

- 1) In Teaching Scenarios, Chapter 2 p. 43 on, pay attention to the lessons of Mr. Cullen, Mr. Ryan, and Ms. Sauerbraun on each of the Lesson Preparation features. What did you learn? How did reading the lesson scenarios give you insight into the SIOP model? Did you notice any Science of Reading (SoR) or structured literacy approaches? You must quote directly from the textbook to support your statements.**

After reading all three teaching scenarios, I learned that effective lesson preparation using the SIOP model involves planning and practicing content learning and language development. This means that teachers will prepare students for what they will learn while using language to interact with the content and access information. In the book “Making content comprehensible for multilingual learners: The SIOP model” by Jana Echevarría, MaryEllen Vogt, and Katie Toppel, Mr. Cullen, Mr. Ryan, and Ms. Sauerbraun all represent different levels of incorporating SIOP features in their lessons. These features include content objectives, language objectives, multiple materials, modification of the content, and meaningful hands-on activities with student interaction.

Mr. Cullen had the strongest SIOP model lesson out of the three teachers. This is seen as Mr. Cullen clearly communicated the content and language objective at the beginning of his lesson. Mr. Cullen’s content objectives for students were “Students will explore major achievements in literature, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, science, and technology in Italy during the Renaissance” and “Students will design a representation of one of the achievements.” Mr. Cullen’s language objectives were “Students will read and take notes from primary and secondary sources on one of these achievements” and “Students will justify orally why the achievement is important” (Echevarría et al., 2024). Mr. Cullen then had students paraphrase what the objectives meant. He made sure to focus on his English language learners and emphasize to them that the key words in the objectives were the verbs “explore” and “achievements.” These objectives make it clear what students were expected to learn and how they will use language to demonstrate their learning.

Mr. Cullen also used a variety of materials to support student learning. He began to build background knowledge by introducing a four minute video “on the cultural and scientific achievements of the Italian Renaissance”. Mr. Cullen then clarified some vocabulary words for the students in a class discussion. Additionally, Mr. Cullen included meaningful activities such as a Think-Pair-Share after the video. This gave students the opportunity to talk with their classmates about which Renaissance achievement surprised them the most. Students were also able to physically move to a chart, selecting a category of their choice, and work with their classmates to create a KWL chart. Students were able to practice researching for new knowledge by conducting research, taking notes, and preparing oral presentations. Therefore, Mr. Cullen effectively used multiple outlets for student learning and engagement, also referred to as the

acronym “GRUVIMOMAMU” (Cowin, n.d). This acronym breaks down and helps learners remember the different meaningful activities that can be included in a lesson. These are implementing group work, visuals, movement, manipulatives, and music (Cowin, n.d). Mr. Cullen did not simply lecture about the Italian Renaissance. Instead, he engaged students through physical interaction, communication, collaboration and presentations.

To add on, Mr. Cullen provided students with primary and secondary sources using “key websites on the classroom computers” and “a class collection of books on the Renaissance that reflected a variety of reading levels.” Not to mention, Mr. Cullen ensured that resources were available at all reading levels and explained that students who can read another language can use sources in that language as well. This is seen as Mr. Cullen states “For those of you who can read in another language, you are welcome to look at websites in that language too.” These materials helped make the content accessible to all learners no matter their native language and demonstrated responsiveness to students’ linguistic needs.

Mr. Ryan, on the other hand, showed minimal strengths in the SIOP model and lacked many significant features. One strength of the lesson was that Mr. Ryan clearly stated a content objective, “Students will learn about the contributions that Italian Renaissance artists made to the world of art.” He also used various materials such as projecting “a large picture of the Mona Lisa” and later showing students paintings through a “Powerpoint Presentation” (Echevarría et al., 2024). These visual supports helped students access the content and begin to form an idea about what achievements the Italian Renaissance inspired.

However, unlike Mr. Cullen’s lesson, Mr. Ryan did not provide a language objective. Instead, students were expected to take notes on a T-chart they created in their notebooks and write a comparative essay. The language skills needed for success such as vocabulary words or phonemic awareness for English language learners were never explicitly taught. The lesson also lacked meaningful opportunities for student interaction. When Mr. Ryan asked students to respond to the warm up question, “No one raised his or her hand.” Mr. Ryan immediately then called on students instead of using collaborative strategies to encourage student communication such as Think-Pair-Share. The text states “The student had no answer, so Mr. Ryan called upon another” (Echevarría et al., 2024). Another weakness was the limited adaptation of the content. Mr. Ryan lectured for “the next 20 minutes” while students took notes. Although he used visuals from his powerpoint presentation, there is no evidence that he modified instruction for English learners. The text also highlights that many students soon became disengaged in the lesson as “some students started to act out” and “other students doodled or put their heads down on their desks.” Some students were even tossing paper back and forth to each other. This illustrates that Mr. Ryan’s lesson did not provide enough active engagement or meaningful learning activities.

As a result, students became bored and restless because they were not actively learning with the content and could not even relate to it.

Mr. Ryan's lesson helped me see that simply presenting information is not nearly enough in the SIOP model. The SIOP model demonstrates clear content and language objectives, building background knowledge, explaining concepts using visuals and models, and strong student interaction through class discussions and active engagement (Echevarría et al., 2024). Although Mr. Ryan was knowledgeable and excited about Italian Renaissance art, the lesson was mostly teacher centered. Students spent almost the entire class time listening to Mr. Ryan and taking notes rather than discussing with their peers, researching, and practicing language skills.

Additionally, there is very little evidence of Science of Reading or structured literacy instruction in Mr. Ryan's lesson. Students were asked to write a comparative essay and take notes, however there was no explicit instruction in vocabulary, decoding, or phonics. Unlike Mr. Cullen who clarified vocabulary words and supported student comprehension through class discussion and research, Mr. Ryan's lesson was more content and lecture based.

Last but not least, Ms. Sauerbraun's lesson implemented many SIOP features through engaging and meaningful activities. Students were immediately drawn to Ms. Sauerbraun's outfit as she walked into the classroom in a traditional outfit worn by women during the Italian Renaissance. This helped students begin to visualize what people looked like during the Renaissance period. Ms. Sauerbraun then used an anticipation guide before reading a text. This gave students the opportunity to make a prediction about what they were going to learn and to later revisit to see if their predictions were correct (Echevarría et al., 2024).

Ms. Sauerbraun then connected the lesson to the state standard, "Analyze the historical developments of the Renaissance, including major achievements, in literature, art, architecture, music, and science." Students were then assigned a creative writing task in which they would "choose one historical person to be" and "write at least six diary entries for that person." This activity connected reading, writing, and historical understanding. It also motivated students to express their creativity by choosing a significant person of their choice. This indirectly means a person that students' admired the most out of the options during the Renaissance period. Students were then able to write diary entries, putting themselves in the shoes of their chosen Renaissance character. Ms. Sauerbraun also provided sample diaries from her previous students last year as a guide for students to see the layout of what a diary entry looks like and allowed students to work in partnerships which supported different learning needs. Working in partnerships helps students to discuss their ideas and gain feedback from their peers to add to their thinking and possibly inspire deeper connections within the content and learning objectives as it correlates to their projects. However, Ms. Sauerbraun did not explicitly state a language objective. Needless to say, her lesson still promoted reading comprehension, note-taking research, and writing skills through meaningful content based activities.

Reading these teaching scenarios gave me a deeper understanding of the SIOP Model because I could compare lessons that implemented the Lesson Preparation features to different levels. Mr. Cullen succeeded in all six lesson preparation components while Mr. Ryan focused heavily on only teacher-led content based instruction. All the while, Ms. Sauerbraun provided engaging activities, promoting student interaction and communication, as well as strong content standards, but could have strengthened her lesson by including explicit language objectives.

As I read these scenarios, I also noted that there was limited Science of Reading (SoR) and structured literacy approaches. For instance, after Mr. Cullen showed his students the Italian Renaissance video, he “used this time to clarify some vocabulary words as well.” He also required students to read from “primary and secondary sources” (Echevarría et al., 2024). This supported vocabulary and comprehension. Additionally, Ms. Sauerbraun used an anticipation guide before reading which helped students gain prior knowledge and allowed her to monitor comprehension. Mr. Ryan did not demonstrate any examples of vocabulary instruction or implementing methods to track student comprehension. None of the lessons, however, included explicit instruction in morphology, phonemic awareness, decoding, or phonics. Thus, the lessons connected more closely with the SIOP Model and Science of Reading than the structured literacy instruction.

2a) After looking at this infographic connect the infographic with your reading in this module-how would you connect Lesson preparation with the Science of Reading and structured literacy?

Lesson Preparation within the SIOP Model aligns closely with both the Science of Reading (SoR) and structured literacy because it emphasizes intentional planning of vocabulary instruction, supporting student language, and meaningful learning experiences before teaching a lesson. In the SIOP framework, teachers establish clear content and language objectives while designing activities that promote student engagement, interaction, and access to multiple sources of information. Similarly, the Science of Reading advocates for systematic and explicit instruction in foundational literacy skills, including phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Structured literacy also stresses the importance of carefully sequenced instruction that allows students to develop skills to strengthen their understanding.

This connection is supported by Carrie Symons in the article “Meeting the Needs of Linguistically Diverse Students in the Mainstream Classroom.” Symons explains that teachers should begin by “reading the text and making note of words and concepts that may be new for students who speak a language other than English at home” and should “emphasize the content learning goals and the language goals developed from their pre-analysis of the text.” This approach reflects both SIOP and structured literacy practices by highlighting the importance of planning vocabulary words and language supports to strengthen comprehension and academic success.

The first feature of Lesson Preparation is that “Content objectives are clearly defined, displayed, and reviewed with students” (Echevarria et al., 2024). This feature aligns with structured literacy's emphasis on direct and explicit instruction. Students benefit when teachers clearly communicate what they are expected to learn and how they will demonstrate their understanding. By establishing clear learning targets, teachers help students focus on important concepts and develop a stronger platform of lesson expectations.

The second feature is that “Language objectives are clearly defined, displayed, and reviewed with students” (Echevarria et al., 2024). This feature directly supports the language elements emphasized in the Science of Reading, including phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Students strengthen their academic language skills when they learn and practice important vocabulary words that are found in classroom texts. English learners especially benefit from opportunities to engage in speaking, listening, reading, and writing activities that reinforce language development.

Vocabulary instruction can be further supported through the use of tiered vocabulary. As explained in “Comprehensible English – An Exploration with Embedded Resources,” “Tier one vocabulary are words that appear frequently in everyday use,” while “Tier two vocabulary are words that are used generally for learning,” and “Tier three words are those that are specific to a subject” (Cowan, n.d.). Teaching vocabulary through these tiers helps students recognize, pronounce, and understand words. This can determine their progress for academic success throughout the lesson.

The third Lesson Preparation feature is that “Content concepts are appropriate for age and educational background level of students” (Echevarria et al., 2024). This feature emphasizes the importance of activating students’ prior knowledge before introducing new concepts. Structured literacy similarly builds upon previously learned skills through systematic and cumulative instruction. By connecting new information to students’ existing knowledge, teachers create a stronger foundation for learning and improve overall comprehension. Students can build upon their prior knowledge to expand their thinking through new ideas about a subject. Increasing their background knowledge also can improve their written and class discussions because they have more information to discuss with their peers.

The fourth Lesson Preparation feature is the use of “Supplementary materials used to a high degree, making the lesson clear and meaningful” (Echevarria et al., 2024). This practice ties closely with culturally responsive approaches associated with structured literacy. Teachers can provide diverse texts, visuals, technology resources, and materials in students’ native languages to make content more accessible. These supports are especially beneficial for multilingual learners, since they allow students to build understanding while developing English proficiency. Additionally, teachers may provide targeted small-group instruction to reinforce skills and address individual learning needs.

The fifth Lesson Preparation feature is the “Adaptation of content to all levels of student proficiency” (Echevarria et al., 2024). This component reflects the teacher competencies associated with structured literacy, which emphasize meeting students where they are academically and linguistically. Teachers can modify instruction through the use of graphic organizers, outlines, study guides, sentence frames, and visual supports. These scaffolds help students organize their thinking, identify important ideas, and communicate their understanding more fluently.

The sixth and final Lesson Preparation feature is the inclusion of “Meaningful activities that integrate lesson concepts with language practice opportunities” (Echevarria et al., 2024). Strong activities may include collaborative discussions, hands-on learning experiences, movement-based activities, visual and auditory supports, and opportunities for peer interaction. These experiences not only deepen content understanding but also strengthen language development. Furthermore, meaningful activities support structured literacy’s emphasis on teaching by allowing teachers to observe students’ responses, monitor their progress, and modify instruction based on students’ learning needs.

2b) Find one article/website on SoR and share it in your DSB with a link, and in 3 sentences, share what you learned or questions you have.

One article I found is the “Science of Reading” from Reading Rockets. In this article, I learned that the science of reading is a collection of education, psychology, linguistics, and neuroscience that has been developed for over the past fifty years. One question I still have is how can teachers use structured reading instruction that works for all students and includes their cultural backgrounds?

References

Cowin, J. (n.d.). *Comprehensible English: An exploration with embedded resources*.

Cowin, J. (n.d.). *Module 2: ESL methodologies and second language acquisition theories for content area teachers* [PowerPoint slides]. Touro University

Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., Short, D., & Toppel, K. E. (2024). *Making content comprehensible for multilingual learners: The SIOP model*. Pearson.

Ida’s new Infomap connects the WHO, what, and how of Structured Literacy as grounded in the science of Reading - International Dyslexia Association. (n.d.).
<https://dyslexiaida.org/idas-new-infomap-connects-the-who-what-and-how-of-structured-literacy-as-grounded-in-the-science-of-reading/>

Symons, Carrie (2016) "Meeting the Needs of Linguistically Diverse Students in The Mainstream Classroom,"Michigan Reading Journal: Vol. 49: Iss. 1, Article 4.
Available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/mrj/vol49/iss1/4>

Peer Responses:

Hey M, great job! I completely agree with you in your response to question #3. Science of Reading is highly effective in progressing student academic success by improving their language proficiency and comprehension. This is because Science of Reading has so many important components that shape a student's mind and thinking differently than what they already know in their native language. There are so many supports you can implement in your lesson using Science of Reading such as introducing vocabulary words with visuals, audios, and translations. Educators can also make vocabulary flash cards for students to paste in their notebooks as a way of making their very own glossary. This way, students can always refer back to their important vocabulary words when reading about a topic and answering topic related questions. This improves students' language proficiency by strengthening their reading comprehension in informational texts and prompting them to use more advanced word language when discussing a topic.

Hey F, great job! I agree with you in your response to question #2a. As educators, we are already aware of the different elements we can input in our lessons to make certain key concepts and our target focus stand out. However, I don't think many of us actually realized how important it is that we continue to do these things to meet the needs of all of our students. By looking at the science and informational background behind why the SIOP model, Science of Reading and structured literacy are so important, it is easy to see how detrimental student learning can become without these components. It is just like what we saw in Mr. Ryan's lesson. His lesson was essentially boring, not because the topic was boring, but because he did not have any guide for students to learn effectively. Students did not interact socially, did not participate in a class discussion, did not engage in a language objective, had zero language support, and were teacher led for almost the entire lesson. Not to mention, the text stated how some students did not even know which two paintings they wanted to pick for their essay by the time the bell rang. This could mean that the students were either so disengaged in the lesson that they could not make up their minds, chose not to choose any paintings, or that they are English language learners who were confused by the assignment and had no additional support to make the target focus clear for them. Therefore, the SIOP model, Science of Reading, and structured literacy instruction are immensely important for teaching highly effective lessons that actively engages students and helps them learn new ideas through critical thinking.

Hey J, I agree with you in your response to question #1 when you talk about Mr. Hensen's lesson. I also like how he made the lesson culturally responsive by asking students if they've ever been to California and what mode of transportation they took to get there. Students like to share their own experiences outside of school. This also sparks up conversation for broader concepts like traveling to other countries and what they noticed differently in other places as opposed to where they live. I also like how you said he used vocabulary words, visual maps, and read aloud from the text. Mr. Hensen reminds me of Mr. Cullen in my reading because they both demonstrate the SIOP framework as they modify the lesson through social interaction in a class discussion. Both Mr. Hensen and Mr. Cullen also demonstrate Science of Reading by going over important vocabulary words that strengthen students' critical thinking when connecting concepts and ideas as well as strengthening their language proficiency. I like how Mr. Hensen also read aloud from the text to support English language learners who may follow along without the pressure of digesting so much information in a language they are still developing.