How to choose a new reading program - with Dr. Maria Murray

Triple R Teaching Podcast #201

Hello, this is Anna Geiger, author of *Reach All Readers* and creator of the Reach All Readers website. Today I'm interviewing Dr. Maria Murray, president of The Reading League, which is a fantastic organization that seeks to share the word about the science of reading.

Today, Dr. Murray and I talk about how schools can choose a new reading program, and we can do that using the resources made available by The Reading League.

She's going to talk about the Defining Guide, which helps teachers understand what the science of reading actually is. She's also going to talk about their CEGs, or curriculum evaluation guidelines, which you can use to help your school evaluate a program. She also talks about a workbook that's available with that, plus a set of program reviews where The Reading League dives deep into particular programs and highlights things that are good and maybe things that should be improved according to the science of reading. As always, you can find the links to all those items in the show notes.

We'll start right away with Dr. Maria Murray introducing herself. Here we go!

Maria Murray:

Hi everybody! My name's Dr. Maria Murray. I am the CEO and founder of The Reading League.

How did I come to do that? How did I come to form a nonprofit? Well, it was because I spent about 28 years in higher ed doing a lot of work with the reading science interventions in local schools, and seeing it dissipate as soon as we left. It was seeing that the educators who we do the research for didn't have access to the journal articles after they got published. It was seeing teachers who we trained to do this successfully teach all their students, but then be told they have to go use this curriculum now, Curriculum X. It was a very frustrating time.

Then I spent ten years just solely focusing on teaching undergrad and graduate level students and noticing that every school they got hired into was balanced literacy.

It was a very frustrating time, and I felt that I was part of a system that had a lot of answers out there but that the system intentionally, if I'm brave enough to say it, and often unintentionally, kept that knowledge away from whom it had been designed for.

I came very close to leaving education altogether. I had my crazy midlife crisis escape. I didn't buy a red Corvette, but my husband and I spent a year learning how to raise alpacas, and we are not farmers. We had a cat, we live in the suburbs, but this was going to be fun. We'd go out to this farm, and I learned how to do all the genetics and how to show them at the New York State Fair. It was a real thing. We even went to meet with a realtor in another state to buy a farm and do this.

Thankfully, I came back from that *exact* day. Talk about divine intervention or whatever you want to call it, but that same exact day that I came back was the day my brain said, "Wait, I know a lot of people who get it."

So we formed a little league, just this grassroots kitchen table thing, and we went around to our local schools here in central New York. Within two plus years we had over forty-two hundred educators come to our live events in cafeterias with metal chairs.

We would bring people in. We met this person named Pam Kastner, and she came and talked to us in a cafeteria at a school on a winter night. They came on their own, and they were turning their systems around.

We have always prioritized educator knowledge above and beyond everything. That is our mission as a nonprofit to provide educators out there with what they have, for far too long, been kept away from. Where there was once unwillingness to provide it, we are throwing it at people.

Thanks for asking. That's what we do.

Anna Geiger:

Well, I know The Reading League has really played a part in helping schools choose programs that are aligned with the science of reading with your curriculum evaluation tool and reviews that you've been doing.

But before we get into that, let's talk about the general things schools should keep in mind when they're looking for a new reading program.

Maria Murray:

That's a phenomenal question, and I have many things that they can keep in mind.

I would say keeping foremost in mind that The Reading League has intentionally created multiple free resources. just for this really important process. That starts with the Defining Guide. That's available for free. It's downloadable. It's also in Spanish.

We did that because we thought, "Hmm, a lot of schools are adopting curricula and programs to do the science of reading, not even understanding what that term means. As a starting point, in the back of that Defining Guide, we have calls to action for multiple stakeholders.

One of them is, I'm going to just read it, "We call on curriculum publishers to create and promote products that are aligned with the science of reading and to eliminate non-aligned products from their offerings."

OK, back to what I was saying... We have these free resources, including the Defining Guide and what you just mentioned, the curriculum evaluation guidelines, CEG. I'm going to call them CEGs from here on out.

Anna Geiger:

OK.

Maria Murray:

Then we developed a corresponding free workbook that people can download to use as they do the evaluation using our guidelines, the CEGS.

Then we have curriculum Navigation Reports. These are fully fleshed out, professionally conducted reviews using our CEGS on the country's most popular curricula.

The curriculum stuff you're asking me about today is on the Compass point page titled Curriculum Decision Makers. Out there in the world, there are many curriculum reviews available, and many for a long time focused primarily on how well a program meets the standards, Common Core state

standards. A few of them focus on how well a curriculum aligns with the findings from the science of reading.

In all of that though, the most important thing people need that has been missing is a tool to point out what we call red flags, those non-aligned aspects within a program. Valuable instructional time is something nobody has to waste on anything that's going to stall or hinder student progress.

When states started mandating the use of HQIM, high quality instructional materials, we were seeing, as I'm sure many people listening did, adoptions of curricula featuring instructional practices not aligned.

We're like pulling out our hair going, "Why is this on their list of recommendations?" People were inadvertently being guided to invest in some programs that had pretty significant red flags, and no one was paying attention to that or noticing. It was maddening.

Please, everybody keep in mind a perfect curriculum is a fantasy. It does not exist. Even if there was one without any red flags, it's still unlikely that any of them feature every possible practice that the science of reading has found to be important for teaching reading, even the ones that we call bloated curriculum.

The CEGs are really helpful to figure that out too. They don't just say, "Here's what to avoid." They help you see which practices might be missing as you review a program.

For instance, "This is important, but it's not in this program, so what do we do? We're going to need to supplement it."

We feature a little place to note, "How are we going to use our knowledge to supplement that area? Where will we go to find knowledge? How do we build our own knowledge to even do that?"

For instance, if it's weak in writing or in oral language, you're going to need to supplement that and do that really well.

The CEGs are not used just by schools; state education agencies are using them. Higher ed is using them to frame course syllabi. How cool is that? Preservice teachers are learning what a red flag is, wow!

Even more mind-blowing is the fact that the publishers themselves are using them as they refine and update their programs, which is just fantastic.

Another point is educator knowledge *before* a program. I should have said that first.

Above all, how do you do anything like supplementing if you don't have that firm understanding of structured literacy practices and evidence-aligned reading instruction?

I have a really cool analogy, if I may, to make this clear. Say I decide, and this is not true, to take up mountain climbing. I now figure I should have a first aid kit in my backpack. I research, I go on Consumer Reports, I go on New York Times Wirecutter, which I'm obsessed with. I find the finest one, and it's got ice packs and burn ointment and a tourniquet and some splints.

Sure enough, the most worrisome thing happens, and someone I'm with falls. They fracture a leg, and the bone pokes through an artery. We've got a real crisis on our hands.

I've got my first aid kit! All right, I get that tourniquet out and I get my splint out. You can guess what I'm doing here, right? I've got my curriculum!

Thank God two EMTs come along; they're also hiking. They push me away, and I see that they're adjusting the tourniquet. I had it too close to the wound; I actually had it over the knee joint, and what good is that? I didn't have it tight enough. I've got it on top of the clothing. They rip the clothing away and they get it close to the skin.

These little nuanced, knowledge things made that bleeding stop.

For the splint they add some more padding, they check the circulation, they make sure it's secure both above and below the wound and it's not messing with the tourniquet they put on. They're communicating with each other and my family member, and they're explicit and systematic in what they're doing. They know the steps.

So what made that first aid kit work? The contents?

Anna Geiger:

The knowledge.

Maria Murray:

The knowledge. I mean, I don't know how it can be any clearer, and I'm not a good analogy maker.

Anna Geiger:

I think that is a good analogy.

It's also the problem we're facing, which is something else we prepared to talk about, this idea that we have to choose our program now, but the teachers don't have the knowledge. So they're going out and asking for recommendations and just picking something because so and so said this was a good idea.

What's the answer there? When schools are pushing this for whatever reason, that there's funding at that time, or this is what we're doing this year, but no one's really prepared to make the choice.

Maria Murray:

Well, maybe the first thing is to provide some cautionary tales. Please do not choose by going to social media.

Actually, one of the things that led to us developing the Defining Guide was a thing that happened one day. I was on a very large Facebook group, a science of reading book group, and there was literally a... I wish I had printed it, but there was an administrator who said, "Hi, I'm an administrator. I'm literally sitting in a curriculum meeting right now and we're choosing, what you recommend?"

I'm like, "Oh no!" If I had ten hearts, I would have had ten heart attacks.

Even at the time of me seeing it, there had already been 74 or 75 responses.

Anna Geiger:

Of course.

Maria Murray:

I'll tell you that about 60 of those were not okay. Just to think that that's a way to go... That's a no.

You also don't want to go based on what the district one town over uses. We know that a district next door can have the exact same demographics that you have, but the outcomes can be dramatically different.

I would suggest also going to the administrators and school board and saying, "I know we have to do this now, but is there any way we can make a case for waiting until at least a foundation of knowledge

of the science of reading is built. Can we also have a promise of ongoing investment in knowledge." This is knowledge for everybody - the educators, the classroom teachers, specialists across the tiers, and guess who, the administrators.

Whether or not you get that pause and are allowed to prioritize PD…

PD should, by the way, be delivered by an expert organization. There are a lot of them that just throw up a slide of The Simple View of Reading or Scarborough's Rope, and you think we've been trained on the science of reading.

You can use the CEGs as well because in the back of them there's a really robust 12-page reference section with the actual studies that point to the evidence of a source for all of the red flags and the aligned practices.

Even if people can't access that research, they can email the authors and they always send you a free PDF of theirs. They're allowed to share that. The references can help you build knowledge.

Then of course, once you've narrowed it down to the two or three you're considering, The Reading League has produced those Navigation Reports. You can see if we have published one for the program you're interested in, and read it thoroughly to see if what we found matches what you have.

If there isn't one, you can always reach out to them and suggest they work with us on getting one done.

Do not let them fill one out for you. We put our heads in our hands… You can't blame people, they have limited time. "We sent your CEGs to the publisher and asked them to fill it out for us." Oh, yeah.

Anna Geiger:

Bad idea.

Maria Murray:

We have two new ones that just got released in the last couple of weeks. Really Great Reading is done, and the structured literacy foundational skills component for Into Reading is now reviewed as well.

Anna Geiger:

OK. Oh, interesting. That's what's at my kid's school, so that'll be interesting for me to look at.

Maria Murray:

Oh, good! You can go get it as soon as we're off; you can go check that out.

Anna Geiger:

It's really interesting that you focus on red flags, because I think… I don't know how much this is still happening, but for sure a couple of years ago when programs were saying that they were aligned… From my perspective, and I didn't dig deep deeply into this, but it looked like they were keeping their balanced literacy stuff, but they were shoving in extra things. So they'd have the leveled predictable book patterned books for kindergarten, but they'd also put in some decodable books.

Maria Murray:

Yeah.

Anna Geiger:

Can you speak to the problem with having red flag material inside the program?

Maria Murray:

Well, the problem is just literally… I guess we can come up with another analogy on the spot.

It's like having a really good, healthy meal on your table, but having twinkies on the plate as well. By having that twinkie on the plate, you're using up precious time that could be used by giving more attention to other practices.

A lot of people are just thinking, and I feel like I'm wasting my breath saying it, but they're saying, "Let's just buy a phonics program."

It's a phonics patch, and they're thinking that that's going to solve it. It does not.

There's a lot to consider. Getting rid of the red flag practices is a non-negotiable.

Anna Geiger:

Especially because you're going to have new teachers come into your school using your programs that maybe aren't as knowledgeable about the science of reading. Teachers need to be very wise to know what to choose from a bloated basal or any bloated program. It's got all kinds of things that they shouldn't be using, and the teacher shouldn't have to be confronted with that. They should be confident that their materials are aligned.

Maria Murray:

Absolutely.

Back to what I was saying, we've seen districts with remarkably similar demographics get wildly different outcomes. The curriculum is solid; it's a great curriculum. They've been using it for a few years, but one school continues to hover at around 28% of students reading grade level proficiency after a few years, and another one soars double digits every year and reaches 80% in a few years.

One of them prioritized educator and administrator knowledge and have highly expert coaches. They have everyone on board with the same knowledge going forward. They're all those EMTs that know just what to do.

They've got the systems of support. I mean, school days are noisy, not just in the audible, but in the mess that happens. Kids are wiggly and day-to-day interruptions are wiggly.

A lot of it is in the delivery of the program and the coaching. I mean, look at the state of Mississippi who has come so far. They really are upfront extolling the virtues of coaches making the difference. Let's keep going with our knowledge.

If you do build that knowledge, nobody's going to be fighting to keep the balanced literacy stuff in that suite of options.

Anna Geiger:

I'm glad you brought that up because just the right program is not the end game; it is not going to get us there. This episode is focused on the program because that is a very important piece, but I appreciate you mentioning that.

I told a story before where I went to a presentation Angie Hanlin was giving a couple years ago before I really understood MTSS or the systems. She gave this presentation about how they had flipped their school completely, like they were like at a hundred percent reaching or exceeding benchmarks, but she never mentioned the program. She just kept talking about systems, and I was like, "What are systems?" I really had no idea. I thought, "I just want to know what program they use!"

At the time I didn't understand how that is so important, but it's not everything.

Maria Murray:

She was smart not to say it, and The Reading League *never* recommends a program. I'm proud to say, I don't think in nine plus years that we've existed, have we ever recommended a program. We build the knowledge and we back away.

We have PD partnerships across the country; there are dozens of districts we work with. When it comes time for them to finally adopt or examine their existing one and keep it with supplementing or so on, *they* make the decisions on what to use because now they know what to do and then they own it.

Anna Geiger:

All right, so that's a little disclaimer for this episode, but it is still important to have a solid program, so we'll talk about that now.

We won't list all of them because there are a lot, but what would you say are some key red flags that schools should avoid?

Maria Murray:

Okay, so I'm literally sitting here in a chair with my tattered copy of my CEGS. The CEGS are organized according to the framework of the Scarborough Rope, although we did add assessment and writing composition, handwriting, spelling, and things that are not on the rope because there's a lot that's important.

For example, under word recognition, and under every element I should mention, we have a heading called non-negotiables. For word recognition, there are non-negotiable red flags. If you see these, this is probably a good time to put that program aside and start spending your time looking at another one.

If there's one that has the three-queuing systems taught as strategies for decoding in the early grades, for example. Or guidance to memorize whole words by sight without attending to sound-symbol correspondences. Or they don't provide a scope and sequence that's systematic and opportunities for practice. No kidding. If that's not in there, forget it. Goodbye.

There are non-negotiables that you *do* want in word recognition, and they're pretty much the converse of everything I just said.

Then it goes on to have other red flags, but those aren't the non-negotiable ones. If you see them, this is where you make a note in the workbook that we'll have to do something about this.

As an example, phoneme awareness is not taught as a foundational reading skill. If that's not in the program, you're going to have to add it.

I could go on. Let me just randomly flip to language comprehension. I'm jumping right to the other element, the big one.

A red flag would be opportunities to bridge existing knowledge to new knowledge is not apparent in instruction. Or read aloud opportunities emphasize simple stories or narrative texts, not sufficiently complex stuff. We featured glossaries, if there are any, what are they talking about moments.

That's why we also encourage people to include on their teams a varied group of experts so we can talk about it too.

Anna Geiger:

In the show notes, I'll link to that. I highly, highly recommend teachers get their hands on that. This is not a five-minute thing; this is going to take some time.

Maybe that's something we could talk about really quickly. How much time should schools allow? I often see it where schools say, "We've got to choose in one month. What should we do?"

Maria Murray:

That's a great question. I mean, it probably could be done. I think it could be done if you have the right people at the table and enough time within that month to really sit down with a few programs.

In the front of the CEGS are directions. Please don't skip them. They're not long; they're just a page. We talk about what to assemble for a team, what to have gathered in terms of scopes and sequences, some lessons from the targeted grades, your suite of assessments that you have in your school on hand, and that's it! I think it could be done.

Remember, you also have the Navigation Reports to back you up on particular programs.

Anna Geiger:

I have a question about choosing a program that can be used from K to grade six. Is that important? Some schools want an all-in-one that they can use across the grades, while others are content to choose a foundational skills piece and a knowledge building piece for primary, then they switch over. Do you have any thoughts on that or opinions?

Maria Murray:

Yeah, I have some comments. I'm not going to come down and land on one or the other. People always ask that question as well. It's not necessary or important to choose multiple programs or just one that goes across grades.

The reasons we know that schools choose multiple ones is because they've already made an investment in a program, right? They bought it two years ago. It's not a bad program. They've trained on it. They'd rather keep it as an investment of time and effort and money already, so they choose to supplement and piece things together, but they're going to have the lift of planning ahead, right? How do we make this as efficient as possible? How do we plan the minutes available? How do we prioritize which components from each don't get left out or could get left out? How do we unify the routines and the common language across programs, because they're going to have different ways of describing things and doing things.

But again, what's the answer for these difficulties? Educator knowledge. Every single time.

Having a K-5 or K-6 program will definitely be more manageable and efficient and less expensive over time, and more user friendly. You don't have twice the materials, twice the teacher manuals, twice the trainings, you know?

So you have a phonics program that requires X number of minutes to implement according to the publisher. You have a knowledge building, text-heavy program, and that publisher says you need X minutes to implement it. Maybe you even need a writing program, and that one's another X minutes. Now you're up to like 300 minutes.

How much time do you really have? You only have 120 if you're lucky, right? So you're coming out of the gate really shorthanded, and you have to cut things out and you're going to have red flag problems.

But again, if you have teacher knowledge, you can do that. Having that K-5 program ensures that the routines and common language stay consistent, but that's not without its problems too.

The drawback is usually when it's first adopted, because there's the awkward, wonky initial couple of years where the older grade classroom teachers are like, "Uh-oh! Our students don't have all that yummy stuff that happened leading up to where we are now!"

But that's only a one-time problem as opposed to every single year that kids leaving second grade going into third grade being thrust into a whole new system.

Anna Geiger:

So yeah, there's not really a firm answer on that, but teachers need to be aware that if they're going to be piecing together multiple programs, they have to talk about language and procedures and things, and you don't want kids going from second to third grade being completely thrown for a loop because things are just completely different.

Let's say a school has decided that next year we're having a new reading program, what would be their first step? Would you say it would be going to the CEGs and reading through those? Would that be the first thing to do?

Maria Murray:

First of all, finding the curricula is not a problem. I bet you they have publishers waiting in their parking lots at school in the morning with all the donuts and fancy orange juice, and that's great.

The Curriculum Decision Makers page on the Compass has almost ten completed reports with more on the way. I think we're going to have eight more by May. We currently have almost ten teams, highly trained teams, working.

Anna Geiger:

Wonderful.

Maria Murray:

They're fantastic.

As for team first steps, educators from every grade level and admins have got to be there. You can't be checking in, popping in, working on your master schedule. You might want parents for transparency, and maybe some school board members for funding support.

Use the free workbook so you can record those red flag statements. You can note the location of what page you found something at to go back to prove where something exists or doesn't exist, the language of the evidence, and you can kind of write it down.

Anna Geiger:

In general, first you want to form a team, and your point is that you'd be from all different areas, and you talk about that in the instructions in your CEGs, right? They could get those CEGs that are available, meet with the team to start off, and maybe start collecting programs to evaluate. As you said, they're banging down your door to get them to you, so that's not a problem getting those curriculum samples. You can maybe start with the completed reviews that The Reading League has done on some of the programs that are possibilities.

Would you say that there is value in having those program reps come to your school and talking to you about the program?

Maria Murray:

Yeah, absolutely! I think that's absolutely valuable. I just would not, again, have them fill out the guidelines or CEGs or accept any that they offer you that they have filled in, because there will be bias. Just to be aware of that; I would just be cautious of that.

You're going to actually want to know the reps and form a relationship, because you want to have them coming in and training, and the training has to be phenomenal.

Anna Geiger:

So that's what you should be looking for then, good training that will be coming with the program.

Also if teachers have the right knowledge, they will have the right questions.

Maria Murray:

That's correct. They will know exactly what to ask for. It was a joke around here in central New York when we first started The Reading League that the publishers were like, "Oh, *that's* why they're asking these questions!"

Anna Geiger:

That's funny! That's great.

This is a hard question to answer, but obviously this happens, I see this in Facebook groups where people chime in and they say, "Well, I want this one, but the rest of the school wants this one, and this is what they're going with."

Do you have any thoughts on what to do if maybe they're both good choices, hopefully, but there is a preference for one? And what can teachers do when their top choice was not chosen or even if the one that was chosen unfortunately has lots of red flags, but they're stuck with it?

Maria Murray:

We're going to use a get out of jail on this one too with teacher knowledge, a basis of knowledge.

In The Reading League, when we work with districts, we really encourage them to pause on choosing a curriculum to give them that time. But without teacher knowledge… I just can't stress it enough.

With the guidelines, they're so straightforward that I'm going to say there's rarely, if ever, been a conflict that we've heard of. If a team has knowledge of the English language, the science of reading, and they can interpret the components…

For example, if you're looking for morphine, you know how to look for it and you know what a morpheme is, right? You know how to look for contrastive analysis or a variant vowel if you have an SLP on the team.

The way we structure it when we do the reviews for the Navigation Reports is we have our team, they're teams of three, and they evaluate individually and then come together. But I know that people don't have time for that.

What we have heard is, and this was an "uh-oh…" You know when you invent something, every time you provide a solution to someone, it creates a new problem? This is a funny instance of this.

A school said a couple of times, "There's no perfect program and there's never going to be," echoing what we say all the time, "but we chose this program because three-queuing was the only major red flag."

Anna Geiger:

Oh, no!

Maria Murray:

I thought, "I'm going to go home and go to bed right now and draw the curtains."

Those things can happen on a team, especially if there's someone that has that lingering bias towards balanced literacy, but non-negotiables mean non-negotiables. Misinterpretations like that could and really should lead to disagreement. But what will always get you out as a final decision maker is that solid basis of knowledge.

Where people might argue is in terms of this is a great program, and this is a great program. They'll both agree that they're both great, but they'll want one for whatever reason. They might get into the weeds in terms of our population of children has certain cultural or linguistic needs that the materials might better be suited for. I think that's where I hear most disagreements.

Anna Geiger:

Yeah. Well, you've mentioned many times the importance of teacher knowledge. I interviewed Heidi Beverine-Curry a long time ago, well over a year ago.

Maria Murray:

Oh yeah, she loves you.

Anna Geiger:

She told the wonderful story of the two of you in class together, and how you knew all the answers and she was in her balanced literacy phase.

Maria Murray:

Yeah, well now she does!

Anna Geiger:

She in that episode talked about how The Reading League provides professional development, but could you go through that again? I know that schools are looking for help and the really special thing about The Reading League is you're not pushing a particular program, you're just pushing knowledge so they can do it. Can you talk a little bit about what you what you offer?

Maria Murray:

I love that about us that we get to remain, I guess the term isn't "agnostic," but we get to remain neutral.

We are a nonprofit organization, so we are not driven by a profit, a bottom line, or anything like that. We do have to keep the lights on, no doubt, but we're driven by our mission, and so we get to focus on that.

When we come to do professional development, there are not boxes of materials waiting to be trained. We're not training a program. We are training so any program is understood and delivered at the highest level.

People fill out a form of interest on our website, and then we have a conversation.

We do a mandatory admin intro day because the people in charge have to have buy-in and support. Then we do the teacher intro day, and a prescribed sequence of PD, and a lot of the why, to a point, is a very open and honest evaluation of current practices. Then we provide coaching.

It's been pretty exciting. I love this time of year because you're getting some winter data from the schools and seeing that growth and watching it happen. We're so proud of so many of our districts that have kept their foot on the gas and start moving it up into the intermediate grades to keep those kids going. What a dream. Who'd have thunk?

Anna Geiger:

Do you guys work with schools outside of your vicinity, like nationally? Do you fly out there and provide training?

Maria Murray:

Yes, we've got one in Hawaii that we're working with now, and we're all over the country.

Anna Geiger:

Wonderful. Well, I will link to all those pages in the show notes, so teachers can look into that or admins can look into that if they want to pursue that.

Thank you so much for all you do with The Reading League. I love going to the conferences and love getting my Reading League Journal in the mail. It's so beautiful.

Maria Murray:

Isn't it fun to read?

Anna Geiger:

Yes, I love it.

Maria Murray:

It's a new cover this year, don't get alarmed. And I've got to give a shout out to our colleague, Kari Kurto. She's really in charge of developing and working with the publishers and doing the work of these resources that I get the privilege of sharing with you all today.

Anna Geiger:

Yes. Thanks to you and your whole team for all the work you continue to do. We look forward to seeing what's next from The Reading League.

Maria Murray:

You got it. We'll be here!

Anna Geiger:

You can find the show notes for this episode at reachallreaders.com/episode 201. 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.