How to address the needs of advanced readers - with Dr. Nancy Young

Triple R Teaching Podcast #199

Hello, this is Anna Geiger, author of *Reach All Readers* and creator of Reach All Readers. Today I'm interviewing Dr. Nancy Young.

Dr. Young is the creator of *The Ladder of Reading and Writing* infographic, which visually represents the ease at which children learn to read and write and how there's a difference. Some students learn to read very easily, some do not, so the amount of support and structure we give them matters.

Dr. Young is also the co-editor of *Climbing the Ladder of Reading and Writing: Meeting the Needs of ALL Learners* with Dr. Jan Hasbrouck.

In today's interview, we discuss, in particular, the substance of her chapter, the chapter about meeting the needs of students who are AIR, A-I-R, advanced in reading. I think far too often these students' needs get dismissed. In this interview, we talk about why it's important to meet the needs of all learners, including those for whom learning to read and write is easy compared to that of their peers. Here we go!

Anna Geiger:

Welcome, Dr. Young!

Nancy Young:

Thank you! Glad to be here, Anna!

Anna Geiger:

I'm really excited to talk with you about how we help our students who are advanced in reading.

Before we do that, could you introduce us to yourself and talk to us about your long career?

Nancy Young:

Well, it has been long with many different things, so I think what I'll do is try to zero in on the topic for today, which is advanced readers. I'll focus on my journey specifically to do with advanced readers.

It really began over 35 years ago as a parent. I didn't know back then any of the concepts being discussed under this "science of reading" umbrella. I didn't know about phonics, morphology, phonemic awareness, all these things. My husband and I were big readers and we just did what we thought parents should do, what our friends did, and what we hope all children or all parents will do, which is to read to our children.

I was a young mom, frazzled, with two children very close in age, and I used to think, "Oh, I should have done this. I should have bought the magnetic alphabet for the fridge. I should have done this." I never did, but despite that, our children both read before school. They were reading before school.

Our son was reading full books at four. I didn't take photos or videos - we had this old dinosaur video camera - but I do have one video of him when he was four. He was reading aloud, sitting on my

husband's lap, and it was a chapter book. In the video it looks like there might have been a picture maybe every four pages. When he reached a word he didn't know, my husband just told him what the word was. There was no sounding out or anything. Again, we didn't know to do that.

Both of our children showed advanced reading skills very early on. What we thought, which is similar to many parents of advanced readers, is, “This is great! They'll be fine in school. They'll so enjoy school.” It's just one less thing to worry about.

Our son's kindergarten year was wonderful, and his teacher recognized his advanced abilities and really enabled him to soar. Really, when I look back, I think, “Wow, that was fantastic.”

But his grade one year was the opposite. That's when it hit us that maybe even with children who were advanced, we couldn't guarantee that they'd be fine in school.

That's when my advocacy began, trying to advocate for what was needed that was not being provided in the classroom. I realized then that to advocate for their needs, I had to learn what they needed. It's so interesting because many parents of children with dyslexia have had to learn about dyslexia in order to advocate for their children's needs.

I was learning about advanced readers back then, buying books and taking courses, and it was clear to me very early on that educators were not being provided what I was learning about. The educators weren't given the training they needed.

When my children were teens, I completed my Bachelor of Education degree. By then I decided that to be able to make a difference with these children, I should become a classroom teacher. For all children really, because I've worked with many different learning needs over the years.

Actually, the principal of our son's first school had said to me, “Nancy, you need to be a teacher.”

I had a BA degree, and before I did my B. Ed. I was able to take courses on giftedness at the university level. It was great because I was doing what I wish we could have more teachers do, which was to take those high level courses on giftedness.

It was opposite of what normally happens. Usually people take their education degree and then they take courses on giftedness. Again, ideally we should have giftedness wrapped into the education degree. This is something that I'm advocating and there are great resources that support that.

But anyhow I took courses on giftedness before my B. Ed., and then during my B. Ed., which was a post-degree two-year program, I was able to do a self-chosen study during one semester. I studied with my professor from my giftedness courses, who was actually well-known in the giftedness field. I was very fortunate to have a real expert teaching me. My self-directed study was on children who were intellectually gifted, yet still had trouble learning to read or to do math.

The years passed, I continued my interest in children who had difficulties, and that led me to studying dyslexia. I hadn't known anything about dyslexia and this was intriguing for me, so I took training on students with reading difficulties. Much of my focus for about 20 years was actually supporting children who had difficulties.

When I speak to people in the field now, I feel like I do have an understanding of the whole continuum because my own children were advanced, but I worked with many students for whom learning to read was difficult, and I spent many years advocating that we improve instruction for those children for whom it was difficult to learn to read.

But a few years ago, I began circling back to the research on advanced readers and those who are ahead in skill development for their age. Really, I was dismayed that after all those decades, the same issues still existed. These children were still not getting what they needed. What I had found as a parent was, and still is, being experienced by families.

My recent focus has been trying to make people aware of the learning needs of the full range, and the full range includes those for whom it is more difficult, to those who learn to read much more easily. I really think that full range is being missed in a lot of the training that our teachers are receiving.

So yeah, that's kind of what brings me to today!

Anna Geiger:

So your perspective is, and I would agree with you, that in schools of education that are working on teaching students now according to the science of reading, and then also maybe perhaps other trainings that teachers are receiving who are already in the field, there's been given a lot of attention to children who are struggling, particularly children with dyslexia, which is a very good thing. But you feel that the students who are advanced in reading might not be getting attention.

Nancy Young:

The training does not recognize these students are also in the classroom. The training does not address how to support these students. Consequently, these students, in most cases, are not getting the instruction and materials that are appropriate for their learning based on where they are in skill development, the ease of learning to read and the more rapid pace which they're likely to acquire skills in literacy.

A lot of our focus is on age and grade, and the research on gifted ed for years has advocated we teach based on where they are in their skill development. We're not doing that.

Anna Geiger:

Let's go ahead and talk about advanced in reading (AIR) that I believe is close to the name of your chapter in your book, *Climbing the Ladder of Reading and Writing* with Jan Hasbrook, and you wrote that chapter. What do you mean by advanced in reading?

Nancy Young:

That book, *Climbing the Ladder of Reading and Writing: Meeting the Needs of ALL Students*, very, very intentionally addressed a wide range. In that book, we have a chapter on dyslexia, which Jan wrote. We have a chapter on intellectual disability written by experts in terms of the research on intellectual disability. I wrote the chapter on students who were advanced in reading. I really wanted this book to address the full range.

In the chapter on advanced in reading, and I created this acronym, AIR, to stand for advanced in reading. What I said was the descriptor, AIR, primarily applies to students who begin school already reading. They've learned implicitly without formal instruction and they demonstrate advanced abilities well ahead of what is age-typical.

But I also said that the descriptor, AIR, may also apply to students who begin school already reading, and particularly since COVID, a lot of parents have grabbed the reins and are teaching their children to read. There are certainly many, many materials out there were not available ten years ago that parents can use. I know that colleagues of mine who are researchers have said they've taught to their own children to read.

We have to be aware that some children arriving in school already read because they've had instruction, we don't know whether they would have learned to read more implicitly had they been left on their own, had they not known of this, but certainly they're ahead and they need to be recognized for being ahead.

Then the last group is the group of students who are from backgrounds that have limited early exposure to literacy. They may come to school looking like they're going to struggle, and maybe because they have been in situations where their exposure is limited… They're not where they could have been had they been in a different environment, but they progress really quickly. I'm thinking of students who are from low SES backgrounds, and particularly students who are gifted from low SES backgrounds, who need to be moved along as quickly as we can. They need to be offered in school what they may not be getting outside of school. I wanted to include them.

Those are the three groups, but the main group would be those who arrive at school already reading with no formal instruction.

Anna Geiger:

What do we know about what kind of instruction these kids are typically provided in school?

Nancy Young:

Well right now, when you look at children who are advanced academically across the board, not just looking at reading, they're not given what they need. They're usually given what their peers are given for their age and grade. They're not given what they need for their skill development.

The research in gifted ed has been has been… These findings have been occurring for decades now, showing that these students are being really held back. They're not being provided with the challenge, the rigorous thinking, the opportunity to progress, based on their skill development.

Then when it comes to reading and writing, a lot of these students, again, are being given the same instruction that everybody else is being given. Even though they can already read, they're being given instruction for beginning readers.

Anna Geiger:

So what does research tell us are appropriate ways to challenge these students?

Nancy Young:

What I did in Chapter 13 was I took the research from gifted ed and applied it to reading and writing, so I'll zero in on that.

I wanted people to learn about the general approaches. The general approaches are that you teach based on skill, not age, and you enable the children to be learning in complex, rigorous ways.

Let me take that into reading and writing.

Actually the first one I want to mention is acceleration.

On my *Ladder of Reading and Writing*, the translational framework that I created, I have next to the dark green the recommendations of acceleration and extended learning. I have extended learning first and then acceleration.

Actually since 2023, I tend to refer to acceleration first because the research on acceleration in the world of advanced learners… Some people use the term gifted, some use advanced learners… In terms of gifted ed, there are decades of research on the advantages of acceleration. Acceleration could be an early start to school, it could be grade level acceleration, so a child goes from grade one to grade three, or it could be subject-specific acceleration.

And just so you know, a tangent for a second, I just attended the National Association for Gifted Children annual conference. It was a four-day conference, and I was actually invited to come and present on advanced readers. I was very excited. I went and attended the whole conference and it had amazing, amazing sessions.

One of the sessions that I went to was on starting school early, and it was a wonderful session. Maybe you could interview this lady one day on your podcast because there's a whole rigorous process that they go through in this district to consider students who will be starting school early.

Another session I went to was on acceleration. It was really, really fun for me to go to sessions that were on things that I'm recommending.

So we've got acceleration, and the research actually has found that for most children, the social-emotional consequences of acceleration are not negative. Always, always, it's a very careful process. That's why this presentation was so interesting to see the steps and what they test and what their procedures are. It's a very careful, careful process.

There's an organization called the Acceleration Institute in the United States that offers support for this for families and for educators looking for support for acceleration. It's a very carefully done process, but the research findings are that for most children the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages.

The second recommendation that I wrote about in the book was extended learning. I see this as the option for children for whom acceleration is not a current option, but maybe it will be in the future. Extended learning is a systematically designed program that's more rigorous, that offers advanced content, that's beyond what's going to be appropriate for many children in that classroom. It recognizes that these children need advanced materials and need a form of complexity that is atypical.

Those are the two things, acceleration and extended learning.

Anna Geiger:

Thank you, and I'll be sure to link to that website in the show notes so people can refer to that.

Here's the other side that I often hear, and that would be something I've heard from someone I respect very much. He said that kids are bored different times in the school day, so what's wrong with them being bored for 30 minutes during a phonics lesson? That was one thing.

Also I hear things like, “We have to really focus on the kids who are behind because the consequences for them are greater than for kids who are advanced in reading and not being met where they're at.” Or I hear, “The teacher's time is limited, and we're just going to focus on the kids who are behind. Those kids will be just fine.” That's what I hear a lot. They will be “just fine” if they receive instruction in things they already know.

Could you talk to the negative consequences of not challenging kids who are ready for a challenge?

Nancy Young:

In terms of the consequences first, many, many research studies have shown that for children who are not getting what they need, the increase in boredom and the disengagement in the academic learning

can have lifelong consequences. People sometimes think that only children who would struggle are at risk for dropping out of school, and actually children who are advanced are at risk too. I don't know the current statistic. I meant to find that out when I was at the conference. I knew what it was many years ago, and it was much higher than I had expected.

I encourage going to the research and I also encourage people to go to the National Association for Gifted Children. Also in the book I put recommended resources in chapter 13, and then for those who own the book there's an online hub and there are more resources so they can go and read from the researchers themselves that being bored and disengaged in school when somebody has advanced academic ability is tragic. It's tragic.

You mentioned teachers thinking that they're supposed to focus on children who are struggling. In my reading of the research that's what teachers believe, and I think that's what the system has led teachers to believe. I think even the fact right now that we're not paying attention to the advanced readers is sending a message to teachers that they should be focusing on struggling readers.

I'm not saying we don't want everyone to learn to read, all right? Let's be really clear. We want every child on the full range of the continuum to receive appropriate instruction based on where they are in skill development and other factors.

What I'm recommending is that all teachers receive training that begins with their understanding the continuum of ease and learning to read. This is what my *Ladder of Reading and Writing* translational framework, the infographic, represents, and what Jan and I in the book we edited wanted to present. There is a range. I believe it's only fair to teachers to begin with the understanding that there is this range.

Then we provide training for teachers on what they need to support children based on the ease of learning to read. We give them what they need to support a child with dyslexia, what they need to support a child with an intellectual disability, what they need to support a child who is deaf or hard of hearing, and what they need to support children who learn to read more easily at a faster pace, be it in the light green or the dark green.

On my website, the page that has *The Ladder of Reading and Writing*, if they go down and scroll down to the third paragraph at the beginning of that page, there is a link to Chapter 2 in the book. They can go and they can get the full overview. This is the chapter sample that the publishers provided, which explains the continuum.

I think that to be fair to teachers and to be fair to students, we need to begin by saying we recognize there is a range of ease. Whereas right now, we're not beginning with that. I think that teachers are being led, and I've seen this on social media, that every child should be taught as if they're a struggling reader. I've seen that quote that everything must be explicitly taught; that skilled readers have been explicitly taught everything.

I encourage people to go to Mark Seidenberg's latest writings where he refutes this and says, no, not everybody needs the same thing. Children need to be offered opportunities to learn based on where they are in skill development, because if we don't offer based on where they are, we're delaying them because they're not progressing.

Anna Geiger:

Okay, so that would be one negative consequence that we're delaying them. We're preventing them from getting where they could go. You also talked about a risk of dropping out of school.

I also think about children who aren't challenged in school then don't learn how to work through hard things.

I see this with one of my children who, in some areas, has not been challenged in school. When he has to do something hard like learn a new piano song, he breaks down in tears very quickly because he's not used to having to struggle through something.

What are some other side effects of being routinely bored in school?

Nancy Young:

Well, I want to refer to what you just said as the need for rigor and the opportunity to make mistakes. I'm trying to remember, there's a term that's gone out of my head that describes this. It's very important, for all of our students, that they move forward at the pace that's appropriate so they can be progressing, and at the same time, are experiencing challenges. This is part of learning, it's part of life, dealing with challenges.

If we don't offer appropriate learning, they're not experiencing those challenges. They aren't having the opportunity to work through mistakes and to push themselves, and that is really important.

You see that often in the research on giftedness. If things are too easy, then they don't learn to fail, and then when they do fail, it's really hard to take.

At the recent conference, somebody mentioned that, and they said they need those experiences very early. In early elementary school, not middle school, not high school, they need to have that experience to fail early because they're more receptive to it.

Anna Geiger:

It's true.

Nancy Young:

Yeah, it's harder. I mean, teenagers are teenagers, right?

Then what was the other thing you said, the negative consequences? Well, when you look at wanting every child to fulfill their potential, and then when you look at the research on delayed opportunities for very bright children, for advanced students...

I've got a book recommendation called, *Failing Our Brightest Kids*. It's really tragic that our society in North America is not recognizing the abilities that are going to help our society. We need to move everybody forward. These children who are extremely bright may be the ones coming up with the solutions to some of the biggest problems because of their amazing brains!

Anna Geiger:

Interesting.

So I think the pattern in a lot of schools is to give all the students in a class the grade-level phonics lesson. There are a lot of voices I respect who do promote this. They state the importance of having all the students get exposed, they would say, to grade-level skills. Then afterwards, what you might do is you would meet with the kids who are struggling. Then maybe a couple times a week if you have time, I question how much people have time for this, then you take the children who already know this information and move them further along in the scope and sequence or challenge them with something else. What is your perspective on that approach?

Nancy Young:

Well, you said grade-level skills, and the advanced readers are going to be above grade. So I say, what's your goal? Is your goal to teach reading? If they're already reading, your goal must be something else. Otherwise you're confining them to learning skills that they either already know, or you're actually going too deeply with something they learn implicitly.

A number of people whose work I highly respect have talked about opportunity cost. What's happening is if a child is receiving instruction they don't need, you're taking away from their opportunity to learn what they do need. There's only so much time. If they are doing repetitive things that are on skills that they already know or going more deeply into skills that they know, you're just preventing them from moving forward.

I'm going to use the example of statistical learning. If children are being required to sit through instruction that is teaching them skills they already know in phonics, they're not getting the exposure that they would be getting if they were in programs systematically designed based on their skill level. They might be getting exposed to very simple patterns, but they learned those patterns when they were three or four. They need to be exposed to much more complex patterns if they don't know them already. I think it's very limiting.

What I say is if the assessment screening and assessment shows that everybody is the same, then you could justify giving everybody the same instruction. But if your assessments and screeners, and if they're good assessments and screeners… If they're appropriate, and I'm saying appropriate for advanced readers, not just beginning readers… If you know that not everybody has the same skill level, then how can we justify giving the same instruction? It just is not aligned to the rights of every child to receive appropriate instruction.

Anna Geiger:

I think that last part is good to remember, that every child has the right to receive appropriate instruction. That would be instruction that they need, not instruction that covers something they already know.

I think many teachers would agree that they want to challenge their advanced students, but they don't know how to make that happen.

For example, if we have a child who is ready to learn something more advanced… Let's say I'm teaching kindergarten, and they're already reading. They don't need this phonics lesson. Maybe I'll address spelling with them, but at a different rate than with the rest of my class. But I have to teach my lesson to these other students so then what am I doing with them? What are they doing when I'm not meeting with them? How do I make time for this? How do we even know where to begin if my program doesn't include resources for kids who are advanced?

Nancy Young:

Well, I really encourage collaboration. I really encourage administrators to be aware of the full range on the continuum. In my experience, most people know… It was teachers who actually said to me years ago when I had my very first version of The *Ladder of Reading and Writing*, they said, "This is *my* classroom." They know there's the range. I feel like some of the leaders in the field have not recognized what teachers know.

We need to collaborate. We need administrators to support teachers in collaborating with each other to provide what I describe as across-grade grouping. Again, this is strongly supported in the giftedness research as a way of differentiating. If you're not going to go through an acceleration process in a different way, then you're going to do across-grade grouping.

What you can do then is you can group your more advanced readers with other advanced readers, and then you group your children who need the beginning reading support with others who require the beginning reading support.

The interesting thing is, in my experience supporting schools in implementing this, it makes the teacher's job so much easier. They can focus on children who require particular skills rather than trying to focus on everybody. Again, teachers know the full range. It's hard to be teaching in a classroom and know that you've got some who are way ahead and way behind. This offers teachers the opportunity to be more successful, as well as providing appropriate programming for children.

I think that the other thing that's really been on my mind recently is the move to scripted programming. Some teachers seem to really like this and some teachers seem to really hate it.

I actually have been thinking that if you have across-grade grouping, you have much more flexibility to say, "Well, maybe for our children who are at the beginning stages or perhaps need more support, we're going to adhere more to a script. Whereas for our advanced learners, if they are in a much more advanced group, there's going to be more of a guided inquiry process, studying morphology."

I think that we can offer teachers so much more. We're expecting teachers to be providing things that I think a lot of them know. When I talk to them, they say, "Yeah."

In fact, right now at the conference, I was hearing from teachers in gifted programming. It's very interesting, Anna, because I heard teachers mention things in sessions and then I went up to talk to them afterwards, and they're really feeling pigeonholed by the state adoption of certain curricula.

I talked to a lady who is a gifted and talented coordinator for numerous programs. She said they have been forced to get rid of the programs they were using that were successful, and they are being required to adopt state mandated programs and implement them with "fidelity".

I think that we're actually making the teachers' jobs harder in expecting this "whole class everybody getting the same thing" because it just doesn't align to the way children learn, and I don't think it really fits why many teachers went into teaching to be successful with children.

With across-grade grouping, the highest group can have much more freedom. You can imagine all sorts of possibilities when you really think outside the box, and we must be providing the flexibility to bring in supplementary materials.

I understand that some people say we need to have a core program, but to restrict teachers to that core program with no other materials, I just don't think it aligns with the evidence. There's a lot to be improved.

Right now I feel like there's such *certainty* being expressed, and I'm going, "Whoa! I don't think so!"

Anna Geiger:

I'm going to kind of summarize what we talked about and, at the end, if there's anything else you want to add, you can let me know.

We talked about advanced in reading, kids who much of the time come to school already reading or maybe they come to school with a background that would make it perhaps hard to read and yet they

surprise us and learn to read very quickly. These are children who learn to read much faster than their peers.

We talked about different ways to reach children who are advanced in reading. One of them is acceleration where they skip a grade or two, and you said that research tells us that the idea that children who skip a grade or more will be damaged socially or emotionally is actually a myth, and that most students do not suffer negative consequences from that, but we would make those decisions thoughtfully.

Then you referred to extended learning where kids could be taught something that's further along, perhaps even in a higher grade, but we're not teaching them what we're teaching everybody else that's on grade level.

You talked about the importance of academic acceleration because if students don't receive that, of course they'll be bored in school. Some people would say, "Well, that's not a big deal," but there are consequences of that. Things like not learning to solve difficult problems because they haven't been faced with them. Things like losing interest in school, some kids even drop out. But also the opportunity cost of these kids are not getting what they need to accelerate. Instead, we're basically holding them back.

Then you talked about a way that a classroom teacher could support students who are advanced in reading is to not think that they're in this alone. They should talk to their administrator about the importance of challenging the student. They should talk to other staff about how they might work together to do that. That could include doing kind of a Walk to Read model where students are going to different teachers, potentially across classrooms, for the reading time or whatever subject.

Finally, I would say that teachers who are struggling with this and wondering what specifically to do with a particular student could certainly reach out to other teachers in Facebook groups. They could certainly send me an email because I'm always willing to look into that and just get them some ideas. Teachers don't have to feel like they're alone. And yet, we want to make sure that all students get what they need, and that includes our students who are advanced in reading.

Nancy Young:

Can I add a few things to that?

Anna Geiger:

Absolutely!

Nancy Young:

Well, first of all, I hope they will get the new book, *Climbing the Ladder of Reading and Writing*, and read chapter 13, but also chapter 2 and chapter 3. All of those chapters refer specifically to students with advanced needs. I really think that we need to give more teachers support on how to differentiate within any program.

I don't call it Walk to Read. I call it across-grade grouping. The reason is because the research in gifted ed has shown that this is valuable for not just language arts, but for math and other subjects. The reason I want to encourage across-grade grouping is because for a child who's perhaps not as advanced in language arts, they might excel in math, or they might excel in another subject. We want to have flexible grouping opportunities and we want to be looking for our students' strengths. When

something is difficult, we want to be sure to find their strengths. We should be looking for all children's strengths, so I think across grade grouping is the term I prefer to use.

You mentioned the students will be bored. I think that sometimes there's a risk that, and I've heard people say this, that, “Oh they're not bored, they're so engaged!” They may not seem bored yet, but they may be bored later. But the other thing is they may be frustrated later when they realize they didn't get what they need. Boredom won't necessarily be visible, but it may be a consequence.

What may be a consequence as well is frustration with an education system that does not address the needs of all children from the beginning. This is something you hear about in the gifted ed research is students who say, “You know, I never got what I needed.” It may be engaging and fun, but it wasn't what they needed.

Anna Geiger:

I think that's a really good point because what I'll hear sometimes is people will say, “Oh, the kids who are advanced really enjoy the lesson. I keep it fast-paced. It's fun for them.” But the answer might be, that's not the point. I'm glad they're enjoying themselves, but they're not getting what they need.

Nancy Young:

Yes. I want children to enjoy school. Absolutely! And I want things to be fun, but I'm really conscious now of wasted time. It’s good to be really looking at being very, very discerning in what we are doing.

The other thing you'll hear is, “Oh, they love helping other children. They like being a little teacher.”

And I'm thinking, “Oh yeah. That's what I heard when my son was in grade one, and I thought, ‘He's not here to be the teacher.’” Yes, it's fine for children to build their self-esteem through helping others, but they shouldn't have to miss the opportunity to learn themselves because they are a teacher's assistant.

Then one thing we didn't mention was being collaborative with parents. There's a whole chapter on the importance of the connection between parents and school in the book. For parents whose children are advanced, this is again supported by the research that many of them want to be involved, not all, but we need to give them the opportunity to play a role in helping to build the educational opportunities that are beneficial to their child.

When it comes to things like assessing reading, we need to ask the parents if they're reading at home, if they're reading chapter books, and if they're writing stories. That information from the parents is very important. I'm a huge believer in parents being integral and valued members of the team.

Anna Geiger:

Wonderful. Well, we covered a lot today and I'm sure we'll fill the show notes with things that you shared as well as other resources. Thank you so much for taking time to share with us.

Nancy Young:

You're welcome. Thank you for having me!

Anna Geiger:

You can find the show notes for today's episode at reachallreaders.com/episode199. Talk to you next time!

Closing:

That's all for this episode of Triple R Teaching. For more educational resources, visit Anna at her home base, reachallreaders.com, and join our teaching community. We look forward to helping you reflect, refine, and recharge on the next episode of Triple R Teaching.