taught by content-area specialists. However, the field has not yet done the legwork needed to decide which responsibilities are best assigned to generalists and which are better assigned to the disciplines.

Here, considerations of grade level would seem to be important as well. Over the past several years, as reformers have worked to call attention to the long-neglected literacy needs of secondary students, it has been customary to group together grades 4–12 under the single banner of “adolescent literacy.” Students in grades K–3 have received most of the attention and resources, reformers have argued, but students in grades 4–12 deserve attention and resources, too. However, if discussion turns to the relationship between general and content-specific literacy instruction, then questions about grade level cannot be far behind. It is possible, for instance, that generalist literacy coaches may be perfectly competent to teach across the curriculum in grade 4 (where the content areas are not yet so starkly different in the kinds of reading and writing they require) but not competent to teach across the curriculum in grade 12 (where the disciplines are relatively more distinct, and where a single coach would be hard-pressed to know all the relevant conventions, text structures, vocabulary, content-specific ways of thinking, and so on).

3) Hurry Up and Wait

The ongoing flood of adolescent literacy reports and initiatives, combined with the many education policy reports now being published in advance of the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, have created a strong sense of urgency among reformers in the field. Further, as researchers have launched new efforts to study and collect data on reading and writing in the secondary schools, the full extent of the nation's adolescent literacy crisis has become increasingly apparent, giving reformers still more reason to push for quick, dramatic changes in schools and classrooms.

This sense of urgency came up many times in the October 2006 meeting, with numerous participants speaking to the importance of making immediate progress on adolescent literacy, both in order to help the millions of struggling readers already in the educational pipeline and to respond to business and political leaders' pleas for better-trained workers.

Moreover, that urgency is felt even more strongly at the ground level, where teachers work with struggling adolescent readers every day. Countless districts and secondary schools across the country have invested in new literacy programs, interventions, professional development projects, and other initiatives to help their students catch up in reading. And in the states, too (some of them with encouragement from organizations such as the National Governors Association and the National Association of State Boards of Education), major new efforts are in place to improve adolescent literacy instruction.

However, this powerful momentum often seems to be at odds with the equally powerful movement to shore up the research base in adolescent literacy and to ensure that new teaching practices, interventions, and policies are based in empirical evidence. Thus, for instance, the initial round of Striving Readers grants (awarded in 2006, prior to the 2007 introduction of legislation that would write the program into law and expand its scope) takes a cautious, research-intensive approach to testing and evaluating specific interventions—the very same interventions that hundreds of districts are rushing ahead to purchase and implement.

Nobody can say for sure how long it will take to develop in adolescent literacy the same kind of extensive research base that exists in early reading. Especially to the extent that schools are pursuing higher-order literacy skills (and not just discrete, more readily measured skills such as read-aloud fluency or literal comprehension), it would seem to be quite challenging to devise interventions that can easily be replicated and evaluated.

The question is, how should adolescent literacy reformers reconcile these competing forces? A strong drive toward evidence-based practice appears to be in tension with the facts on the ground, where there is a growing pressure to act, and where important decisions have to be made without clear evidence as to what works.

Next Steps

For the field of adolescent literacy, these are exciting times. After decades of major investment in and attention to early reading instruction, the literacy needs of middle and high school students have finally begun to receive the attention they deserve. Moreover, the focus on adolescent literacy is no passing fad. Given the social and economic realities of twenty-first-century America—where postsecondary degrees are fast becoming the coin of the realm—it is inconceivable that middle and high school literacy instruction could ever be neglected again.

For adolescent literacy, these are exciting times also in that the field enjoys a rare level of consensus and consistency in its core principles, priorities, theories, and recommendations for policy and practice. In just the last few years, and owing in no small part to the lack of “reading wars” or other internal divisions, advocates have made tremendous progress in persuading federal, state, and local education leaders to invest new resources in this area, to adopt new curricular guidelines, develop new classroom materials, create new professional development programs, and sponsor important new lines of research.

Yet, as was revealed at NALC’s fall 2006 summit, when the field’s leading advocates, scholars, and practitioners get together to talk about next steps in adolescent literacy, conflicts do reveal themselves, suggesting some serious disagreements as to where those next steps ought to lead. In particular, this report identifies three areas that appear to be ripe for further discussion, and it recommends that NALC members give serious attention to questions such as the following:

- Do schools have sufficient resources to invest in programs for struggling readers and to improve content-area literacy instruction?
- To what extent do reading and writing skills transfer across the academic content areas, and to what extent are they discipline specific?
- Is it wise to assign a single literacy coach to work with teachers across multiple content areas?
- And how should educators reconcile the imperative to help kids now with the need to develop a stronger research base in adolescent literacy?

The National Adolescent Literacy Coalition remains committed to fostering the necessary dialogue among diverse constituencies in order to further the important work around these questions over the next year.

References

- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York, Second edition*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Cassidy, D., & Casidy J. (2007). What's hot, what's not for 2007: Adolescent literacy ranks as hottest topic in 11th annual survey. *Reading Today* 24 (4): 1, 10–12.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools—A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- International Reading Association. (2006). *Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches*. Newark, DE: Author.
- Kaestle, C., et al. (1989). *Literacy in the United States: Readers and reading since 1880*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kirsch, I., et al. (2007). *America's perfect storm: three forces changing our nation's future*. Princeton, NJ: ETS.
- Myers, M. (1996). *Changing our minds: negotiating English and literacy*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- National Academy of Sciences (2006). *Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Center for Education and the Economy (2006). *Tough choices or tough times: The report of the new commission on the skills of the American workforce*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Owen, Harrison. (1997). *Open Space Technology: A User's Guide* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Torgesen, J., et al. (2007). *Academic literacy instruction for adolescents: A guidance document from the Center on Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Appendix A

The Guiding Question

“In order to ensure a twenty-first-century literate society for all, what does middle and high school education need to be, and how is that accomplished in light of existing tensions?”

Appendix B

NALC Steering Committee

School Development Program, Yale University
National Middle Schools Association

Alliance for Excellent Education
Education Development Center, Inc.
International Reading Association
National Council of Teachers of English
National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform
National High School Alliance
The Asia Society International Studies Schools
The College Board

Kylene Beers, Committee Chair
Linda Robinson, Committee Chair Elect

Rafael Heller; Jeremy Ayers
Cynthia Mata-Aguilar
Barbara Tierney
Barbara Cambridge
Deborah Kasak
Naomi Housman
Judith Conk
Helen Santiago

Appendix C

NALC Participating Organizations

Alliance for Excellent Education

American Association of School Librarians

America's Choice, Inc.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Australian and United States Services in Education

AutoSkill International Inc.

Battle Creek Central High School

Battle Creek Community Literacy Collaborative

Center for Youth Development and Education,
Commonwealth Corporation

Central Michigan University

Collaborative for Teaching and Learning

The College Board

Consulting for Results

Cooperative Educational Services

DeKalb County School System

Education Development Center, Inc.

Education Priorities

Education Trust

Florida International University

Forum for Youth Investment

Houghton Mifflin Company

Institute for Educational Leadership

International Reading Association

James Harvey & Associates

Lakeview School District

Learning Point Associates

Lesley University

Macomb Intermediate School District

Michigan Coalition of Essential Schools

National Association of Secondary School Principals

National Association of State Boards of Education

National Council of La Raza

National Council of Teachers of English

National Education Association

National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform

National High School Alliance at the Institute for
Educational Leadership

National Institute for Literacy

National Middle School Association

National Urban Alliance

National Writing Project

Public Education & Business Coalition

Reading Is Fundamental, Inc.

School Development Program, Yale University

St. Petersburg College Literacy Research Institute

Success for All Foundation, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education

United Way of Greater Battle Creek

University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning

W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Washington Partners, LLC

WestED/Strategic Literacy Initiative

The Writer's Express

Appendix D

Participants at NALC's October 2006 Summit in Oak Park, Illinois

Cynthia Mata Aguilar	Education Development Center
Janet Allen	Literacy Leadership Collaborative
Donna Alvermann	University of Georgia
Kylene Beers	School Development Program, Yale University
Ilene Berman	National Governors Association Center for Best Practices
David Bloome	The Ohio State University
LaQuanda Y. Brown-Avery	McNair Middle School, Fayetteville, AR
Jim Burke	Burlingame High School, Burlingame, CA
Bonnie Burns	Dominican University
Barbara Cambridge	National Council of Teachers of English
Danielle Carnahan	Learning Point Associates
Leila Christenbury	School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University
Robert Collins	Los Angeles Unified School District
Mark Conley	Michigan State University
Judith Conk	The Asia Society International Studies Schools Network
Louis Constantino	RMC Research Corporation/The New York Corporation
Agnes Crawford	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Cecelia P. Daniels	Success for All Foundation, Inc.
Diane DeFord	University of South Carolina
Elyse Eidman-Aadahi	National Writing Project
LaVerne S. Flowers	National Urban Alliance for Effective Education
Susan Galletti	West Wind Educational Policy
Arzie Galvez	Los Angeles Unified School District
Eunice Greer	Scholastic, Inc.
Sally Hampton	America's Choice, Inc.
Karen Hart	Lakeview School District, Battle Creek, MI
Rafael Heller	Alliance for Excellent Education
Lawrence Hirsch	RMC Research Corporation/The New York Corporation

Naomi Housman
Anthony Jackson
Laura Kaloi
Deborah Kasak
Marilyn Ludolph
Ann Levett
Christie Maloney
Lynda Markham
Barbara Mechler
Catherine Cobb Morocco
Melvina Phillips
Bob Probst
Deborah Reck
Penny Reinart
Marci Resnick
Linda Robinson
Helen Santiago
Ruth Schoenbach
Timothy Shanahan
Tanya Shuy
Geri Siener
Marilyn Smith
Barbara Tierney
Joseph K.Torgeson
Julie Walker
Aida Walqui
Kathleen Whitmire
Kent Williamson
Trenace Richardson

National High School Alliance
The Asia Society International Studies Schools Network
National Center for Learning Disabilities
National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform
Dominican University
School Development Program, Yale University
Collaborative for Teaching and Learning
Alma College, Michigan
Cooperative Educational Services
Education Development Center
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Education Consultant
The Writer's Express
Kaplan K-12 Learning Services
National Writing Project
National Middle Schools Association
The College Board
WestED/ Strategic Literacy Initiative
University of Illinois at Chicago/International Reading Association
National Institute for Literacy
Los Angeles Unified School District
Reading Is Fundamental
International Reading Association
Florida State University/Florida Center for Reading Research
American Association of School Librarians
WestED/ Strategic Literacy Initiative
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
National Council of Teachers of English
George Washington University

