

## **Providing Classroom Leadership in New Literacies: Preparing Students for Their Future**

Donald J. Leu, Elena Forzani, and Clint Kennedy

University of Connecticut

### **To appear:**

Leu, D.J., Forzani, E., & Kennedy, C. (2013). Providing classroom leadership in new literacies: Preparing students for their future. In Shelley B. Wepner, Dorothy S. Strickland, and Diana Quatroche, Editors. *The Administration and Supervision of Reading Programs*, 5th edition. (pp. 200-213). New York: Teachers College Press.

## Chapter 15

### Providing Classroom Leadership in New Literacies: Preparing Students for Their Future

Donald J. Leu, Elena Forzani, and Clint Kennedy

- Continuously new literacies pose a fundamental challenge for literacy educators -- the reading and writing skills our students require tomorrow will include ones that we do not know about today.
- The nature of new literacies can best be understood on two different levels: a variety of lower-case new literacies and a common upper-case New Literacies.
- Ten principles can be applied in school classrooms to direct New Literacies instruction.

We have entered a markedly new era for literacy education with the Internet. The continuously changing nature of online technologies means that online reading and writing skills will also keep changing. This creates a fundamental challenge for literacy educators--the reading and writing skills our students require tomorrow will include ones that we do not know about today. This simple fact requires us to think in new ways about how we teach, administer, and supervise classroom programs in the English language arts.

#### The Continuously Changing Nature of Literacy

Today, new online technologies continuously appear for literacy that redefine reading, writing, communication and learning, sometimes on a daily basis. Consider just a few of the recent arrivals: Twitter, Facebook, Google+, Siri, Foursquare, Dropbox, Skype, Chrome, iMovie, Contribute, or any of thousands of mobile “apps.” Each requires additional reading and/or writing skills to take full advantage of their affordances. Moreover, additional tools for literacy will appear on the Internet tomorrow with additional, new literacies required to use them effectively.

Thus, when we speak of new literacies in an online age we mean that literacy is not just new today; it becomes new every day of our lives. Proficiency in these online new literacies will define our students' success in both school and life. Most importantly, how we adapt to a new and dynamic definition of literacy in the classroom will define our students' future.

Some believe that there is little to teach; our students are already "digital natives," skilled in online literacies. It is true that today's students have grown up in an online world and are developing proficiency, from out of school experiences, with gaming, social networking, video, and texting (Alvermann, Hutchins, & DeBlasio, 2012; Zickuhr, 2010). However, this does not necessarily mean that they are skilled in online information use (Bennet, Maton, & Kervin, 2008.) Indeed, recent research shows that students are unskilled with locating, critically evaluating, and reading online information (Forzani & Burlingame, 2012; Graham & Metaxas, 2003; Kuyper & Volman, 2008).

### **The New Literacies of Online Research and Comprehension**

New Literacies theory (Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2004) works on two levels: lowercase (new literacies) and uppercase (New Literacies). Lowercase new literacies carefully explore: a set of new literacies required by a specific technology and its social practices, for example, text messaging (Lewis & Fabos, 2005); a disciplinary base, such as the semiotics of multimodality in online media (e.g., Kress, 2003); or a distinctive, conceptual approach such as new literacy studies (Street, 1995, 2003).

New Literacies, as the broader concept, benefits from work taking place in the multiple, lowercase dimensions of new literacies. Common findings from work within lowercase new literacies, across multiple perspectives, define a broader, uppercase New Literacies theory. Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, Castek, and Henry (2013) suggest that New Literacies theory currently includes

these common findings:

1. The Internet is this generation's defining technology for literacy and learning within our global community.
2. The Internet and related technologies require new literacies to fully access their potential.
3. New literacies are deictic; they rapidly change.
4. New literacies are multiple, multi-modal, and multi-faceted, and, as a result, our understanding of them benefits from multiple points of view.
5. Critical literacies are central to new literacies.
6. New forms of strategic knowledge are required with new literacies.
7. New social practices are a central element of new literacies.
8. Teachers become more important, though their role changes, within new literacy classrooms. (p. 1158)

The new literacies of online research and comprehension (Leu, et al., 2013) is an example of a lowercase theory, and may be especially important to classroom reading programs. This perspective frames online reading comprehension as a process of problem-based inquiry involving the new skills, strategies, dispositions, and social practices that take place as we use the Internet to conduct research, solve problems, and answer questions. At least five processing practices occur during online research and comprehension: 1) reading to identify important questions, 2) reading to locate information, 3) reading to evaluate information critically, 4) reading to synthesize information, and 5) reading and writing to communicate information. These processing practices require specific skills and strategies that are distinctive to online research and comprehension.

How does the nature of reading and writing change on the Internet? What, if any, new literacies do we require? We are just discovering the answers to these questions (Afflerbach & Cho, 2008). First, it appears that online reading comprehension typically takes place within a research and problem solving task (Coiro & Castek, 2010). In short, online reading comprehension is online research. Online reading also becomes tightly integrated with writing as we communicate with others to learn more about the questions we explore and as we communicate our own interpretations. A third difference that exists is that new technologies such as browsers, search engines, wikis, blogs, email, and many others are used online. Additional skills are required to use each of these technologies effectively. Keyword entry in a search engine, for example, becomes an important new literacy skill because it is required in search engines, an important new technology for locating information. Other online technologies require additional new strategies during online reading.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, online reading may require even greater amounts of higher level thinking than offline reading. In a context in which anyone may publish anything, higher level thinking skills such as critical evaluation of source material and understanding an author's point of view become especially important online.

Emerging research has provided the following additional insights:

- Some challenged offline readers, who possess online research and reading comprehension skills, may read online better than other students who lack online reading skills (Castek, et al., 2011).
- Prior knowledge may contribute less to online research and reading comprehension than offline reading comprehension, since readers may gather required prior knowledge online, as a part of the reading paths they follow (Coiro, 2011).

- Students often learn many online research and comprehension skills from other students as a result of challenging activities designed by the teacher (Kiili, Laurinen, Marttunen, & Leu, 2012; Zawilinski, 2011).

These insights will be important to our work in the administration and supervision of reading programs. They will also become important to the new contexts for learning that are emerging online such as MOOCs (Massively Open Online Courses) and others. Students will require these new reading skills to successfully participate in the new online contexts for learning that will define our future.

## **New Standards**

### **Australia**

A growing number of communities are beginning to recognize the changes to literacy that are taking place in an online age. They are changing educational standards so their students are better prepared for work and life in an online age of information. Australia, for example, has recently developed the Australian Curriculum (Australia Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], n. d.). This Australian initiative tightly integrates literacy and the Internet within the English curriculum:

ICT competence is an important component of the English curriculum. Students develop the skills and understanding required to use a range of contemporary technologies. In particular, they explicitly develop increasingly sophisticated word-processing skills to enhance text construction. Students also progressively develop skills in using information technology when conducting research, a range of digital technologies to create, publish and present their learning, and communication technologies to collaborate and communicate with others both within and beyond the classroom.

(ACARA, n.d., General Capabilities, Information and Communication Technology  
Competence section, para. 2)

The English Curriculum integrates this capability into each year's statement of the Australian content standards.

### **Canada: Manitoba**

The province of Manitoba has developed an educational framework called Literacy with ICT Across the Curriculum (Minister of Manitoba Education, Citizenship, and Youth, 2006). This initiative outlines skills and includes standards required in the 21st century in all aspects of their curriculum such as:

...identifying appropriate inquiry questions; navigating multiple information networks to locate relevant information; applying critical thinking skills to evaluate information sources and content; synthesizing information and ideas from multiple sources and networks; representing information and ideas creatively in visual, aural, and textual formats; crediting and referencing sources of information and intellectual property; and communicating new understandings to others, both face to face and over distance....

(Minister of Manitoba Education, Citizenship, and Youth, 2006, p. 18)

### **The United States**

In the U. S., the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Initiative (2012) has recently sought to establish more uniform standards across states that better prepare students for college and careers in the 21st century. One of the key design principles in the CCSS, research and media skills, shows that it is essential to integrate literacy and new, online technologies in the classroom. It states:

To be ready for college, workforce training, and life in a technological society, students need the ability to gather, comprehend, evaluate, synthesize, and report on information and ideas, to conduct original research in order to answer questions or solve problems, and to analyze and create a high volume and extensive range of print and nonprint texts in media forms old and new. The need to conduct research and to produce and consume media is embedded into every aspect of today's curriculum. (Common Core State Standards, n.d., p. 4)

Three changes are especially noticeable in the English Language Arts Standards of CCSS:

1. There is a greater focus on reading informational texts.
2. Higher level thinking is emphasized.
3. Digital literacies are integrated throughout the English Language Arts standards.

Each of these reflects the shift in reading from page to screen. While there is more that can be done (Drew, 2012), a number of anchor standards now include new literacies required by digital technologies (Leu, et. al, 2013).

Despite differences in the nature of integrating new literacies into national and provincial standards, all represent the changes taking place to literacy education as reading shifts from page to screen. Global economic competition and workforce preparation are causing governments to rethink the literacy preparation of our youth.

### **Ten Principles to Inform Classroom Leadership and Instruction in New Literacies**

As you think about integrating these new literacies into your classrooms, it may be useful to consider ten research-based principles that can inform the administration and supervision of classroom reading programs in this area:

1. Recognize that a new literacies journey is one of continuous learning.



2. Begin teaching and learning new literacies as early as possible.
3. Use new literacies to help the last student become the first.
4. Recognize that online search skills are important to success in new literacies.
5. Use online reading experiences to develop critical thinking skills and a generation of healthy skeptics.
6. Integrate the Internet into classrooms through online communication.
7. Open doors for teachers by using the word “pilot” in resistant schools and districts.
8. Use performance based assessments for evaluating new literacies.
9. Use Internet Reciprocal Teaching as an effective strategy to teach the new literacies of online research and comprehension in one-to-one computing classrooms.
10. Prepare students for their future by using collaborative online learning experiences with classroom partners in other parts of the world

Below, we define these principles and include several specific instructional practices that can be used to implement each one.

### **Recognize That a New Literacies Journey Is One of Continuous Learning**

As new technologies appear on the Internet, new literacy requirements and opportunities appear (Leu, 2000; Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2013). Consider, for example, one student who was reading online about how rainbows are formed. She encountered an unfamiliar word, “refraction.” A second student noticed the problem and showed her a strategy that had become possible with an update to this search engine. This second student went to the Google search box in the browser and typed in “define: refraction.” She knew that using the keyword “define:” plus an unfamiliar word generates results limited to online dictionary entries for the target word.

Reading several entries in the search results made the meaning of this unfamiliar word clear to the first student, who had acquired a new online reading skill.

Examples like this take place regularly as we encounter new affordances within older technologies or as new technologies, themselves, appear. They remind us that our new literacies future is really a journey, not a destination. The regular appearance of new literacies requires additional roles for school leaders, teachers, and students.

For school leaders, it means developing a vision for working with this continuously changing landscape. This means living an active, online professional life so that you might become more familiar with the new literacies that new technologies require. Your role may also be enhanced by working to build supportive online communities among teachers so they can share and exchange new skills and new technologies that they, themselves, discover.

For teachers, it means integrating online literacy experiences into the classroom in a regular and thoughtful fashion. This will require knowing which online reading and writing skills are the most important to support. It will also mean developing learning experiences to maximize the take up of these skills by students. In addition, it means learning about new online skills and resources from other colleagues, an important source of information in a world where it is hard for any one person to keep up with all of the changes. It also means being on the lookout for new skills and strategies that students in your class manifest so you can then distribute these skills to all of your other students and to fellow teachers.

For students, it means having regular, consistent, and safe access to online technologies in the classroom and at home. When this is not possible at home, it becomes even more important for it to be possible at school. It also means expanding an interest in learning new literacy skills and developing the ability to share these effectively with others.

**Build an online support system.** Keep a running list of the best new online tools and resources that you encounter. Regularly distribute these through your school's social network, wiki, or blog. Alternatively, send a weekly email message to the teachers with whom you work, pointing them to new online tools and resources that may be useful in their classrooms. Encourage teachers to also share the best online resources that work effectively in classrooms to support learning. This will quickly build a community around the effective integration of online new literacies into classrooms.

**Build an online expert board.** Encourage teachers to keep an Online Expert Board in their classrooms or in their class blog or wiki. As teachers observe students who demonstrate new and useful online reading and writing strategies, they should add the name of the student and the expertise they displayed in an Online Expert Board, where everyone can see it. Others can use this information when they need help, finding a student who might be able to help them.

### **Begin Teaching and Learning New Literacies As Early As Possible**

Schools should begin to integrate the Internet and new literacies into the classroom as soon as children begin their literacy education program, and not be delayed until they have learned to read offline. A useful first step is to begin Internet integration within the earliest grades, using online resources that serve to teach initial offline reading skills. These locations teach early offline reading skills at the same time they provide experiences with navigating an online interface. *Starfall* is an exceptional and free resource for children that supports the development of early offline reading skills, and is located at <http://www.starfall.com/>.

*ReadWriteThink* is a wonderful resource for teachers that provides an extensive set of K-12 lessons that teach offline reading and writing skills to young children, and is located at <http://www.readwritethink.org/>.

## **Use New Literacies to Help the Last Student Become the First**

Teach your most challenged students a simple set of new literacies associated with a new technology tool before you teach them to anyone else. This enables struggling readers and writers to become literate in this new technology before other, higher performing students. Those who struggle with reading and writing are now literate in a new form, and can teach this new literacy to others in the classroom. Unfortunately, the opposite often happens. Struggling readers are frequently denied access to online experiences because their offline literacy skills are thought to be insufficient (Castek, Zawilinski, McVerry, O'Byrne, & Leu, 2011).

**Teach email systems, wikis, and blogs.** In the next few years, all classrooms will be using child safe email systems that are already available such as *ePals*, *Gaggle*, and others. Capitalize on this opportunity by teaching your particular email system to your struggling readers and then have them teach email skills to other students. Have them also be available to support those who require assistance. Include their names on your online expert board (see above).

When you begin to use wikis and blogs in your classroom make certain that you use these opportunities, too, to help the last become first with new literacies. Teach your struggling readers how to make wiki and blog entries first. Have them assist others with these new tools.

## **Recognize That Online Search Skills Are Important To Success in New Literacies**

The reading ability required to locate online information (Broch, 2000; Guinee, Eagleton, & Hall, 2003; Eagleton, Guinee, & Langlais, 2003; International ICT Panel, 2002; Sutherland-Smith, 2002) is a gate-keeping skill. If one cannot locate information, one will be unable to solve a given problem. Locating skills appear to function in a similar manner to word recognition skills during offline reading. That is, during offline reading it is very difficult to comprehend text

without word recognition skills in place. Similarly, it is very difficult to conduct research and solve a problem during online reading without locating skills in place.

For example, new online reading skills and strategies are required to generate effective keyword search strategies (Bilal, 2000; Guinee, Eagleton, & Hall, 2003; Kuiper & Volman, 2008); to read and infer which link may be most useful within a set of search engine results (Henry, 2006); and to efficiently scan for relevant information within websites (Rouet, Ros, Goumi, Macedo-Rouet, & Dinet, 2011). Each is important to integrate into classroom reading programs.

**Create new search engine skills.** Search engines regularly add new search capabilities that are not always known to users. To keep up to date with those that are added to Google, visit Google's "*Inside Search*" at: <http://www.google.com/insidesearch/searcheducation/index.html>. Here, you will find lesson plans, activities to improve your own search skills, daily search challenges for your students, and training webinars for both you and your students. There is a similar page for the *Bing* search engine at <http://onlinehelp.microsoft.com/en-us/bing/>. *Bing* integrates closely with *Facebook*, which provides additional search capabilities.

Unskilled online readers often "click and look" their way down a list of search results, inspecting each site without reading and making inferences from information in the results list. This is very inefficient and often leads students to skip the best site when it does not appear as they expect. To develop better inferential comprehension skills during the reading of search results, play "One Click." Conduct a search for any topic you are studying in class. If you lack a Smart Board and a projector, print out enough copies of the first page of search results for each student. Distribute these. Then see if students can locate the best link on the search results page for each question that you ask such as, "Which link will take you to a site developed by an

Egyptologist?” or “Which site on this page is a commercial site and will probably be trying to sell you something?” Each question should require students to make an inference from the limited information appearing in the search results list. If you have a Smart Board and a projector, do the same but ask students to come to the board and link to the answer they think is correct, and explain their reasoning.

### **Use Online Reading Experiences to Develop Critical Thinking Skills and a Generation of Healthy Skeptics**

A central objective of any instructional program in new literacies is to develop students who read as “healthy skeptics.” We seek to raise a generation of students who always question the information they read for reliability and accuracy, always read to infer the bias or point of view of the author, and always check the sources that they encounter. The Internet demands this.

Critically evaluating online information includes the ability to read and evaluate the level of accuracy, reliability, and bias of information (Center for Media Literacy, 2005). Although these skills have always been necessary to comprehend and use offline texts (Bråten, Strømsø, & Britt, 2009; Bråten, Strømsø, & Salmerón, 2011), the proliferation of unedited information and the merging of commercial marketing with educational content (Fabos, 2008) presents additional challenges that are quite different from traditional print and media sources, requiring new strategies during online reading.

Without explicit training in these new literacy skills, many students become confused and overwhelmed when asked to judge the accuracy, reliability, and bias of information they encounter in online reading environments (Graham & Metaxas, 2003; Sanchez, Wiley, & Goldman, 2006; Sundar, 2008). Your leadership in this area will ensure that students in your district graduate with the critical evaluation skills required for an online age.

**Reverse Wikipedia.** Typically, Wikipedia is simply used for information. Reverse this and use Wikipedia to make critical evaluation skills the primary focus. Select an entry for any topic being studied in the classroom. For an assignment, have students find one claim made at the site that is contested by others online and bring in the disputed information as well as the sources to class. Have students share their disputed facts and sources and discuss critical evaluation strategies that could be used to help resolve the conflict. This conversation will teach many new strategies to your students. In addition, someone will eventually figure out the simplest way to complete this assignment. By selecting the “talk” tab on every Wikipedia entry, they are likely to discover discussions and debates about controversial claims made at the site, an important new literacy skill to possess.

**Source Plus.** Schools increasingly require students to list the sources for any online information that is used in a report. Take this one step further and require students to also indicate how they determined that each source was reputable and reliable.

### **Integrate the Internet into Classrooms through Online Communication**

It may be easiest to integrate the Internet into classrooms through the use of online communication tools such as email, wikis, and blogs, as well as the child-safe social networks for schools that are now beginning to appear. Each creates a wonderfully natural way in which to develop a culture of effective online information use in classrooms (Zawilinski, 2011). Importantly, they may be used to keep parents informed about what is taking place in classrooms.

As we begin to integrate these online communication tools into our classrooms, we should not ignore concerns about child safety. We want to restrict communication only to our students and to a community of people whom we can trust, such as parents and other teachers

and classes. There are many versions of wikis, blogs, and email that can provide these protections. Typically, they do this in one of two ways. First, most permit you to restrict access. Typically, you can list the addresses of people you wish to be able to view, add, or edit information. Second, many tools, especially child-safe email tools, permit you to approve any message that is submitted to be sent.

**Investigate other teachers' use of blogs, wikis, and email in their classrooms.** To gather ideas about how online communication tools can be used effectively in classrooms simply search online to see how other teachers do this (Zawilinski, 2011). Use keywords such as: 1st grade classroom blog, 4th grade classroom blog, classroom wiki, or classroom email. Send links of good classroom models to the teachers in your district or school to review and consider.

**Child-safe email at ePals and Gaggle.** Both *ePals* (<http://www.epals.com/>) and *Gaggle* (<http://www.epals.com/>) provide child-safe email. Many teachers begin classroom email use by choosing settings that limit students to exchanging emails with other students in the classroom. Later teachers adjust settings to permit email to students in other classrooms in your school. Finally, they open settings to other students around the world who have been admitted into the system. At each step you can monitor all correspondence if you wish.

### **Open Doors for Teachers by Using the Word “Pilot” in Resistant Schools and Districts**

Technology coordinators often place severe restrictions on classroom access to Internet tools for one reason or another. As a literacy leader you should determinedly work to make child-safe access to online tools and resources easier for teachers.

A useful strategy is to simply suggest that a “pilot” be implemented in a single classroom for each new online technology. Present the case, describing what the technology does, how it will increase opportunities for students, and how the teacher can ensure child safety. Also



suggest that a note be sent to parents to inform them about what will be taking place, why it is important, and to request their permission. Thus, anxieties are reduced in the district and, after a successful pilot, your district may be more receptive to additional innovations.

**Incorporate online tools.** One tool that is likely to be blocked by your district is *Voicethread* (<http://voicethread.com/>). This is a supportive tool for classroom learning and communication, especially for struggling readers and younger grade levels. Individuals can post an image, a video, or a text and invite others to respond by voice, video, or text. Because students can respond by voice it makes full participation possible for beginning or struggling readers and writers. It is also a child safe tool, where access can be limited only to students in a single classroom. Propose and conduct a pilot of this tool in one classroom to evaluate its potential for other classrooms in relation to the costs for the district.

Another tool is *Google Drive*. While more and more schools are seeing the usefulness of Google Drive for their students, many still block this tool. *Google Drive* offers a free suite of collaborative online tools, including *Google Docs* for word processing, spreadsheets, forms, presentations, and drawing pages. Word processing and other files may be used by anyone with permission from the creator. Thus, multiple students and teachers can collaboratively work on a single document at once. Using this tool as part of a pilot is a low-risk way to begin implementing technology into the classroom.

### **Use Performance Based Assessments for Evaluating New Literacies**

Good instruction is informed by good assessments. Thus, it is important to have assessments capable of measuring new literacies in ways that inform instruction. Performance based assessments provide diagnostic information gathered as students perform an authentic task that is required in life and in the classroom. While no assessment is a perfect solution (Darling-

Hammond, 2010), some have argued that performance based assessments do this better than many other forms of assessments (Wiggins, 1998).

Some initial models for assessing the new literacies of online research and comprehension have appeared. For example, the PISA Digital Reading Assessment (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2011) evaluated 15-year olds in a number of different countries. Unfortunately, it was not a performance based assessment. Instead, it used isolated online tasks to estimate a student's abilities. In addition, problems in this assessment typically took place within a single website rather than requiring students to search through the extensive set of sites that defines the Internet. Thus, the challenges presented by locating information in complex information contexts were profoundly minimized. By restricting the information space, the PISA Digital Reading Assessment may have limited the more complex informational demands of actual online research and comprehension.

Another approach, with greater fidelity to online environments is the Online Research and Comprehension Assessment, or ORCA (Leu, Kulikowich, Sedransk, & Coiro, 2009). Each online research task in science is directed through chat messages from an avatar student within a social network. Along the way, students are asked to locate four different websites and summarize the central information from each in their notepad. They also evaluate the source reliability of a website and write a short report of their research in either a wiki or in an email message. The assessments have demonstrated good levels of both reliability and validity (Leu, Coiro, Kulikowich, & Cui, 2012). This format and the performance based nature of the assessment may provide a model for others. To gain greater understanding of what these types of assessments will look like in the future, you may view a video of one student completing one of the assessments: <http://neag.uconn.edu/orca-video-ira/>.

The extent to which CCSS assessments will focus on offline and online literacies is not yet clear. The use of performance based assessments for CCSS is also not clear, though a recent indication suggests that these have been severely limited (Jacobs, 2012). What does appear to be clear is that to the extent performance based assessments in new literacies are included in CCSS assessments, teachers are likely to be better informed about instruction.

**Use informal observation strategies.** Use informal observations of students conducting online research in much the same way as performance based assessments to gain important diagnostic information about individual students' ability. Look carefully at how they locate, evaluate, synthesize, and communicate information online during their research.

Another way to gather informal, performance based assessment data is through think alouds. As students conduct online research or a research task at a Smart Board, have them think aloud so that the entire class can see online research and comprehension strategies.

### **Use Internet Reciprocal Teaching as an Effective Strategy to Teach the New Literacies of Online Research and Comprehension in One-to-One Computing Classrooms**

As we move to one-to-one computing classrooms (cf. Argueta, Huff, Tinggen, & Corn, 2011), we will be challenged to teach new literacies. Teachers may have only a few seconds of their students' attention to teach a new online skill if laptops are open. If laptops are closed, attention may not be substantially greater. A central issue is this: How do you teach a new online research and comprehension skill in the 15 seconds or so that you have students' attention? One way is to embed the skill that you seek to teach in a research problem for groups of students to solve. When you see a student figure out the target skill that you have embedded into the research problem, have that student explain what he or she did on the Smart Board so that others can also solve the problem. This approach, a part of Internet Reciprocal Teaching (Leu, et. al,

2008), has demonstrated efficacy in the classroom for developing online research and comprehension skills (Leu & Reinking, 2010).

**Teach source evaluation skills.** If you want to teach source evaluation skills, have small groups conduct research to answer a three-part problem like this: 1) How high is Mt. Fuji in feet? 2) Find a different answer to this same question. 3) Which answer do you trust and why do you trust it? As you observe students begin work on the third part of the problem, you will likely see a student begin to use the strategy that you wish to teach, locating and evaluating the author or the source of the information. Interrupt the other groups and have this student teach the strategy to the class. There are many inconsistent facts online that can also be used to teach source evaluation including: “How long is the Mississippi River?” or “What is the population of San Francisco?”

**Monitor laptop use.** Consider the use of monitoring software on the teacher’s computer in one-to-one classrooms. Monitoring software places a thumbnail image of each student’s computer screen on the teacher’s computer. Thus, if a student is visiting a popular rock star’s site inappropriately, the teacher can simply project it up on the Smart Board and ask, “Who is visiting Bieber’s home page today?” The offending site will quickly disappear and students will be more likely to stay on task in the future. More importantly, though, this tool may be used to display a student’s screen when the student is teaching an important new skill that they know to the class. There are many different monitoring software programs including: *Apple Remote Desktop*, *LanSchool*, *Netop School*, and others.

**Prepare Students for Their Future by Using Collaborative Online Learning Experiences with Classroom Partners in Other Parts of the World**

Some teachers are beginning to explore the future of classroom instruction. They connect with other classrooms around the world to engage in collaborative classroom learning projects. These classrooms use *Google Drive*, blogs, email, wikis, and simple web page development tools to learn, exchange information, and work on collaborative research projects. With these projects, students increase their new literacies skills, develop a richer understanding of content, and develop a greater understanding of the differences that define our planet. Most importantly, it provides students with preparation for the world they will soon enter, especially in the workplace.

**Find an international classroom to work with on a common project.** Use tools like “*Find a Classroom Match*” (<http://www.epals.com/find-classroom>) to connect with classrooms, around the world. Visit “*Join a Project*” (<http://www.epals.com/find-project>) to select a classroom learning project. Both sites require you to register in order to access the free, child-safe email. You may need to request that your district provide your classroom with access.

**Use Internet morning message of the week.** Connect up with several teachers at your grade level, possibly in different countries, by email, to set up a weekly email exchange project. Require each participating classroom to send all other classrooms in the project a weekly email, sharing details of what took place in their classroom on one day. Thus, each classroom will receive a number of messages from around the world each week. Print copies out for students or display on a Smart Board to help students develop new friends and a richer understanding of the world around them. In younger grades, ask your class to dictate a response each week, while you transcribe it. In older grades, assign the report writing project to a different group each week. Have a different group serve as editors to read, suggest revisions, and edit the work. Then send it out to the other participating classes.

## **Conclusion**

The nature of reading is changing in an online world of information and communication. We encounter new literacy tools, requiring new literacy skills nearly every day. It is essential that we include instruction in these new literacies within our classrooms since our students are not fully prepared for them (Forzani & Burlingame, 2012; Kennedy, 2012).

It is equally important to begin thinking about reading and literacy in a new way. It may be that a continuously shifting landscape of new literacies means that learning how to learn becomes more important than mastering a fixed and static set of literacy skills that will need to be continuously updated as new technologies appear. It may become essential to create classrooms in which learning is organized around the social practices of continuously new, online literacies, not a set of specific skills that may become altered over time.

The world of new literacies requires school leaders and teachers with the understanding of what is taking place and a vision of what is now possible for our students. It is an exciting world for leaders who are interested in supporting change and development. One thing is very clear--the leadership that you provide will determine the future that our children achieve.

## **Reflection Questions**

1. Which of the ideas in this chapter best suit the instructional opportunities with your teachers and classrooms? Why? How could they be adapted to support student learning in new literacies?
2. Is one, or several, of the instructional principles described in this chapter most important to K-12 education? Which one(s)? Why?
3. How could you use this chapter to organize and conduct a two-hour workshop for the teachers at your school? Plan this workshop and the set of experiences that you would provide.

## **Project Assignment**

Explore *ePals*, *Voicethread*, *Google Drive*, *ReadWriteThink*, or another technology discussed in this chapter. Identify several great ideas that could be used in a classroom and send an email to colleagues describing the resource and how they might use it. If your district blocks these tools, have a meeting with the appropriate person to request that it be unblocked for one classroom so that this teacher might conduct a “pilot.” Prepare a presentation for this meeting that explains its function and importance, and how it can be used in a child safe fashion.

Portions of this material are based on work supported by the U. S. Department of Education under Award No. R305G050154 and R305A090608. Opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the position of the U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences.

### **References**

- Afflerbach, P. A., & Cho, B. Y. (2008). Determining and describing reading strategies: Internet and traditional forms of reading. In H.S. Waters, & W. Schneider (Eds.), *Metacognition, strategy use, and instruction* (pp. 201-255). New York: Guilford Press.
- Alvermann, D., Hutchins, R. J., & DeBlasio, R. (2012). Adolescents' engagement with Web 2.0 and social media: Research, theory, and practice. *Research in the Schools*, 19(1), 33-44.
- Argueta, R., Huff, J., Tingen, J., & Corn, J. (2011). Laptop initiatives: Summary of research across six states. North Carolina State University, College of Education. Retrieved from [https://www.fi.ncsu.edu/assets/podcast\\_episodes/white-paper-series/laptopinitiatives-summary-of-research-across-six-states.pdf](https://www.fi.ncsu.edu/assets/podcast_episodes/white-paper-series/laptopinitiatives-summary-of-research-across-six-states.pdf)
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (n. d.). *The Australian Curriculum*, v3.0. Available at: <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/Home>

- Bennet, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The 'digital natives': A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39, 775-786
- Bilal, D. (2000). Children's use of the Yahoo! search engine: Cognitive, physical, and affective behaviors on fact-based search tasks. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51, 646–665.
- Bråten, I., Strømsø, H.I., & Britt, M.A. (2009). Trust matters: Examining the role of source evaluation in students' construction of meaning within and across multiple texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(1), 6–28.
- Bråten, I., Strømsø, H.I., & Salmerón, L. (2011). Trust and mistrust when students read multiple information sources about climate change. *Learning and Instruction*, 21(2), 180–192.
- Broch, E. (2000). Children's search engines from an information search process perspective. *School Library Media Research*, 3. Retrieved from [www.ala.org/arasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume32000/childrens](http://www.ala.org/arasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume32000/childrens)
- Castek, J., Zawilinski, L., McVerry, G., O'Byrne, I., & Leu, D.J. (2011). The new literacies of online reading comprehension: New opportunities and challenges for students with learning difficulties. In C. Wyatt-Smith, J. Elkins, & S. Gunn (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on difficulties in learning literacy and numeracy* (pp. 91–110). New York: Springer.
- Center for Media Literacy. (2005). *Literacy for the 21st century: An overview and orientation guide to media literacy education. Part 1 of the CML medialit kit: Framework for learning and teaching in a media age.* Retrieved from [www.medialit.org/cml-medialit-kit](http://www.medialit.org/cml-medialit-kit)



- Coiro, J. (2011). Predicting reading comprehension on the Internet: Contributions of offline reading skills, online reading skills, and prior knowledge. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43, 352–392.
- Coiro, J., & Castek, J. (2010). Assessment frameworks for teaching and learning English language arts in a digital age. In D. Lapp & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English Language Arts* (3rd ed., pp. 314-321). Co-Sponsored by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English. New York: Routledge.
- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2012). *Common Core State Standards Initiative: Preparing America's students for college and career*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Performance-based assessment and educational equity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(1), 5-31.
- Drew, S. (2012). Open up the ceiling on the Common Core State Standards. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56, 321–330.
- Eagleton, M., Guinee, K., & Langlais, K. (2003). Teaching Internet literacy strategies: The hero inquiry project. *Voices from the Middle*, 10(3), 28–35.
- Fabos, B. (2008). The price of information: Critical literacy, education, and today's Internet. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies* (pp. 839–870). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Forzani, E. & Burlingame, C. (2012, December). Evaluating representative state samples of seventh-grade students' ability to critically evaluate online information. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Literacy Research Association, San Diego, CA.

- Graham, L., & Metaxas, P.T. (2003). Of course it's true: I saw it on the Internet! *Communications of the ACM*, 46(5), 71–75.
- Guinee, K., Eagleton, M.B., & Hall, T.E. (2003). Adolescents' Internet search strategies: Drawing upon familiar cognitive paradigms when accessing electronic information sources. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 29, 363–374.
- Henry, L. (2006). SEARCHing for an answer: The critical role of new literacies while reading on the Internet. *The Reading Teacher*, 59, 614–627.
- International ICT Literacy Panel. (2002, May). Digital transformation: A framework for ICT literacy. Retrieved from [www.ets.org/Media/Tests/Information\\_and\\_Communication\\_Technology\\_Literacy/ictreport.pdf](http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/Information_and_Communication_Technology_Literacy/ictreport.pdf)
- Jacobs, J. (2012, December 3). New 'core' test will be (a bit) shorter, simpler. *Education Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://www.joannejacobs.com/2012/12/new-core-test-will-be-a-bit-shorter-simpler/>
- Kennedy, C. (2012, November). Comparing representative state samples of students' ability to conduct online research and communicate information: A one-to-one laptop state vs. a state without one-to-one laptops. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Literacy Research Association Conference, San Diego, CA.
- Kiili, C., Laurinen, L., Marttunen, M., & Leu, D. J. (2012). Working on understanding during collaborative online reading. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 20(10), 1-36.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.
- Kuiper, E., & Volman, M. (2008). The Web as a source of information for students in K–12 education. In J. Coiro, M. Knobel, C. Lankshear, & D. Leu (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new literacies* (pp. 241–246). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Leu, D.J., Jr. (2000). Literacy and technology: Deictic consequences for literacy education in an information age. In M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 743–770). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leu, D. J., Coiro, J., Castek, J., Hartman, D., Henry, L.A., & Reinking, D. (2008). Research on instruction and assessment in the new literacies of online reading comprehension. In C. C. Block & S. Parris (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 111-153). New York: Guilford.
- Leu, D. J., Coiro, J., Kulikowich, J., & Cui, W. (December, 2012). Using the psychometric characteristics of multiple-choice, open Internet, and closed (simulated) Internet formats to refine the development of online research and comprehension assessments in science: Year three of the ORCA project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Literacy Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Leu, D. J., Kinzer, C. K., Coiro, J., & Cammack, D. (2004). Toward a theory of new literacies emerging from the internet and other IT. In R. B. Ruddell & N. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and process of reading* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 1570-1613). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Leu, D. J., Kinzer, C. K., Coiro, J., Castek, J., & Henry, L. A. (2013). New literacies: A dual level theory of the changing nature of literacy, instruction, and assessment. In N. Unrau & D. Alvermann (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (6<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 1150-1181). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Leu, D. J., Kulikowich, J., Sedransk, N., & Coiro, J. (2009). Assessing online reading comprehension: The ORCA project. Research grant funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

- Leu, D. J. & Reinking, D. (2010). Final report: Developing Internet comprehension strategies among adolescent students at risk to become dropouts. U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences Research Grant. Retrieved from <http://www.newliteracies.uconn.edu/iesproject/researchdocuments.html>
- Lewis, C., & Fabos, B. (2005). Instant messaging, literacies, and social identities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40, 470-501.
- Minister of Manitoba Education, Citizenship, and Youth. (2006). A continuum model for literacy with ICT across the curriculum: A resource for developing computer literacy. Retrieved from [www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/tech/lict/resources/handbook/index.htm](http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/tech/lict/resources/handbook/index.htm)
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2011). PISA 2009 Results: Students on line: Digital technologies and performance (vol. VI). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264112995-en>
- Rouet, J.-F., Ros, C., Goumi, A., Macedo-Rouet, M., & Dinet, J. (2011). The influence of surface and deep cues on primary and secondary school students' assessment of relevance in web menus. *Learning and Instruction*, 21(2), 205–219.
- Sanchez, C.A., Wiley, J., & Goldman, S.R. (2006). Teaching students to evaluate source reliability during Internet research tasks. In S.A. Barab, K.E. Hay, & D.T. Hickey (Eds.), *Proceedings of the seventh international conference on the learning sciences* (pp. 662–666). Bloomington, IN: International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies*. London: Longman.
- Street, B. (2003). What's new in new literacy studies? *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 1–14.

- Sundar, S.S. (2008). The MAIN model: A heuristic approach to understanding technology effects on credibility. In M.J. Metzger & A.J. Flanagin (Eds.), *Digital media, youth, and credibility* (pp. 73–100). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2002). Weaving the literacy web: Changes in reading from page to screen. *The Reading Teacher*, 55, 662–669.
- Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- Zawilinski, L. (2011). *An exploration of a collaborative blogging approach to literacy and learning: A mixed method study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.
- Zickuhr, K. (2010). *Generations 2010*. Pew Internet and American Life project. Retrieved from [http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP\\_Generations\\_and\\_Tech10.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2010/PIP_Generations_and_Tech10.pdf)