Video 6: Reading Fluency

Robert Savage:
A very warm welcome again, colleagues, to this, the sixth of seven professional development videos focused on strand B of the revised Ontario Language Curriculum 2023. This video focuses specifically on fluency in word and passage reading and spelling. The ideas here build squarely on work in all of the preceding 5 videos. This video takes about 30 minutes to complete the content. Following a familiar structure now, there are then reflection points for you to consider after that. Similarly, there are also follow-up videos and material you may find useful to help you understand the research and practice of teaching reading and spelling fluency.

This session will cover 10 key points about teaching reading and spelling fluency:

1. **What is fluency?**
2. **What does the evidence-based research tell us about the role of reading and spelling fluency in literacy that I should I know about as a teacher?**
3. **Does fluency in reading and spelling develop on its own, or do I have to teach it?**
4. **Practicalities – How do I teach reading and spelling fluency using evidence-based research?**
5. **Practicalities - When do I teach reading and spelling fluency?**
6. **Practicalities - To whom and with how much focus on fluency do I teach?**
7. **How do I assess my teaching for fluency has been successful?**
8. **How do I use this teaching to prevent difficulties?**
9. **How does teaching of reading and spelling fluency fit with my teaching of reading for meaning?**
10. **How does teaching reading and spelling fluency fit to my wider curriculum?**

On completion of this sixth session, you should have much of the essential information you need to be able to both plan and deliver a strong evidenced reading and spelling fluency can impact many young people, especially those who otherwise struggle to reach reading and spelling fluency.

1. **What is fluency?**

Fluency has been described as "reading quickly, accurately, and with proper expression" (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). This ability to read fluently is fundamental to reading success. An influential set of theories first set out in broad terms by LaBerge & Samuels, (1974) explain exactly why. LaBerge & Samuels state that 'automaticity' (a form of relatively 'effortless' fluency) in rapid decoding or recognition of words reduces conscious attentional demands needed to process 'word -level' print and phonology. This in turn allows the limited short term attentional capacities all young students bring to reading to be more fully focused on building their comprehension of the text they are reading. We know that reading fluency and reading comprehension are closely linked. Lervag & Lervag, (2020) describe fluency as a 'bridge' between decoding and comprehension – both are intimately involved in fluent reading. They also note the research evidence provides reasons to think that text-level fluency is not just the sum of speed in reading individual words. At least from grade 2 onwards, text reading fluency likely involves fluent interplay between words and syntax in text reading, and is an index of text comprehension. Recent neuroscientific work exploring brain imaging while reading texts (Lee & Stoodley, 2024), confirms that many brain areas involved in print-sound and word recognition as well as brain areas associated with wider language processing and attention and monitoring abilities are all involved in reading fluency tasks.

Dysfluency can be a distinct problem, sometimes even where reading accuracy is achieved. One such context is in 'transparent orthographies' (spelling systems such as German, Italian, Spanish, and Welsh) where the grapheme to phoneme correspondences (GPCs) are highly consistent guides to word pronunciations. It is also quite possible nevertheless to find struggling readers who are dysfluent but have very accurate word reading in opaque spelling systems with inconsistent GPCs, such as English.

2. **What does the evidence-based research tell us about the role of reading and spelling fluency in literacy that I should I know about as a teacher?**

As in previous videos the guidance for teaching here is drawn from, and illuminates, the evidence-based practice that has informed the development of the revised Ontario language curriculum and detailed in the Strand B guidance.

How might we make sense of this complexity described above as a teacher? One way is to think of a **developmental model**. In its first stages in the early grades of elementary school, reading fluency incorporates early accuracy and then automaticity in 'sub lexical' processes *inside* words (especially GPCs), 'lexical' processes (word reading speed), and their early integration in reading words, sentences, and text passages efficiently. Beyond that, a fuller involvement of print knowledge, multiple word meanings, and morphology may more gradually become incorporated over the school years. At the most mature stages of its development, typically in the middle to late grades of elementary school and

beyond, reading is marked by relatively effortless word decoding and reading, and where oral reading of extended text is smooth and accurate and occurs with correct *prosody*. Prosody is the appropriate 'phrasing' and intonation of text read – somewhat poetically described by Huey (1908) as *"the rise and fall of pitch and inflection, the hurrying here and slowing there, what we have called the melody of speech"*. At this point, a reader's attention can be almost fully allocated to text comprehension.

From this view, fluency is firmly not an 'add-on' at the end of learning to read, after accuracy has been achieved, but an ability to be built from its components in the very earliest school grades. As Wolf & Katzir-Cohen (2001) put it "*fluency is influenced by the development of rapid rates of processing in all the components of reading"*. Fluency should be a target even ***during*** early acquisition of even the most foundational processes. For this reason, early reading assessment screeners used in the province of Ontario and elsewhere often involve short, timed assessments of early reading sub-process fluency, tasks such as letter naming fluency.

What might this developmental model look like in my class? First, fluency is indicated by a reading speed of 80-100 words per minute of connected text read by fall of grade 3, (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2017). To achieve this, between K and Grade 2, all the processes we have met in videos 1 through 5 will need to be practiced. I will not recap the logical models of the likely processes in using GPCs PGCs and morphology and vocabulary in reading English in we met in videos 1-5, but all will need to be practiced beyond accuracy towards fluency. (Please revisit these videos as necessary to secure *your fluent knowledge* of them).

For example, once a word is sounded out phonemically (and with the help of Set-for-Variability for irregular words), students should be able to read that word directly subsequently. With highly frequent printed words sounded out should then be read automatically with perhaps only 2 or 3 exposures, as the self-teaching hypothesis suggests. Repeated exposures to the printed form of this word and multiple word meanings that are distinct, along with varied semantic features (multiple meanings of a vocabulary word, and the shared meanings of bases and affixes from morphology) as well as the grammatical function of a word, and spelling, will all contribute to reading fluency. Once students have achieved adult like fluency, print size and spacing optimality effects influence fluency (Grainger, 2020).

3. Does fluency in reading and spelling develop on its own, or do I have to teach it?

What evidence is there that direct instruction by educators to teaching vocabulary aids student reading in elementary schools? One approach is repeated re-reading, an approach that consists of re-reading printed words and their constituents and / or connected text until a satisfactory level of fluency is reached. One meta-analysis (a careful review) of all well-executed studies in this domain (Strickland et al., 2013) synthesized all the available evidence then available from reading fluency interventions focusing on (a) repeated

reading as the primary intervention, (b) repeated reading compared to other reading interventions, (c) repeated reading in combination with other reading interventions, and (d) repeated reading as part of a reading program. They found some 19 controlled studies that compared the sustained intentional teaching of fluency to some students with an alternative teaching approach for other comparable students. This study also included many single case studies, that may provide less generalizable effects, so some caution is needed here. Across these studies, Strickland and colleagues found that fluency instruction was, overall, effective in helping children increase both reading fluency and reading comprehension. These positive effects on fluency were not, however, as strong when students were assessed on novel unpracticed text passages.

The individual studies in the Strickland et al. review used a wide range of methods to teach fluency. While repeated reading was consistently important, it was not the only way to improve reading fluency. A sustained focus on phonic competency was a prerequisite of fluency. One successful approach involved (1) reading story structure questions presented on a cue card, (2) either repeated reading of a text to fluency, or completing four reading trials (3) assisted story structure questioning and answering, and (4) factual and inferential comprehension story questioning. In one study, effects were evident even without repeated readings.

This latter theme has been picked up in a subsequent review by Zimmerman et al (2021) that suggests that *some* non-repetitive techniques of fluency support may have modest impact in students who struggle with reading fluency. Zimmerman et al describe *wide reading interventions*, where students complete just a single reading of multiple texts with some support from an educator who, for example, selects appropriate reading materials, groups or pairs students, and who corrects oral reading errors. Wide reading often involves choral reading, where students read a text aloud in unison, or echo reading, such that a more capable reader models reading of a short text fluently that is then copied by other students. By contrast to wide reading, *independent reading* is defined by students ultimately choosing the materials they read (for example in extensive free voluntary pleasure reading, or other sustained silent reading). Only a small number of studies (eight) were found by Zimmerman's review, making comparisons difficult. Results showed that while modest positive effects were found for all teacher-guided fluency tasks, the weakest effects were in unguided (i.e. unmonitored) reading fluency tasks.

Turning back briefly to repeated re-reading, Lee & Yoon (2017) found some reliable evidence for positive effects of repeated reading in their systematic review of 34 relevant intervention studies with students who experience significant reading difficulties. They also note that the biggest positive effects on learning were associated with students *initially listening to an audiotape or teacher's model of the reading the passage* before repeatedly re-reading the text. This is perhaps further evidence for in the importance of teaching using the echo reading technique we have just met above. The designs of most studies in Lee and Yoon's review often had no comparison groups, so do not allow us to say that repeated

reading caused improvements in fluency, so some caution is needed in interpretation here.

Multicomponent interventions

Evidence from multi-component interventions (e.g., Morris et al., 2012), provides support for the view that while phonics instruction is foundational to word reading and spelling success, the addition of other features is key to larger reading gains and fluency for otherwise struggling readers. Teaching only phonics proved to be least effective over such multicomponent approaches.

One multicomponent approach, the RAVE-O program (Wolf, 2000; Morris et al 2012); focuses both on sight word reading efficiency as well as fast access to semantics (shared meanings of networks of vocabulary words). In RAVE-O students were focused by educators on knowing *as much as possible* about a word including its phonemes, spelling patterns, semantic meanings, syntactic uses, and morphological roots and affixes, and drawing on all this connected knowledge to aid fast word decoding, retrieval, and comprehension. Students were taught a group of core words each week that embody these principles and learn the connections between these linguistic systems that serve a word. There was a focus on depth and flexibility in using word meanings, and fast word recall such that they facilitated both accuracy and fluency in word recognition, oral reading fluency, and the comprehension of connected text. This was paired with a robust phonics program.

In another multi-component approach (PHAST, Lovett et al, 2000), students were taught phonics thoroughly plus four word identification strategies: (1) use of analogy (e.g. from 'card' to 'hard' to 'yard'), (2) attempting variable vowel pronunciations (a form of the 'set-of-variability' strategy we met in video 2, (3) identifying the part of the word that they know, (4) "peeling off" prefixes and suffixes in a multisyllabic word. These latter two pedagogies are morphology strategies very similar to those we met in video 4.

Both multicomponent programs were more demonstrably more successful in improving reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension in a large group of struggling readers than a robust phonics program alone. This pattern was shown most clearly in effects of interventions a year after the interventions had finished, and which included measures of transfer (that is, clear generalization of learning gains to new texts).

Teaching prosody. We noted earlier how even advanced fluency abilities should not be added at the end of word learning but incorporated in pedagogy even in the early elementary years. We noted also that one of the features of the most 'advanced' stage of fluency is use of appropriate prosody. Prosody influences reading at word, phrase and text-levels (Wade Woolley et al., 2022) and is shown in the revised Ontario curriculum Strand B as appropriate intonation in reading and 'parsing' (appropriate segmenting) of a sentence, and appropriate pausing indicated by punctuation (commas, periods etc.), or by context.

Here is one example of an experimental research intervention exploring word level and phrase-level components of fluency (appropriate syllabic stress – the correct assignment of emphasis on one syllable in a polysyllabic word), alongside sentence prosody teaching in very early printed word knowledge development:

Harrison et al. (2018) sought to support 4- to 5-year-old children's explicit understanding of syllabic stress and prosody using 2.5 hrs of intervention in England. Typically developing children were randomly allocated to either A) a prosody training group, B) a phonological awareness training group, or C) a mathematics training comparison (control) group. In the prosody training group students practiced three component skills of prosody - 1) identifying whether the pronunciation of a pictured object was correct, e.g., hearing '***so***fa' (with appropriate speech emphasis on the first syllable of the word), or incorrect, e.g., hearing 'so**fa'** (with inappropriate speech emphasis on the second syllable of the word, 2) intonation (identifying whether a spoken phrase was asking something (i.e., with a rising intonation at sentence-end) or telling something (i.e., no rising intonation at sentence-end), and 3) what they call 'precise timing' (assessed by identifying whether 1 word or 2 was presented (such as in 'football', versus 'foot', 'ball').

Results of assessments taken after this intervention showed that the students who received the 3-component prosody training improved most compared to the other intervention groups in their prosodic competence and also outperformed the mathematics-taught control group in their word reading abilities. The degree of improvement (the 'effect size') was substantial. Such results need to be replicated at scale but provide early evidence that the foundations of even quite advanced fluency abilities such as prosody can be built through principled teaching in the earliest grades of schools.

In sum across all this research, it is clear that the teacher plays a central role as both direct instructor and constructor of effective learning contexts to support reading fluency. Fluency does not just happen 'on its own'.

4. Practicalities – How do I teach reading and spelling fluency using evidence-based research?

The school-based intervention research literature provides some guidance for *direct instruction* in fluency. A strongly evidenced fluency strategy is *repeated reading* of a text or parts thereof. The research evidence suggests that both the repeated reading of text passages and of individual words is effective. In many successful approaches, practice has also been given in fluent reading of GPCs and other sub-word units, words, phrases and whole passages (e.g., Torgesen et al., 2001). In all cases encouragement is given to reading to meet a planned or expected fluency target (e.g. an improved words per minute read). Effects of focusing on word reading fluency are then shown up in novel text reading accuracy *if* those specific practiced words are strongly represented. Here 'tutors' and peers acting as tutors as well as teachers leading, have been used to encourage reading

fluency, and evidence suggests well-trained and supported peer tutors can be highly effective. Often, tutor or teacher modeling of techniques and then giving fluency feedback have been effective. Sharing graphs of improvements has sometimes been used to set and measure fluency goals developed with students.

Much research has shown big differences in the amount of daily word reading students undertake, as we have noted before. Cunningham & Stanovich, (1998), for example, estimated that a capable grade 5 student reads as many words in 2 days as a struggling reader in Grade 5 might do in a year. These patterns of inequity emerge in the earlier school years. Once behind, it is very hard for struggling readers to catch up as the number of new and unfamiliar words is ever-increasing up to and through grade 3. Concerted and carefully planned efforts to interrupt and prevent this meaningful word exposure gap that leads to dysfluency are both needed and evidenced. Wide reading is likely to be one of these approaches – an approach that also builds fluency if carefully monitored by a teacher rather than set as an unmonitored task. Here, some interest-based reading in student choices between texts set, for example, based on hobbies and interests such as sports, cooking or lived experiences might usefully be explored, and can be highly motivating.

As ever, 'one size for all' will not fit students as they vary widely in experience and knowledge of foundational phonology, GPCs, PGCs, decoding, and wider language resources of vocabulary, morphology, and text structures which all ultimately underpin reading fluency. Nearly all students will need at least some highly differentiated support throughout elementary school grades to integrate these effectively, and some will need early and sustained attention here to prevent later dysfluency.

All these ideas we have considered here are all represented in expectations in the Strand B table B2.8 B2.5 and B2.3 "Reading Fluency: Accuracy, Rate and Prosody" found on the Ontario Curriculum and Resources website. [ON SCREEN: table: "Reading Fluency: Accuracy, Rate, and Prosody" appears on screen. It can be accessed through the Ontario Curriculum and Resources website]

5. **Practicalities - When do I teach reading and spelling fluency?**

As we have noted in theory and evidence above, effective automated reading and spelling fluency teaching likely starts with the start of literacy instruction. Later fluency in text reading builds on increasingly 'effortless' fluency in decoding and word recognition that draws equally from strong phonological and semantic abilities. Sustained work on both these foundations suitably differentiated can start early, as the Revised Ontario Language curriculum describes with grade-by-grade specificity. Low reading fluency effects show up very clearly at Grade 3 and beyond as comprehension tasks get harder, so strong preventative work supporting efficient word reading fluency learning in the K to grade 2 phase is firmly suggested.

6. **Practicalities - To whom and how much fluency do I teach?**

Fluency assessments such as letter naming speed in younger learners, and in more mature readers, timed passage fluency, can be a starting point for indicating instructional needs. This can be backed up by observations and assessments of the relative 'automaticity' of components tasks in reading after appropriately sustained instruction (phoneme awareness, GPCs, decoding, vocabulary knowledge and morphology, syllabic stress together in fluent word recognition, plus syntax and prosody in text fluency). There is a relatively modest amount of work on the appropriate 'dosage' or instructional time needed here, so assess student fluency gains against curriculum expectations, and normative tests where available. Maki & Hammerschmidt-Snidarich (2020) note a consistent finding in their meta-analytic study was that the longer the amount of time on fluency, the greater the growth in reading fluency. Their data showed no clear effects of more massed versus more distributed (little and often) teaching, and effects were very similar for typical and for more at-risk (low current literacy performance) readers. Effects were largest from kindergarten to grade 3 compared to older readers (up to Grade 12 in their study), consistent with an early preventative approach being most effective. They also note that if instructional 'time' is the only measure of class wide fluency instruction, and if only delivered uniformly to all students, then, by definition, slower readers will have less exposure to print than faster readers. This practice is unlikely to produce 'catch up' learning. Some caution is needed in interpreting results from this study as it included several case studies which may not generalise well to all students.

7. **How do I assess my fluency teaching has been successful?**

As ever, assessment-teach-assess loops of practice are effective practice but ensure students are starting to *generalise* gains in fluency on repeatedly practiced text – this is seen in fluent independent reading of new texts. These can be praised even where small gains in fluency are first evident.

Assess against the detailed curriculum expectations *in Strand B*. Use the evidenced description of practice above in the curriculum to then assess against the curriculum-based instruction.

If students are not progressing, consider needed changes. As ever, assess the *teaching*: evaluate the quality of fluency teaching approach you are using.

Does the approach:

1. Embody intentional early teaching of all component reading skills in videos 1-5 beyond accuracy and toward fluency from kindergarten onwards?

2. Provide a clear strategy or set of strategies for all this learning as described in videos 1 -5, clearly modelled by teacher and supported and evaluated as being used effectively?

3. Link print-based phonics teaching, oral vocabulary meaning depth and morphological meaning breadth to achieve rich overlapping 'orthographic mapping' for words?

4. Uses a judicious mixture of carefully supervised repeated reading and the best-evidenced non-repetitive techniques we have met, to improve reading fluency?

5. Differentiate appropriately and consider methods to prevent fluency delays using more intensive (teacher and peer-modeled) approaches where justified?

6. Set, formatively assess, and evaluate reading fluency targets for all students?

7. Link words and texts learned to fluency to wider communicative intent and purpose for comprehension across the curriculum alongside strategies for comprehension?

8. Provide motivation – interest-based word learning, engaging text choices, clear records of success over time shared with students?

9. Provide culturally appropriate content (in all senses)?

10. Have some independent evidence of its effectiveness?

If 'no' you may have your answer to why students are not learning as you hoped – you may need to modify or supplement your existing approach.

8. How do I use this teaching to prevent difficulties?

As we have found before, documenting and monitoring of the program and its quality delivery over time is a key step to making sense of reading progress students make. In some cases of slow progress, consider increasing the range and intensity of supports given, and even, if possible, consider sensitively delivered intensive tutoring or small group support for those making least progress. There is some evidence from the reviews we have already met that capable (and or older) peers, if carefully chosen and supported and monitored by a teacher, can provide direct support for echo and choral reading techniques and model prosody effectively to support fluency gains. One caution here is that occasionally we meet students who read too fast to comprehend a text. A student in grade 3 who is reading beyond 160 words per minute is reading too fast!

9. **How does teaching of reading and spelling fluency fit with my teaching of reading for meaning?**

We have already seen evidence that reading fluency is intimately connected as a 'bridge' between word reading fluency and text comprehension. We have also met the key idea that increasing automaticity in word reading fluency increasingly frees students' attention to meaning making at the text level. As noted in previous videos, it is both 'word-level' and 'text-level' teaching and learning, not just one or the other that will build strong reading comprehension.

10. **How does teaching reading and spelling fluency fit to my wider curriculum?**

Reading fluency use underpins much of the wider curriculum of course, and also provides opportunities to practice specific skills taught during literacy / language arts time for fluency in a range of other content areas. The same evidence-based repeated reading, and wide reading interventions (echo and choral reading), modelled and peer assisted learning, etc., can be applied across the curriculum. Indeed, the various prosodic 'voices' needed in reading a science or social science or drama or fictional text provide rich opportunity for such quite sophisticated contextual textual understandings.

Finally, and to reiterate again in closing a message across videos, research evidence clearly does *not* say we should return to models of exclusive use of direct instruction, drill and rote learning, or endless homework. Indeed, while direct instruction is helpful, the teaching of productive meaning-laden strategies for text reading fluency in stimulating language rich contexts is at least equally necessary. There are *authentic reasons* to repeatedly re-read a text such as to memorize it for an oral presentation or in proof reading of writing. I have repeatedly re-read this text! Equally, interest and motivation and our students' unique experiences are also key features of best practice across the curriculum.

Some research-led suggestions on what will and will not be effective

Not effective	**Effective**
Teaching words by sight or by rote only	There may be a role for some sight word teaching, but fluency instruction involving strategy along with phonics and meanings likely provides a way of deeper and broader learning for fluency and comprehension.
Rely on phonics alone to aid reading and spelling fluency	Effective reading and spelling firmly requires phonics, but phonics is necessary but not sufficient to fluency. Evidence clearly shows that additional focus on all aspects of a word (including print, multiple and distributed meanings, and its role grammatically in sentences) is key to fluency.

Teach for fluency only once word reading accuracy has been achieved	Evidence shows teaching for fluency in all components of later text reading fluency starts early from kindergarten onwards. A good working assumption is to teach to both accuracy and fluency for all literacy curricular targets at all grade levels. Even sophisticated skills such as prosody can be supported in kindergarten and beyond.
Assume one size fits all in teaching	Assess through your teaching what students can do and teach at instructional level (at least 90% success) to meet curricular targets. Differentiate e.g., some students especially those with weak word reading and text comprehension will need more focus on the effective strategies for fluency and may need more than average instructional time here in any given inclusive lesson.
Insist students struggling with reading fluency or with known articulation difficulties demonstrate vocabulary knowledge in 'public' spaces.	Consider the assessment needs of students with morphological and speech and language difficulties carefully and consider non-verbal responses where appropriate. *It is most **inappropriate,** for example, for students who stutter or those with wider articulo-motor problems to read aloud for fluency.* *Consider the anxiety some students may experience with speeded tasks closely (for example emphasising their improvement and not a competition across the class)*
Assume one articulation or 'accent' or meaning of given words is better than another - students' backgrounds and other languages may impact reading aloud. Some very shy or nervous students may also find reading aloud publicly challenging.	**Consider diversity and inclusion needs here *very* carefully**
Teach fluency in an incidental or an 'as needed' way or on an occasional basis or in any other ways without detailed attention to the evidence on effective practice.	A systematic intentional planned sequential fluency program focused on printed and oral words, phrases, sentences, and texts, delivered and reinforced regularly, is likely most effective in teaching students in elementary classes to read.
Don't assess reading fluency	Use assessment systems including regular assessment against the revised Ontario language

	curriculum content guidance and the Strand B particulars. Consider graphing and monitoring of fluency with students to set and assess goals.
Teach without consulting colleagues and evidence-based research	Think of school-wide structures here especially others who might help. Might evidence-based research such as those available on Onlit be consulted for example? Consider a whole school approach - ask consultants speech and language and educational psychology specialists for example who typically have had extra training in reading and fluency). There are cross-school opportunities e.g., for peer and older student fluency mentors.
Teach reading and spelling as desk-based skill and drill with worksheets	Reading fluency is again a form of sustained problem solving – linked closely to text comprehension. Direct instruction is also key but modelling of processes and opportunities to practice in texts and in 'real life' for the purpose of communication are essential. Aspire to creating self-teachers of your students! As ever, motivation and success go together.

Across all six substantive videos we have considered in detail the processes and teaching and learning about literacy in a robust evidenced effective equitable way. You should now have all the tools in a toolkit to support strong foundations of word reading and spelling accuracy that also underpin text comprehension.

Summary and conclusion

We have considered	**We have learned**
1. What is fluency?	Reading fluency is reading "*quickly, accurately, and with proper expression*". It involves efficient coordination of all word knowledge with textual understandings.
2. What does the evidence-based research tell us about the role of reading and spelling fluency in literacy that I should I know about as a teacher?	The evidence-based research indicates that word reading automaticity underpins text comprehension.
3. Does fluency in reading and spelling develop on its own, or do I have to teach it?	Evidence shows that the direct and intentional and systematic teaching of fluency sub-skills aids word and text reading and spelling.

	Teaching of reading fluency is effective but sits alongside the construction of multiple effective learning opportunities and wide carefully monitored text exposure.
4. Practicalities – How do I teach reading and spelling fluency using evidence-based research?	Repeated reading with text and prosody modelling and feedback with use of echo and choral and other monitored wide reading techniques and peer assisted teaching are all evidenced approaches. Teach by modelling of fluency use to the class, reinforcing over time, and then evaluating use in an intentional, planned, pedagogical manner.
5. Practicalities - When do I teach reading and spelling fluency?	As early as possible from kindergarten through the elementary grades and beyond in a sustained coordinated manner teaching all aspects of words to build fluency following the revised Ontario language curriculum.
6. Practicalities - To whom and how much fluency do I teach?	Based on assessments some students may need more instructional time to meet fluency goals so plan to differentiate here.
7. How do I assess my teaching for fluency has been successful?	Assessment is key as ever: Assess student learning but also assess strategy use and your program and its mix of evidenced learning approaches.
8. How do I use this teaching to prevent difficulties?	Documenting and monitoring is key, again. Consider higher intensity of support preventatively, early on, where students are still striving to reach fluency targets.
9. How does teaching for fluency in reading and spelling fit with my teaching of reading for meaning?	The teaching of word reading fluency is an essential platform for reading comprehension. Reading fluency is one powerful force underpinning text comprehension: They work together.
10. How does teaching for reading and spelling fluency fit to my wider curriculum?	The wider curriculum provides rich opportunity to practice and extend reading fluency learning approaches first met in language arts.

Reflection points

1. How can I use this information about reading fluency alongside what I know about phoneme awareness and GPCs, vocabulary and morphology together to shape my literacy teaching practice?

2. How can we as a whole school (or early years group) work together on a robust approach to early literacy development where no one ‘fall through the cracks’ using this information and research?

3. How might we develop a community of practice here to develop together or work with my school board or other skilled professionals to advance practice even further?

In conjunction with the approaches we have considered in videos 1 to 5, you should now have all you need to plan and deliver a strong and highly impactful literacy teaching experience for diverse learners.