

6-2022

Enacting Disciplinary Literacy Instruction: Essential Practices in Action

Darin B. Stockdill

University of Michigan School of Education, daristoc@umich.edu

Stacie B. Woodward

Oakland Schools Intermediate School District, stacie.woodward@oakland.k12.mi.us

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/lajm>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stockdill, Darin B. and Woodward, Stacie B. (2022) "Enacting Disciplinary Literacy Instruction: Essential Practices in Action," *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*: Vol. 37: Iss. 2, Article 4.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.9707/2168-149X.2333>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Language Arts Journal of Michigan by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Enacting Disciplinary Literacy Instruction: Essential Practices in Action

Cover Page Footnote

We would like to acknowledge Kim Kocsis, Project Based Learning Consultant at Oakland Schools, for her valuable contributions to this project.

Enacting Disciplinary Literacy Instruction: Essential Practices in Action

DARIN B. STOCKDILL, PH. D. AND STACIE B. WOODWARD

"My favorite part of the project was learning about real world issues. I notice that a lot of times in classes we learn about stuff that doesn't really have any personal connection, but this project was something that affects us all."

This quote from a 9th grade student participant in a program we co-designed captures what we as educational consultants strive for: getting students engaged and excited about learning. But what excited us as instructional designers was not just the high level of student engagement, but the fact that students were involved in deep historical thinking and disciplinary literacy work around "real world issues" that captured their attention. Even though this program required a level of rigor that some might think would turn students off, students in the program gave it very positive feedback. In other words, they liked a project that required them to analyze a wide range of primary and secondary sources through historical lenses, write both formally and informally for different purposes, and engage in multiple discussions and presentations.

This kind of discipline-specific literacy instruction embedded into critical, problem-driven units of study is not a new approach and has been promoted by educators and educational organizations in the United States for more than a decade. For example, in 2009 and 2010, literacy scholars working with the Carnegie Corporation released two research reports calling for a paradigm shift in adolescent literacy instruction, *Reading in the Disciplines: The Challenges of Adolescent Literacy* (Lee and Spratley, 2009), and *Time to Act: An Agenda for Advancing Adolescent Literacy for College and Career Readiness* (Carnegie Corporation Adolescent Literacy Council, 2010). In both of these research syntheses, the authors highlighted the importance of literacy instruction across all content areas at the secondary level, noting that

literacy instruction should not be the sole responsibility of English language arts (ELA) teachers.

Not long after these reports were issued, national organizations representing the core content areas developed new frameworks for state learning standards intended to disrupt conventional knowledge transmission modes of teaching and promote pedagogies that engaged students in inquiry, critical thinking, and problem solving.

The National Council for Social Studies, the primary professional organization for social studies education, put forth the *College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards* (NCSS, 2013) and issued the following call to social studies educators:

NOW MORE THAN EVER, students need the intellectual power to recognize societal problems; ask good questions and develop robust investigations into them; consider possible solutions and consequences; separate evidence-based claims from parochial opinions; and communicate and act upon what they learn (p. 6).

In the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts*, a similar call was made.

The Common Core asks students to read stories and literature, as well as more complex texts that provide facts and background knowledge in areas such as science and social studies. Students will be challenged and asked questions that push them to refer back to what they've read. This stresses critical-thinking, problem-solving, and analytical skills that are required for success in college, career, and life (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, 2010).

These national initiatives are informing a range of ongoing work at the state level. In this paper, we will explore a statewide initiative in Michigan designed to support exactly this kind of teaching, the *Essential Instructional Practices for Disciplinary Literacy: Grades 6-12* (referred to as the *Essential Practices* in the remainder of the paper). In particular, we will

discuss key instructional implications of the *Essential Practices* for both social studies and ELA instruction and highlight important commonalities and distinctions across these two content areas. We will also provide concrete examples of these practices in action from the aforementioned curricular project we undertook with US History and ELA teachers, *Equitable Futures*. In this initiative, teachers engaged their students in inquiry-driven learning that involved the development of a range of disciplinary literacy practices and tools. We share some insights into the challenges and opportunities that emerged through this program in the hopes of supporting educators looking to develop similar programming, and/or seeking to better understand disciplinary literacy instruction in social studies and ELA classrooms.

Conceptualizing Literacy and Disciplinary Literacy

Before delving into a deeper discussion of literacy instruction at the secondary level, it is important to clarify how we are using the term *literacy*. In addition, it is important to distinguish literacy instruction from ELA instruction as these ideas are often confused. As generally understood, ELA is the course in which students learn the conventions and rules of the English language as well as develop the arts of communicating effectively through reading, writing, speaking, and listening. ELA at the secondary level often focuses on differing combinations of literary studies, grammar, and writing instruction. With ELA's focus on language and text use, it is not surprising that literacy learning and ELA learning are often seen as the same thing, but there are important distinctions to be made.

Literacy can be more broadly conceptualized as sets of socially constructed practices and tools used to develop and communicate meaning with symbolic systems. Moreover, these practices and tools are employed “for specific purposes in specific contexts of use” (Scribner & Cole, 1981). Literacy thus is about how we gather, organize, interpret, and share ideas using tools and encoded language, and we develop literacy through our interactions and participation in different communities. In this framing of literacy, it is a core component of all subject area learning, not just ELA.

All academic disciplines of course depend upon some form of literacy to develop, record, and share knowledge and information. However, specific practices, norms, and tools vary across disciplines. This brings us to the concept of disciplinary literacy, which is the idea that academic disciplines like mathematics, history, or biology have specialized literacy

practices that “include the ways that scholars identify, evaluate, use, and produce the wide range of texts and information or data sources typical of their particular discipline, including the specialized reading, writing, and communication practices used to analyze, produce, and share information” (Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators, 2019). In this context, disciplinary literacy instruction seeks to help students learn and use content by helping them learn the language and practices of the academic disciplines at the core of school content areas (Moje, 2015).

In ELA, this disciplinary work is most closely associated with literary studies, although other disciplines like rhetoric and composition, linguistics, and journalism also come into play. In literary studies, scholars commonly read to pursue a literary puzzle or problem; and they look for patterns in language and literary elements in this process. They explore different ways to interpret texts and consider aspects of a work that are surprising or perplexing. They analyze histories and contexts of use for these works, exploring for possible audiences and purposes and other elements. They also work to develop original claims about the works they are analyzing, whether those claims be interpretive, evaluative, or critical (Rainey 2017).

While similar in some respects, the disciplinary literacies of the social sciences have their own unique approaches. In history, for example, scholars work to frame historical problems and questions, and then do research to locate, select, and analyze evidence to help solve this problem (Bain, 2005; Collingwood, 1999). Much of what is considered historical reading takes place in the process of analyzing evidence across multiple texts (Rouet, Britt, Mason, & Perfetti, 1996) in which historians typically use the disciplinary heuristics of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration as described by Wineburg (2001). Scholars in other areas of the social sciences also leverage these practices, as well as other ways of working with text and evidence that are more unique to their domains (such as the use of statistical representations in economics).

To promote disciplinary literacy teaching and learning in secondary classrooms across Michigan, a statewide collaboration of educators developed the *Essential Practices*. The core document for the *Essential Practices*, supported by a larger program of professional learning, outlines 10 sets of research-supported instructional practices to promote disciplinary literacy teaching and learning and has content area specific versions for math, science, ELA, and social

studies. These practices are intended to inform instruction to help students learn content and develop important literacy skills in the different core academic disciplines. The document itself is meant to help shape professional learning and support for teachers, as opposed to being a list of things that teachers should just be expected to implement without support or time to reflect and learn.

A Model for Disciplinary Literacy Instruction: Equitable Futures

To explore how the *Essential Practices* can be enacted and illustrate what disciplinary literacy instruction can look like in history and ELA classrooms, we will share some of our own work through a project called *Equitable Futures* (EF). EF was an inquiry-based, high school initiative that ran from 2016 to 2020; it engaged teachers and students in Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland Counties in inquiry-based, collaborative learning around issues of regional equity. EF was based at Oakland Schools intermediate school district (ISD) and supported by educators at the University of Michigan School of Education. Over the course of the project, 25 schools and 48 teachers participated, as well as over 3,700 students. Opportunities for disciplinary literacy instruction in both US History and ELA were intentionally built into the curriculum and supported through the professional learning experience. For the purposes of this article, we will highlight just a few examples of materials and activities from US History to help illustrate disciplinary literacy instructional practices in action, followed by a brief description of how they were implemented in ELA to allow for comparison across these two content areas.

The Practices in Action in the Social Studies Classroom

Essential Practice 1: Inquiry at the heart. While there are ten *Essential Practices* that are intentionally interconnected, they are not all the same grain size. Namely, Essential Practice One (inquiry-based or problem-based instruction) is foundational and sets the context for all other practices. It asks teachers to frame units of study around important problems or questions that enable students to ask and answer questions about humanity, society, their communities, and their lives. This practice requires a shift for most of us in our curricular planning, and the *Equitable Futures* project offers insight into what those planning shifts can look like.

Equitable Futures was designed to be integrated into the US History curriculum as a substitution for the conventional unit on the civil rights movement. The most traditional

approach to teaching this unit usually involves students learning about some key leaders and events, relying mostly on the textbook as a source, and leaving students with the impression that the movement is something in the past with little relevance today. The *Equitable Futures* project offered a model of how to leverage the civil rights movement to help students problem solve what they might do today to improve inequities in their own communities. To help situate the civil rights movement in a broader historical context connected to contemporary issues of justice, we designed a compelling question that students would pursue throughout the project: “How can we use the history of social justice movements and inequality to create a more equitable future?” In the project’s US history classrooms, this question was then broken down into a broad range of supporting, or “need to know” questions that students pursued in the process of developing a response to the larger question. These questions included the following:

- What are some of the core ideals in American civic life, what do they mean,
- and how are they reflected in different historical documents?
- Is America living up to these core ideals?
- How do we know what happened in the past?
- What can we learn from the tactics and strategies of the civil rights movement?

One lesson within the *Equitable Futures* project was focused on investigating the supporting question “Why do people of different races live in different places?” and investigated it through the lens and practices of historians (lesson and resources available [here](#)). This lesson positioned students as apprentice historians as they deepened their understanding of how redlining, a mandated racial segregation practice enabled through local, state, and federal housing policies, is an enduring cause of inequity in the United States even though it was technically outlawed in 1968.

This lesson began with an inquiry-based activity in which students were asked to make observations about a map that depicted the population distribution of Metropolitan Detroit by race (using data and race categories from the 2010 Census). It did not take much time for students to note that Metro-Detroit is a racially segregated place today, and this realization caused them to wonder aloud, “Why is it this way?” Teachers then revealed to students the compelling question for their learning, “Why do people of different races live in different places?”

Next, students worked in teams to make lists of the

things they would need to know in order to answer the compelling question, which were then compiled and posted visibly in the classroom for the duration of the module. Teachers also prompted students to plan for how they might go about getting the answers to their questions and to consider another question authentic to the discipline of history, “How can we know about the past?” This entry event not only served as an inquiry-based launch of the module that piqued student interest, it also laid the foundation for the role of inquiry throughout the module as the student-generated questions were returned to and used as students conducted their investigation. After all, it is much more motivating to answer one’s own questions than it is to answer somebody else’s questions. Leveraging inquiry practices in these ways increases student ownership of the learning and engagement.

Interestingly, EF teachers reported that students who were not normally engaged in school took up the work of collaborating with their peers around an authentic problem and generally exceeded expectations. In this framework, inquiry and problem framing are necessary practices, but they are not sufficient on their own to develop student learning. This is where the other practices come into play, as demonstrated below through the analysis of additional Essential Practices in action.

Essential Practices 2 and 3: Diverse texts and instruction in disciplinary reading. Since the thinking and literacy skills of historians do not come naturally to anyone, teachers must provide materials and contexts to drive the use of these skills, along with direct instruction and guided practice to support skill development. This lesson thus featured opportunities for students to use multiple texts of different types along with activities that engaged them in the skill of corroboration, a disciplinary practice involving comparing different pieces of evidence for areas of agreement and disagreement to better understand what happened in the past. One of the bullets in Essential Practice 3 reads, “teaches students to apply disciplinary tools and concepts when working with text.” In this lesson teachers explicitly named corroboration as one of many “reading” tools that historians use when they are building accounts of the past and stressed that it is also a helpful skill for non-historians to have in life. Teacher modeling and student activities then supported students as they practiced this skill. One slide in the lesson articulated the following questions to provide a model of the kinds of questioning historians use when engaging in corroboration:

- What does each source say? What are the main ideas or arguments?
- Do the sources present the same ideas or accounts? What do they share?
- Are they different, and if so, how are they different?
- How does reading across these documents and comparing them help me understand the issue?

Before having students try the skill of corroboration independently, teachers modeled how to read sources like a historian through a “Think Aloud” method. In this case the sources included actual letters written by children to First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt during The Great Depression, as well as photographs from the time period. In small groups, students then grappled with the following questions, which provided a scaffolded way for students to engage in corroboration:

- If someone was studying the struggles of children during the Great Depression, how would these sources, compared and taken together, help them understand this?
- What different and similar information can we pull from each source?

Students then discussed these questions and proceeded to move into the primary focus of the lesson, redlining. After learning some basic background information on the origins of redlining, student teams worked collaboratively to corroborate across the following six sources:

1. An excerpt from the Federal Housing Administration’s underwriting manual of 1936 which outlined overtly racist rules and instructions for how, and to whom money could be borrowed for federal home loans
2. A 1952 deed restriction for a property in Metro Detroit that explicitly forbade the land from being sold to, rented to, or occupied by “any person of Negro Blood”
3. A 1941 deed restriction from a subdivision in Seattle, Washington that explicitly stated the property could only be sold to, rented to, or occupied by a person of the “White or Caucasian” race
4. A 1939 color-coded zoning of Metro Detroit based on race, social class and ethnicity created by the Home Owner’s Loan Corporation (HOLC). This map was designed to provide guidance to lenders. Black neighborhoods were coded in red, which is where the term redlining originated.

5. A 1915 “United Welfare Association” postcard advertisement from St. Louis, MO that encouraged residents to vote for a segregation ordinance that would prevent anyone buying a home in a neighborhood that was more than 75% occupied by another race
6. A 1941 photograph of Black children standing on “the 8 Mile Wall” which was erected to keep a white housing development separate from the adjacent Black neighborhood.

Notice that the sources were diverse in type (map, photograph, postcard advertisement, property deeds, and a federal policy handbook excerpt) and were also authentic to the discipline of history. Historians use these exact same types of sources to understand what happened in the past and construct evidence-based arguments. Even though students receiving conventional textbook driven instruction might encounter similar documents as embedded features in a textbook, they also encounter already constructed explanations of events and are not challenged to develop their own historical accounts. On the other hand, problem driven, text-rich instruction – while certainly more challenging to implement– provides students valuable opportunities to engage in the discipline of history more fully.

Of course, many social studies teachers use sources beyond their textbooks, and it is not unusual for history teachers to engage students in the analysis of primary and secondary sources. However, it is sometimes the case that students are engaging in this kind of analysis for the sake of engaging in the analysis, as students are not often asked to pursue an authentic historical investigation. The *Essential Practices* offer a road map for how social studies teachers can go beyond analyzing sources and apprentice students into developing rich disciplinary skills. For instance, the first bullet under Essential Practice Two reads, “engages students with texts that provide entry way into investigations of compelling issues or social science problems with attention to matters of equity, power and justice” (Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators, 2019, p. 21). This short sentence has implications for how we situate the role of sources or text in our classrooms. It is not enough to have students read or analyze sources; we must establish that the reason students are analyzing those sources in the first place is to investigate a compelling social science problem. Furthermore, this practice highlights that the sources students encounter should help them grapple with issues of equity, power, and justice.

We designed this lesson so that students first established some ownership over and interest in figuring out why there is so much racial segregation in our region, and then we engaged them with sources selected with a driving question in mind. Establishing a purpose for engaging with the historical sources increased student engagement during the corroboration activity because they were looking across them for answers to a worthwhile question.

Essential Practice 4: Instruction in disciplinary writing. Not only do history teachers need to attend to teaching students how to read and interpret historical texts, but they must also offer opportunities for them to think about issues or events from a historian’s lens and write or explain historical concepts. Does this mean that social studies teachers need to constantly assign and assess history papers to students? No. Social studies teachers will breathe a sigh of relief when they note that in Practice 4 there is a lot of flexibility for what “counts” as disciplinary writing. In fact, there is a case to be made for leveraging thoughtful informal writing in the social studies classroom. For instance, one bullet of Practice 4 reads, “provides regular time for students to write, both formally and informally, aligned with Practice #1” (p. 22). The lesson on redlining provided students an opportunity to write like historians in a low-stakes, informal way as they corroborated across the six sources and took notes on important ideas and patterns. Next, they engaged in informal disciplinary writing by developing written historical claims about how redlining and real estate practices affected racial segregation across the country during the Great Depression. These informal writing opportunities form important building blocks as students develop their disciplinary writing skills.

After developing their claims, students were asked to watch a six-minute segment of a PBS program on race and redlining. Instead of the traditional discipline-agnostic approach to the source such as asking students to take notes on the events or key figures outlined in the segment, students were instead asked to pay attention to the arguments made by the experts in the segment and to identify the evidence these experts used to support those arguments. In this way, the video clip served as a type of disciplinary mentor text. Students were asked to compare their arguments and evidence to the one made in the clip by experts, offering another opportunity to engage in corroboration. At the end of the module students were also given the opportunity to pair up with another team and discuss how to improve their arguments and use of evidence, which is a disposition

and writing practice authentic to the discipline of history and aligned to the *Essential Practices*. After all, historians also revise their historical accounts in light of new evidence. Ultimately, through historical thinking skills, well-curated historical evidence, and opportunities to collaborate, students were able to construct evidence-based claims about why Metro Detroit is so racially segregated today.

Essential Practice 5: Higher order discussion of increasingly complex text. Beyond reading and writing, EF offered students multiple opportunities to engage in discussion that reflected back to their problem frame and engaged them in disciplinary practices. Discussions are already common in many social studies classrooms and Essential Practice 5 offers ways teachers might make student discussions more powerful and effective. The table below provides examples of some of the moves named in Essential Practice 5 paired with descriptions of what the practice looked like in this short lesson from EF.

An important enabling factor of the rich discussions throughout the project was the learning environment of collaboration and teamwork that the teachers and students continually cultivated. Students saw one another as resources,

which made the discussions worthwhile to them. We surveyed EF students about their experiences in the project and overwhelmingly students responded very positively to the collaborative and dialogic nature of the learning they did. Students referenced ideas including teamwork, collaboration, discussion, and sharing of ideas with their classmates. Some of these responses touched on the social dynamics of their classroom, such as the students who noted that, “I like that i [sic] had got to work with people I never would choose.” Other students liked the fact they were able to really engage with their peers around ideas, as seen in the words of the student who wrote that, “I liked having discussions with people about important issues and hearing different opinions. It opened my mind up to new ideas and what I could do to help.” Similarly, other students appreciated that they were working with their peers on complex issues. One student stated that, “I like how groups could discuss tough issues. People were very understanding throughout this project.” This idea was developed further by a student who shared the following reflection:

Table 1

Essential Practice 5 in Practice

Elements of Essential Practice 5 (p. 23)	What it looked like in the “Why do people of different races live in different places?” lesson
The teacher:	
allocates time for whole-group, small-group, and pair discussion of text, and uses a range of discussion and grouping strategies.	The corroboration tool offered students a scaffold for their written analysis, and also a scaffold to talk about sources in discipline-specific ways as the learning took place in small, collaborative student groups.
supports students to read and discuss artifacts and data sources that historians and other social scientists would use to build social scientific arguments	Throughout the lesson there were multiple discussion formats (large group, pair-shares, small-group).
has students use evidence from the past or from social science theory or research in discussions.	Student discussions were always focused on a question or task that centered a wide variety of disciplinary texts. Student discussions mostly focused on making sense of the historical evidence they encountered.
engages students with reading secondary sources (work produced by actual social scientists) and also consult tertiary sources (textbooks, maps, and other reference materials) for chronology and spatial framing to prepare for discussions.	
uses discussions to support students to produce their own social scientific arguments and narratives.	In small groups, students not only discussed the sources and evidence presented, they also discussed and then constructed their own historical claims to the question, “Why do people of different races live in different places?” Students also discussed their claims with other small student groups, received feedback, and revised their claims.

I liked the sense of community I felt with my class and those in other history classes that were doing the same project. It was really great and allowed me to move out of my comfort zone which is normally to just do my own work. I had to work as a part of the team and make sure everyone, not just myself, was on task.

As you can see from this feedback, student discussions structured around disciplinary literacy practices enriched the learning experience in important ways for students that extended beyond deepening their historical content knowledge.

The Practices in Action in the ELA Classroom

In a smaller set of ELA classrooms, students also explored issues of segregation and redlining, but through a more literary lens and with a focus on Lorraine Hansberry's play *A Raisin in the Sun*. Students in ELA classes also began with an analysis of the racial dot map to identify patterns of ongoing racial segregation in southeastern Michigan. They engaged in some background reading of nonfiction, secondary historical texts to build background knowledge around redlining and segregation, and then turned to literary analysis and activities. They used the following driving and supporting questions to guide their discussion and analysis of both the play as well as the poem *A Dream Deferred* by Langston Hughes, from which the name of the play originates.

- Why does literature matter?
- How can literature help us think about the ways that people respond to injustice and unfair policies?
- What makes a play a particularly useful genre for showing the ways that people experience injustice?
- What about this play... why does this play matter?

At the activity level, students engaged in disciplined inquiry, for example by analyzing Hansberry's use of dialogue and language to develop the character of Walter, and then to interrogate what Hansberry might have been trying to show or illustrate through Walter's particular arc. As they did so, they took notes, completed reflection writings, and discussed the texts in small and large groups. Through the lens of ELA, students explored the craft of writing, questioned Hansberry's own biography as context for the work, and connected the play to other works like the poem *A Dream Deferred*. In a sense, they also engaged in some level of sourcing, contextualization, and corroboration, but in ELA these were focused on understanding and interpreting the creative process of the author and less about developing

accounts of past events. At a more general level, the teachers were implementing different Essential Practices by providing a problem frame and supporting questions that were revisited at key moments to sustain inquiry and drive literacy learning. The teacher was also engaging students with multiple texts of varying genres, and was providing explicit instruction in disciplinary literacy practices, as well as opportunities to write informally and discuss the texts with peers.

Conclusion

Perhaps now, more than ever, learning experiences in classrooms need to focus on building the critical thinking, problem solving, and participatory skills vital to engaged citizenship. Thankfully, there is an emerging emphasis on shifting toward this type of powerful education. *The Essential Instructional Practices for Disciplinary Literacy: Grades 6-12* provide a framework for teacher learning and instructional planning that can help educators deepen their practice in inquiry-driven, disciplinary literacy instruction. Central to all the practices in the Essentials is the idea of problem, phenomena, or question driven teaching and learning in which a line of investigation, explanation, or inquiry drives the use of disciplinary literacy practices and tools. In other words, reading, writing, discussion, speaking, and listening take place in the service of pursuing a problem that is authentic to the discipline. In history, students can engage with historical problems and questions and be supported to develop claims about, or accounts of, past events and trends as they read and discuss a broad range of historical sources, including but not limited to primary documents. In ELA, particularly with respect to engagement with literature, students can pursue questions about language, expression, and the human experience and develop evidence-based interpretations of different works to understand themes, the craft of writing, or other broad areas of inquiry. Statewide, there is a need to maintain and expand our ongoing work around disciplinary literacy instruction. Toward this end, educators can create new collaborative efforts to develop and promote curricular programs like EF that provide the professional learning opportunities and support teachers need to engage in this work.

We want to emphasize that the *Essential Practices* were developed to drive professional learning, and it is clearly stated in the introduction that teachers need time, resources, collaboration, and opportunities to learn in order to do this work effectively. Our experiences developing and facilitating

Equitable Futures bear this out. It was necessary for teachers to engage in ongoing professional learning experiences that focused on helping them to better facilitate dialogues around issues of institutional racism and equity and shift to an inquiry-based learning approach. Ongoing support was required and took several forms—face-to-face professional learning, online meetings, conference calls, observations of teachers, co-teaching, and revising materials to meet the needs of the diverse set of learners engaged in the project.

There is no question that teachers needed support and time as they took up this work. They also needed their colleagues. By connecting teachers with one another as they embarked on this project, we facilitated the growth of a community of practice across socio-economic and geographic boundaries. Teachers learned from one another as they implemented the project and shared their experiences. Project leads saw significant growth in the teachers who participated in the *Equitable Futures* project. Teachers reported that it not only improved their practice, but also renewed their passion and excitement for teaching. Additionally, teachers reported that *Equitable Futures* provided an incentive to continue to engage in creating meaningful learning opportunities for all their students.

In sum, the pedagogical framework offered by the *Essential Practices* is a valuable resource for deepening our work around disciplinary literacy instruction, and can be leveraged to plan, develop, implement, and analyze curricular projects supporting inquiry and disciplinary literacy instruction such as *Equitable Futures*. Teachers in all content areas can explore what it means to enact these practices to support deep content and literacy learning in their classrooms. To do so, however, they need time, collegial support, curricular resources, and meaningful professional learning opportunities in order to provide their students the high-quality instruction they deserve.

References

Bain, R. (2005). They thought the world was flat? Applying the principles of how people learn in teaching high school history. In Donovan, S. & Bransford, J. (Eds.). *How students learn: History, mathematics, and science in the classroom*, pp.179–214. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Carnegie Corporation Adolescent Literacy Council. (2010). *Time to act: An agenda for advancing literacy for college*

and career success. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Collingwood, R.G. (1999). *The principles of history, and other writings in philosophy of history*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lee, C. D., & Spratley, A. (2009). *Reading in the disciplines and the challenges of adolescent literacy*. New York City: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators General Education Leadership Network Disciplinary Literacy Task Force. (2019) *Essential instructional practices for disciplinary literacy: grades 6 to 12*. Lansing, MI: Authors.

Moje, E.B. (2015). Doing and teaching disciplinary literacy with adolescent learners: A social and cultural enterprise. *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2), 254–278.

National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). Social studies for the next generation: Purposes, practices, and implications of the college, career, and civic life (C3): framework for social studies state standards.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards*. Washington, DC: Authors.

Rainey, E. C. (2017). Disciplinary literacy in English language arts: Exploring the social and problem-based nature of literary reading and reasoning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 52(1), 53–71. doi:10.1002/rtrq.154

Rouet, J. F., Britt, M. A., Mason, R. A., & Perfetti, C. A. (1996). Using multiple sources of evidence to reason about history. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 88(3): 478–493.

Scribner, S. & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.



Dr. Darin Stockdill is the Design Coordinator at the Center for Education Design, Evaluation, and Research (CEDER) in the University of Michigan's School of Education. A former secondary social studies and English teacher, his research and instructional design work focus on disciplinary literacy teaching and learning at the secondary level.



Stacie B. Woodward is a Disciplinary Literacy and Social Studies Consultant for Oakland Schools. She has been an educator since 2000, and has served in the profession in many capacities including as a high school social studies teacher, instructional coach, curriculum designer, and professional learning facilitator. Currently, as part of the Leadership and Continuous Improvement team at Oakland Schools, she supports district and school leaders in implementing evidence-based practices and developing leadership capacity focused on improving student learning in equitable ways.