CHAPTER 2

Innovative Hybrid Professional Learning at Redmond Mountain High School

Cynthia H. Brock, Leigh A. Hall, Erin E. Silcox,
and Jeff Makelky

Watch a related video from the authors at this link.

Picture this. Fifteen teachers, the school principal, and two university teacher educators are all sitting in the library of Redmond Mountain High School (RMHS) in Wyoming, participating in a professional learning (PL) session. The five leaders of the PL session are RMHS teachers. Mary,[1] one of two math teachers at the school, has been teaching at RMHS for 21 years; Sylvia, one of two science teachers at the school, has been teaching at RMHS for 2 years; Amanda and Frances, both English teachers, have been teaching at RMHS for 10 years and 1 year, respectively; and Mike, one of two special education teachers, has been teaching at RMHS for 6 years. In this PL session, Mary, Sylvia, Amanda, Frances, and Mike each spent approximately 15 minutes sharing with their fellow teachers how they had been using literacy as a tool in their respective disciplines over the past 4 to 5 months.

Mary, Sylvia, Amanda, Frances, Mike, and their colleagues at RMHS had been participating in a collaborative PL initiative at their school for approximately a year and a half at the time the aforementioned PL session occurred. How did the RMHS collaborative PL initiative get started? What *was* the collaborative initiative? What made the collaborative initiative innovative? We briefly address these questions in the introduction

---

[1]The school's name and all teacher names are pseudonyms.

to this chapter, and we devote most of this chapter to unpacking the different components of the PL initiative. We end the chapter discussing how the PL initiative promoted equitable and sustainable PL among the teachers at RMHS. As well, we share RMHS's current PL plans and work.

How Did the Collaborative PL Initiative Get Started?

The superintendent of the school district where RMHS is situated had worked with Dr. Smith, a colleague from Western University (WU) specializing in adolescent literacy, in his previous position as a principal in a different district. When Dr. Smith was appointed to his position, the superintendent invited him to do a literacy presentation to the teachers at RMHS. Jeff (the fourth author of this chapter and the principal of RMHS) was impressed with Dr. Smith and her presentation; he was also concerned about his students' reading scores on state-level standardized tests. Jeff noticed that whereas RMHS students consistently scored above the state average on standardized assessments in math and science, they consistently scored below the state average in reading. He saw students' reading test scores as a problem to be addressed, and he knew that addressing this problem would require a schoolwide effort. He also believed it would be useful for his school to work with Dr. Smith and her colleagues. So, Jeff called the Literacy Research Center and Clinic (LRCC) at Western University, and the collaboration between RMHS and WU began.

What *Was* the Collaborative PL Initiative?

When Jeff called the LRCC at Western University, we had a collaborative conversation focused on (1) striving to understand what Jeff wanted to accomplish at his school, and (2) considering ways that we might work jointly with Jeff and the teachers and students at his school to achieve their goals. Drawing on the work of Taylor (2011), our first PL activity with RMHS—as in all schools with whom we do PL work—involved engaging in a schoolwide needs assessment. A schoolwide needs assessment helps us to understand what key stakeholders at the school (e.g., teachers, students, administrators, and specialists) see as important areas for instructional improvement, the extent to which different stakeholders are willing to engage in the work, and the nature of the school leadership structure that might support such work.

    After engaging in this assessment, we worked with Jeff and the leadership team at RMHS to create an initial PL plan that would be flexible

and adaptive to the needs of the teachers and students at RMHS. Key components of the co-developed plan, which are explained in more detail below, included (1) two to three face-to-face PL sessions each year designed around the school leadership team's suggestions for the content and focus of each session, (2) online micro-courses on topics that the teachers deemed important and that could be completed by teachers at their own pace, and (3) monthly check-ins with the RMHS leadership team via Zoom to determine what was working for teachers at the school and to problem-solve about anything that was not working.

What Made the Collaborative PL Initiative Innovative?

Traditional PL approaches are often short-term, hierarchical, one-size-fits-all models of teacher training (Lieberman & Miller, 2014). They are short-term because outside "experts" typically present at a school once or twice; they are hierarchical because the outside "expert" tells the educators at the school what they "need to know" about a topic or issue; and they are one-size-fits-all because the outside "expert" typically shares the same message with different schools in different contexts.

Perhaps not surprisingly, these traditional approaches have been criticized for a host of reasons. First, teachers are viewed as passive recipients of information rather than active constructors of knowledge. Second, often little or no follow-up takes place relative to teachers' actual instruction in their classrooms after the outside "expert" session(s). Third, these traditional approaches to PL rarely result in meaningful teacher or student learning (Lieberman & Miller, 2014).

As a field, we know that successful PL approaches are (1) context-embedded, (2) tailored to teachers' and students' unique instructional needs in specific contexts, and (3) democratic and co-constructed (Brugar & Roberts, 2017; Koellner & Jacobs, 2015). In these more successful PL approaches, collaborative inquiry among educators provides a sense of ownership and sustained, active engagement in PL focused on teachers' instructional needs to support student learning (Risko & Vogt, 2016; Timperly et al., 2020).

We included the following features of our collaborative work with RMHS to strive to make the work innovative. First, our work with RMHS was co-designed with the teachers and administrators and tailored to their specific needs. Second, Leigh (the second author of this chapter) developed online micro-courses for the teachers and administrators at RMHS to address the content areas on which they wanted to focus. Third, the professors at WU provided face-to-face PL sessions several times across

the year designed specifically around the content areas on which the teachers wanted to focus. Fourth, Cindy (the first author of this chapter) met with the RMHS leadership team each month to discuss teachers' successes and challenges regarding the implementation of instructional ideas about which they were learning and striving to implement in their classrooms. Finally, across time, the RMHS teachers themselves became the PL presenters, sharing with their colleagues their successes and challenges as they implemented instructional ideas.

Now, having briefly introduced our collaborative PL initiative, we delve more deeply into each component of the work. In doing so, we paint a more detailed picture of the nature of our collaborative work.

The Major Components of Our Collaborative Work at RMHS

The Literacy Needs Assessment

Because we knew from the onset that we wanted to tailor our collaborative PL work to RMHS's specific needs (Brugar & Roberts, 2017), we worked with RMHS teachers, students, and administrators to ascertain what they were currently doing with respect to informational text reading and writing. In short, we conducted a needs assessment, which included the following mutually agreed-upon components: visits to teachers' classrooms, selected interviews, teacher surveys, and student surveys.

Classroom Observations

The teachers at RMHS welcomed us into their classrooms, and Leigh and Cindy spent an entire day visiting the different classes across the school. Because we knew that RMHS educators and administrators wanted to improve their students' informational text reading and writing, we focused our observations on (1) whether teachers engaged with informational texts in their respective classes, and (2) if they did, the ways they did so.

Whereas we observed some examples of engagement with informational texts (e.g., one English teacher was asking her students to read about Malcolm X and consider different cultural lenses with which different readers might interpret the text), we did not see many instances of teachers engaging with informational text reading or writing across our day of observations. We did, however, learn about a unique reading instructional practice at RMHS: The school had a schoolwide reading program, which we learned more about in our interview with Jeff and describe below.

Selected Interviews

After visiting most classrooms across the school, we then spoke with Jeff, as well as the district language arts specialist[2] who worked at RMHS. In our discussion with Jeff, we (1) asked him to share his central goal(s) for our collaborative work and (2) posed questions and offered suggestions regarding our initial interpretations of our visits to RMHS teachers' classrooms.

With respect to the central goal for our collaborative work, Jeff stated, "Well, it's pretty basic; we just want to improve our overall reading." Jeff explained that his students scored lowest on the state standardized test on informational reading.[3] He reasoned that if his students were learning what they needed to know about informational reading, their test scores should be higher.

Regarding our questions and observations from our classroom visits, we mentioned that we did see some engagement with informational text reading and writing across the day, but not much. We suggested to Jeff that a schoolwide focus on disciplinary literacy could strengthen students' learning about, and engagement with, informational texts.

In our discussion, we asked Jeff to tell us more about the schoolwide reading initiative we had observed. Jeff mentioned that the schoolwide reading initiative had been part of the school culture for quite some time. In fact, it was started before Jeff's tenure at RMHS. He explained that the school's goal with the schoolwide reading initiative was to foster "the excitement, enthusiasm, and enjoyment of reading." Because students were divided across all teachers at the school for this reading initiative, groups were small (typically 12 to 14 students per group), and students usually stayed with the same teacher for their 4 years in high school. As we concluded our discussion of the schoolwide reading initiative, Jeff stated: "I'm open for suggestions or whatever you think we should do to maximize that period, to better use it."

Teacher and Student Surveys

Jeff was clearly interested in maximizing the use of the schoolwide reading initiative to promote student learning about informational text reading

---

[2]The district language arts specialist shared wonderful ideas for how we might work with content-area teachers to foster more meaningful engagement with informational texts. Due to space constraints, we do not focus on our conversation with her in this chapter.

[3]We note here that RMHS scores for information text reading were just slightly below the state average, but Jeff, and the teachers at his school felt that they could do better.

and writing. Thus, we created surveys about this reading initiative that we asked teachers and students to complete. We asked teachers to tell us how they engaged in this schoolwide reading initiative, what they saw as the goals of this reading time, what they were doing with their students during this time, what was working with this reading time, what possible suggestions they had for revisiting the use of this reading time, and so on.

Overwhelmingly, the teachers wanted to keep the schoolwide reading time focused on reading for enjoyment and striving to get students interested in, and engaged with, reading. We did learn, however, that teachers used a wide variety of different practices during this time including, but not limited to (1) students reading a chapter of a book at a time and then discussing the chapter with the group, (2) popcorn/round-robin reading, (3) teacher read-alouds, (4) reading and journal writing, and the like.

Most of the students at the high school (i.e., 143) filled out the student surveys about the schoolwide reading program. When asked to describe what occurred in classes during the schoolwide reading sessions, student responses resembled faculty responses. However, because the students' experiences varied based on the group they were assigned to, we got a sense of the frequency of different literacy-related practices in classrooms. For example, overwhelmingly students said that most of their time was spent engaging in silent reading and discussing what they read. The next most prevalent type of reading was round-robin or popcorn reading. Students also reported teacher read-alouds, some writing in response to reading, and some vocabulary work. However, these three practices were not as common across the classrooms.

When asked about the goals for schoolwide reading, overwhelmingly students responded that central goals included reading more, getting better at reading, reading for pleasure, and finishing entire books. A limited number of students also mentioned raising standardized test scores, engaging in skills-building (e.g., vocabulary and comprehension), and having parties after finishing entire books or 600+ minutes of reading. Thus, we noted that students' goals and teachers' goals for schoolwide reading overlapped considerably; most people in both groups saw reading books for enjoyment and pleasure to be central goals for schoolwide reading time.

Needs Assessment Summary Comments

Taken together, our analysis across the components of the needs assessment revealed two general areas where we could begin to work to improve students' informational text reading and writing: the way teachers engaged with students during schoolwide reading time, and the way teachers used literacy tools (i.e., reading, writing, and discussion) during instruction

in their content areas. We knew that teachers would need to learn more about possible ways to adjust their literacy-related instruction in these two contexts. It is to this issue that we now turn.

Online Micro-Courses

Having conducted our needs assessment, we collaborated with Jeff to create a plan that could support the staff's PL goals. We agreed that teachers would benefit from a sustained approach over the course of a school year and beyond. Teachers needed regular opportunities to learn, apply, and receive feedback on a variety of instructional approaches that could support their students' literacy development.

We immediately ran into a practical issue. The distance between our university and RMHS limited how often we could be physically present at RMHS. However, we recognized that PL did not have to happen entirely face-to-face. Leigh proposed that we use this situation as an opportunity to try a different approach to PL. Rather than only come to RMHS for two or three times, we could design an online experience for teachers that would give them access to content when they needed it and allow for ongoing support from university collaborators. Our in-person work together could then concentrate on where teachers needed additional learning and support.

Leigh got straight to work on creating an approach for PL at a distance. While she oversaw the creation of the content and the approaches for online mentoring, Cindy worked with the leadership team on understanding their needs, creating goals, and planning our in-person visits.

In designing the courses, the team agreed that all teachers should take a course that would help them understand the concept of disciplinary literacy. This course was foundational to them in achieving their overarching PL goals as a school, and we agreed it was important for everyone to have this shared knowledge. From there, teachers would be free to pick and choose from a menu of options that included topics on vocabulary, comprehension, and writing instruction.

Since an important component of our process was giving teachers access to information about high-quality, research-supported literacy instruction, Leigh designed the courses to be asynchronous and on-demand. This allowed teachers to access them when it served them best and they were ready to learn the information. There were no official start or end dates for the courses, allowing teachers to (1) begin when it was convenient for them, (2) work at their own pace, and (3) return to any of the content as needed.

It is important to note that Jeff, the school principal, took micro-courses along with the teachers at his school. As an instructional leader at his school, Jeff modeled the importance of continuing to engage in

his own PL around literacy (Robinson et al., 2008). Because everyone at RMHS was taking micro-courses and striving to apply what they were learning in their instruction, the school was developing a common language and common practices built around literacy instruction. The common language and practices being co-developed at RMHS provided a platform for meaningful discussions about teaching and student learning when Jeff visited classrooms to observe instruction.

Leigh worked to identify current and former teachers who specialized in literacy education and could create a range of content. Over the course of the year, these creators were able to develop 43 courses. All courses were housed on Thinkific, a platform that allows for the creation and sharing of online courses. Fifty-four percent of the courses ($n = 23$) took 5 hours for teachers to complete, and 46% ($n = 20$) took 15 hours for teachers to complete.

Each course followed the same format. Teachers were first given an overview of the course and the objectives it covered. They then completed a pretest to assess their understanding of the course objectives. Once the pretest was completed, teachers gained access to the course content and were able to progress through the remainder of the course.

The course content was largely video-based and divided up into chapters. Each chapter focused on teaching one objective. At the end of each chapter, there was a challenge where teachers demonstrated their knowledge of what they had learned in that section by either (1) explaining their understanding of the concepts presented in the course, or (2) applying concepts to their instruction and discussing what happened. Completing challenges was optional, and teachers could decide if they wanted to complete all, some, or none within a course. Teachers completed a posttest at the end of each course so that we could measure their learning. After they completed the posttest, they received a certificate.

In addition to having unlimited access to content, teachers also had access to a private site where they could share and discuss their work. They were able to ask for help from us or their colleagues at any time. This approach allowed us to better understand teachers' successes and struggles and shaped our thoughts on planning their in-person experiences.

Monthly Planning Meetings

To have a viable collaboration that would make a difference with respect to teacher and student learning, we knew that we would need ongoing collaboration. Jeff already had a leadership team established at his school. Consequently, we did not need to create a leadership team specifically for this collaborative PL endeavor. RMHS leadership team members included Jeff and teacher representatives from across different subject areas.

As a group, we decided that we would (1) co-create specific goals, which are described below, (2) seek input from the faculty on the goals before finalizing them, (3) ask leadership team members to check in with colleagues prior to our monthly meetings to see how teachers were progressing on completing micro-courses and practicing the skills and strategies learned from the micro-courses with the students in their own classes, (4) problem-solve together whenever teachers raised concerns, questions, or issues with the PL work in which we were all engaging, and (5) collaboratively make decisions about the focus for face-to-face PL sessions that were led by university colleagues toward the beginning of the PL process.[4] Members of our monthly planning group also decided to revisit the nature of the work we were doing together to make sure that the tasks in which we were engaging were working to foster teacher and student learning at RMHS.

We co-created a two-pronged approach to our collaborative work about reading and writing informational text at RMHS. The first prong focused on the existing schoolwide reading program and included the following two goals:

- All students engage in meaningful reading and discuss what they read.
- All students read a variety of fiction and nonfiction genres throughout the school year.

The second prong (i.e., a disciplinary literacy content goal) focused on ways that each teacher could use literacy tools such as reading, writing, talking, and viewing in their content-area instruction. Our goal for the second prong was stated as follows: Teachers will implement disciplinary literacy practices within their core subjects.

Sample Face-to-Face PL Session

We conducted two to three face-to-face PL sessions with RMHS each of the years we worked together. We share one sample face-to-face PL session in detail here to illustrate (1) how we made decisions about the conceptual focus for PL sessions and (2) the way PL sessions led by university collaborators were typically conducted with RMHS colleagues.

As noted, one of the many topics addressed at monthly leadership team meetings included discussions of plans for face-to-face PL sessions at RMHS. Recall, too, that one micro-course that folks at RMHS could

---

[4]As our introductory vignette illustrated, however, the RMHS teachers themselves led face-to-face PL sessions as our collaborative work progressed.

choose focused on vocabulary. Several teachers at RMHS had taken the vocabulary micro-course, and they wanted additional work on vocabulary. Also, some teachers at RMHS were concerned about their students' SAT scores. When this information was brought to one of the monthly leadership team meetings, the leadership team decided that an upcoming face-to-face PL session should focus on vocabulary. While discussing the potential vocabulary focus for the PL session, one of the teachers mentioned Beck's work on tiered vocabulary instruction (Beck et al., 2013). Thus, the leadership team chose Beck et al.'s (2013) vocabulary work—especially choosing and teaching Tier Two vocabulary words—as a PL focus. See Beck et al. (2013) for a discussion of Tier Two vocabulary words.

Whereas Cindy, Leigh, and Erin (the first, second, and third authors of this chapter, respectively) were originally scheduled to co-lead this PL session, road closures due to inclement weather prohibited Leigh and Cindy from making the 5-hour drive to RMHS. Erin lived only an hour from RMHS, and because the roads were not closed between her home and RMHS, she drove to RMHS to lead the PL session on her own. Erin had developed the PL session after talking with Leigh and Cindy about the focus the RMHS teachers wanted for their PL work. We briefly outline key aspects of Erin's PL session to illustrate how we strove to co-create meaningful face-to-face sessions geared to the specific needs of RMHS teachers.

Introducing the PL Vocabulary Session

First, prior to the day of the PL session, Erin had asked the teachers to bring texts relative to their unique disciplines to the session. Erin wanted the teachers to draw on materials that they normally use to choose Tier Two words on which to focus for their instruction. Second, Erin's interactive presentation included an infographic with a URL. The URL was chock-full of practical resources for identifying and teaching Tier Two words that the teachers could take back to their classrooms to use immediately after the PL session. Erin's objectives for the PL session were written as follows: By the end of this session, you will be able to (1) define Tier Two vocabulary, (2) choose Tier Two words to teach, and (3) incorporate Tier Two words into your instruction.

Engaging in the PL Vocabulary Session

Rather than just telling the teachers about Tier One, Two, and Three words, after defining the different tiers of words, Erin asked the teachers to engage with her and with one another as they explored and debated

the differences between Tier One, Two, and Three words. See Beck et al. (2013) for a discussion of Tier One, Tier Two, and Tier Three vocabulary words. As the teachers identified which tiers different words belonged to, Erin asked them to draw on the definitions and examples she had provided in the infographic to justify their assertions. Once teachers had experienced identifying Tier Two words, Erin provided instruction on how to choose Tier Two words for weekly instruction. Then, she showed video clips of teachers engaged in effective teaching of Tier Two words, and she shared key practices for effective vocabulary instruction.

Finishing the PL Vocabulary Session

In the final portion of the PL session, Erin asked the teachers to use the infographic to guide them in the process of choosing Tier Two words for their respective subject areas. She also asked the teachers to begin planning how they would teach these words to their students. In addition to discussing ways to implement Tier Two vocabulary instruction in their own classrooms, teachers began to discuss how they could choose Tier Two words to feature schoolwide so that the teachers across school subjects were all reinforcing key Tier Two words across each week. According to Jeff, choosing and teaching Tier Two words schoolwide is a practice that continues today at RMHS.

The PL Vocabulary Session: Concluding Comments

When we debriefed about this PL session after Erin implemented it, we identified several features that made it successful overall. First, most of the teachers were internally motivated because they had chosen the focus for the session; in short, the session was specifically designed to address the needs of the teachers at RMHS. Second, the session was highly interactive. Erin did not talk *at* the teachers; rather, she designed a series of experiences in which teachers engaged to explore the underlying concepts pertaining to choosing and teaching Tier Two vocabulary. Finally, much like the teachers at this school had adopted a whole-school reading approach, the RMHS teachers decided to implement a whole-school approach to Tier Two vocabulary word instruction.

   We think it is important to point out that not everything went perfectly with this PL session, just as not everything went smoothly in our overall collaborative PL work across time. For example, with respect to this PL session, some teachers expressed concern about having sufficient time to teach Tier Two words in their disciplines given the difficulty of finding time to teach all their academic content. Some teachers also expressed concern about knowing enough to effectively teach Tier Two

words in their classrooms since the vocabulary instructional strategies introduced in this session were new to some teachers.

Conclusion: Promoting Equitable and Sustainable Change at RMHS

The collaborative, innovative hybrid PL approach that we co-developed at RMHS included the following components: a needs assessment designed to ascertain current informational text instructional practices; online micro-courses tailored to the instructional needs of the teachers at RMHS; monthly planning meetings between the leadership team at RMHS and the WU; two to three face-to-face PL sessions each year; and a culminating PL session whereby the teachers at RMHS shared their learning and experiences with one another. With respect to this last item, we come full circle to the beginning of this chapter whereby we presented a brief vignette of five teachers who led one of the culminating PL sessions at RMHS. Toward the end of our collaboration, teachers shared with colleagues many literacy-related instructional approaches they had learned about and were implementing in their respective classes.

Overall, we judge our collaborative PL work to have been effective for several reasons. Two practices at RMHS were already in place that contributed to our successful school–university partnership. First, the teachers and administrators at RMHS had been engaging in PL communities (PLCs) since 2014. Thus, teachers and administrators had already spent time thinking and working together to foster positive change to promote student learning in their school.

Second, as an experienced and successful high school principal, Jeff[5] knew that he wanted to continue to foster *collective efficacy* at RHMS (i.e., the shared belief that a school's staff can have a positive impact on student learning; Goddard et al., 2004). One of Jeff's goals as an instructional leader was to ascertain common interests and common ground on which teachers could focus to promote student learning (Robinson et al., 2008). Hence, Jeff played a crucial role in (1) narrowing down our PL focus to working on schoolwide reading instruction and disciplinary literacy instruction within content area classrooms, and (2) leading the focused ongoing work and reflection across the years of our school–university collaboration.

With respect to the role WU colleagues played in the school–university collaboration, as university colleagues, we had already worked extensively with different schools and districts in our state. In all of our PL work, we seek to (1) understand current literacy-related practices at schools by implementing literacy needs assessments, (2) draw on

---

[5] Jeff was named the Wyoming State Principal of the Year in 2020.

research-based literacy practices as a foundation for collaborating with the teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators at each school to tailor PL work to the specific needs and interests of each school with whom we work, and (3) collaboratively work with schools to put into place iterative structures and systems whereby school personnel engage in an ongoing process of inquiry and knowledge building (Timperley et al., 2020).

In short, both the school and university partners had established certain practices and systems prior to our collaborative work that contributed to the success of our collaboration. However, we also worked together across an extended period of time to assess the specific needs of RMHS and co-develop and co-implement a PL plan tailored to those needs. Our collaborative plan included an ongoing system of checks-and-balances. Each month when we met, we problem-solved what was working and what was not. Then, we adjusted our work together to address concerns along the way.

We draw on two of many possible examples of evidence to support our assertion that we co-constructed an effective school–university PL partnership. After Erin's face-to-face PL session at RMHS, Jeff provided schoolwide PL time for the entire staff to complete the micro-courses on vocabulary instruction. (Recall that only a few micro-courses were completed by the entire staff. Then, staff members had options for additional micro-courses they wished to complete.) Next, the RMHS leadership brainstormed ways to continue to work on vocabulary on a schoolwide basis. The school decided to continue to work together to support one another in effectively choosing and teaching Tier Two vocabulary words. Moreover, the school chooses three new Tier Two words each week as a whole-school focus. (This activity is in addition to Tier Two vocabulary work that individual teachers perform in their classrooms.) These schoolwide focus words are shared during morning announcements; anyone walking into Jeff's school will see these words displayed on a reader-board in the front entrance to the school. In addition, Tier Two words from across the year are displayed near the front entrance of the school (see Figure 2.1). Finally, the leadership team encouraged teachers to continue choosing and teaching Tier Two words as well as identify crucial Tier Three words for their respective disciplines to teach.

Across time, Jeff and the teachers at RMHS have seen a rise in ACT scores with respect to informational text reading. We suggest that test scores are improving because of high-quality instruction at RMHS. Thus, test scores are the result of high-quality instruction rather than the central goal for Jeff's school (Raphael et al., 2014). As we have long known, there are no quick fixes for raising standardized test scores (Allington & Walmsley, 1995); rather, higher standardized test scores are a result of sustained high-quality instruction.

FIGURE 2.1. Tier Two words near the front entrance at RMHS.

Final Thoughts

The PL collaboration between RMHS and the LRCC created accessible opportunities for sustainable PL for the following reasons. The RMHS principal and his school leadership team drove the PL initiative. Members of the university and the RMHS leadership team co-developed a cohesive schoolwide plan to improve students' informational text reading. The online micro-courses developed for RMHS were geared toward the needs of the teachers at RMHS, and teachers exercised choice in micro-course selection. Finally, across time, the teachers and administrators at RMHS developed a self-sustaining culture of learning from, and with, one another that extended beyond the life of the school–university PL collaboration.

REFERENCES

Allington, R., & Walmsley, S. (1995). *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools.* Teachers College Press.

Beck, I., McKeown, M., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Brugar, K., & Roberts, K. (2017). Seeing is believing: Promoting visual literacy in elementary social studies. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(3), 262–279.

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., & Hoy, A. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher, 33*(3), 3–13.

Koellner, K., & Jacobs, J. (2015). Distinguishing models of professional development: The case of an adaptive model's impact on teachers' knowledge, instruction, and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(1), 51–67.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2014). Teachers as professionals: Evolving definitions of staff development. In L. Martin, S. Kragler, D. Quatroche, & K. Bauserman (Eds.), *Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices PreK–12* (pp. 3–21). Guilford Press.

Raphael, T., Vasquez, J., Fortune, A. J., Gavelek, J. R., & Au, K. (2014). Sociocultural approaches to professional development. In L. Martin, S. Kragler, D. Quatroche, & K. Bauserman (Eds.), *Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices, PreK–12* (pp. 145–173). Guilford Press

Risko, V., & Vogt, M. (2016). *Professional learning in action: An inquiry approach for teachers of literacy.* Teachers College Press.

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership type. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674.

Taylor, B. M. (2011). *Catching schools: An action guide to schoolwide reading improvement.* Heinemann.

Timperley, H., Ell, F., Le Fevre, D., & Twyford, K. (2020). *Leading professional learning: Practical strategies for impact in schools.* Victoria, Australia: ACER Press.