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Note: *To ensure consistency from Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply to Part II - Program Review, Section A: Information contains repeated content in both applications with small adjustments made in the Part I -Letter of Intent to Apply component of this section****.***

# SECTION A: Information

## Background

The Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act (READ Act), passed by the Colorado legislature in 2012, focuses on early literacy development for all students kindergarten through third grade and especially for students at risk of not reaching grade-level proficiency in reading by the end of third grade. Included in the READ Act is the requirement that the department shall create an advisory list of evidence-based or scientifically based instructional programming in reading, pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209.

The main purpose of the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming is to provide districts and schools with a choice of instructional programming that adequately enhances teacher quality and is a major vehicle that schools/districts can utilize to upgrade their capacity as it relates to the implementation of the evidence-based literacy practices.

The department shall create an advisory list of evidence-based or scientifically based instructional programming in reading that local education providers are encouraged to use, which include the following criteria pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209:

* alignment to the READ Act assessments
* proven to accelerate student progress in attaining reading competency
* provides explicit and systematic skill development in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills, and reading comprehension
* is evidence based or scientifically based
* aligned with the preschool through elementary and secondary education standards for reading
* provides initial and ongoing analysis of the student's progress in attaining reading competency
* includes texts on core academic content to assist the student in maintaining or meeting grade-appropriate proficiency levels in academic subjects in addition to reading

## Purpose

The purpose of this Program Advisory List Submission Application, is to solicit professional development products and evidence-based instructional programming including core, supplemental and intervention in both Spanish and English, for inclusion on the READ Act Advisory Lists of Instructional Programming, pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209. This is not a competitive process and will be used to provide an advisory list for Colorado school districts.

## Advisory List Information

Advisory lists are intended to provide clear guidance on selection of scientifically and evidence-based reading programming and supports as defined by statute and rule (see Appendix C). *See Appendix A for further information on attributes of what is and what is not considered Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR).*

Advisory lists are available to Colorado schools and school districts via the [Colorado Department of Education’s website](http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/index.asp). Inclusion on this list does not include a provision for expenditure of state funds to providers on the list and there is no guarantee that providers will be selected by schools/districts. The list of providers will be maintained by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). The department is required to review the advisory lists at least every two years to update the lists and add additional items when appropriate pursuant to C.R.S.22-7-1209 (3)(c).

During each review cycle, new providers have the opportunity to apply to be added to the list.

* **Program editions that were submitted and not approved during the 2019-2020 application process are not eligible to apply.**
* Programs that were partially approved may submit those grades or areas not previously approved providing there has been a change in the materials that addresses the areas not approved.

Providers on the current advisory lists may be removed from the list if their instructional programming is found to no longer meet the criteria.

## Process

The CDE process for review of instructional programming materials for inclusion on the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming follows these steps:

* *Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply*
* *Part II – Program Review*
	+ Programs must meet the *Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply* criteria to receive the *Part II – Program Review* application from CDE.
* Appeal Window
* Instructional Programming Advisory List posted on the CDE website

Note: To be included on the Instructional Programming Advisory List programs must be reviewed during this review window.

## Eligibility Criteria

### Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply

The first stage of this review is the *Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply* for inclusion on the advisory list for instructional programming. In order for a provider to submit materials to the CDE for full review of programs, each vendor must have established that the program submitted meets the criteria outlined in *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply*. Only those vendors that completed the application for *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* and were asked to move forward with a full review will be considered for *Part II – Program Review*.

Programs included on the advisory list of instructional programs must be scientifically and evidence-based as defined by statute and rule to meet the requirements of the READ Act (see Appendix C). Programs that use the Three Cueing Systems Model of Reading, also known as Meaning, Syntax, Visual (MSV) as their primary model for instruction may not advance to *Part II - Program Review.* All programs must demonstrate a full alignment to the science of reading across instructional and promotional materials. Programs found to be aligned to practices that promote balanced literacy or whole language whether in the instructional practices or found in vendor materials outside of this review will not be approved.

Completion of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* did not guarantee a program submission would advance to *Part II - Program Review*. Vendors with program submissions advancing to *Part II - Program Review* must complete and submit the *Part II - Program Review* application and all necessary materials to be reviewed for consideration for inclusion on the Advisory List for which the program was submitted for review.

### Part II- Program Review

The application for *Part II - Program Review* includes instructions to submit materials for the second stage of the Program Advisory List Submission Applicationfor review. **All application and program materials must be submitted in digital or online format. No hard copies of application or program materials will be accepted.**

**Only vendors meeting criteria of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* and *Part II - Program Review* may be considered for inclusion on the Advisory List for which the program was submitted for review.**

*Note: All prospective providers interested in inclusion on the advisory lists must submit for a review.*

## Appeal Process

An appeal process has been established in rule pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209(1)(d). If a publisher’s instructional program is not included on the approved list, the publisher may submit a written appeal to the department no later than 14 days after receiving notification. Grounds for written appeal will be limited to an explanation of why the submission met the evaluation criteria that was identified and posted by the department.

No later than 30 days after receiving the written appeal, the department shall either add the instructional program to the approved list or respond to the publisher with a written explanation of why the program will not be included (*CCR 301-92, 11.0*).

# SECTION B: Timeline

|  |
| --- |
| **Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply** |
| October 18, 2021 | Notification of *Part I -Letter of Intent to Apply* for Instructional Programming. |
| October 21, 2021 | Technical Assistance Webinar  |
| November 5, 2021 | All *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* submissions for Instructional Programming due to CDE by 4:00 PM MT |
| November 8, 2021 – November 12, 2021 | CDE review of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* for Instructional Programming |
| November 15, 2021 | Vendor notification of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* decision. Applications distributed for eligible vendors for *Part II – Program Review*. |
| **Part II - Program Review** |
| November 15, 2021 |  Applications for *Part II - Program Review* distributed for eligible vendors for *Part II – Program Review.* |
| November 18, 2021 | Technical Assistance Webinar Thursday, November 18, 2021, at 10:00 AM MTRegister for Zoom webinar*\*This webinar will be recorded, and a recording link will be emailed to program contacts.* |
| December 15, 2021 | Application for *Part* *II - Program Review* deadline. |
| January 5, 2022-January 28, 2022 | CDE Review of *Part II - Program Review* applications for Instructional Programming  |
| January 31, 2022 | Vendor notification of inclusion of instructional programming on CDE Advisory List |
| January 31, 2022-February 15, 2022 | Vendor appeal window. |
| March 15, 2022 | Anticipated deadline for appeal response from the CDE. |
| March 25, 2022 | Anticipated date to update and post the Instructional Program Advisory List on the CDE READ Act webpage. |

*Please note: The timeline for review and approval of programs may be extended or changed if unforeseen circumstances arise during the review period.*

*The timeline for review of Spanish program materials may be extended if needed.*

**Note:** Applications will be submitted online via Smartsheet form.

Submission of application materials either in hard copy or via email will not be accepted.

# SECTION C: Cover Page

**All requested information in *Part II - Program Review* must be included to be considered for review for inclusion on the Advisory List for which the program was submitted for review.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Name of Publisher** |
| **Product Title and Edition:** | **Publication Year:** |
| **Contact Person for notification of review outcome:**  | **Email:**  |
| **Telephone:** | **Mailing Address:**  |
| **Publisher Webpage:**  | **Product Webpage:** The webpage that is specifically related to the program materials for review.  |
| **Instructional Program Submission for Review** |
| **Please select which program is being submitted for review and inclusion on the Advisory List** Choose an item.***Note: A separate application must be submitted for a program to be reviewed for inclusion on more than one advisory list.*** **Target Audience:***Select all that apply.***[ ]** Kindergarten[ ]  First Grade[ ]  Second Grade[ ]  Third Grade[ ]  English Language Learners  |
| **Agreement of Completion** |
| **In order to be considered to be reviewed in this *Part II - Program Review*, the following must be completed:****Check each box and sign below to indicate each required section noted below has been included and is complete.**[ ]  Section C: Completed Cover Page[ ]  Section D: Part 1 Eligibility Required Components: [ ]  Scope and Sequence[ ]  ESSA Level Evidence [ ]  Essential Program Components[ ]  Section E: Anchor Conceptual Models [ ]  Section F: Vendor Program Worksheet[ ]  Completed Vendor Program Worksheet (Appendix F)[ ]  Phase 1 Worksheet: Scientifically Based or Evidence-based Reading Programs (completion required for all program type submissions)[ ]  Phase 2 Worksheet: Completed corresponding program type and required elements[ ]  Section G: Alignment to 2020 Reading, Writing, and Communicating Standards [ ]  Signature - Confirming all parts above are included **Printed Name of Representative:**Click here to enter a date.**Signature (required):** |

# SECTION D: Verification of Required Components

*To move forward with the program rubric review phase 2, the vendor must explicitly state the location of and/or provide evidence of the required components listed in this section. The components listed in this section will be reviewed using phase 1 of the review rubric.*

## Scope & Sequence (required component)

A key component of instructional design when considering systematic and explicit instruction for reading programming includes a scope and sequence (Foorman, Smath, Kosanovich, 2017). See Appendix B for further information on key elements of instructional design for reading programs. Check the box(es) below that align with each component of literacy addressed within the instructional program being submitted. This will verify systematic and explicit instruction of this component(s) within the program.

Aligned Scope and Sequence for each component, select all that apply:

*Note: Beyond Core programming, the department is aware that not all components will be provided (e.g., A supplemental program focused on phonology only, would only need to ensure a phonology scope and sequence is available).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Programming** | **Supplemental Programming** | **Intervention Programming** |
| In order to be considered for core programming, all components below must be included within the scope and sequence.  | Check the boxes to indicate which components are: * explicitly taught within the program, and
* have an aligned scope and sequence.
 |
| [ ] **Phonological Awareness**[ ] Early [ ] Basic[ ] Advanced[ ] **Phonics**[ ] Basic [ ] Advanced[ ] **Vocabulary** [ ] **Comprehension** [ ] Listening Comprehension[ ] Reading Comprehension[ ] \***Fluency**  | [ ] **Phonological Awareness** [ ] Early [ ] Basic [ ] Advanced[ ] **Phonics**[ ] Basic [ ] Advanced[ ] **Vocabulary**[ ] **Comprehension**[ ] Listening Comprehension[ ] Reading Comprehension[ ] \***Fluency**  | [ ] **Phonological Awareness** [ ] Early [ ] Basic[ ] Advanced [ ] **Phonics**Basic [ ] Advanced[ ] **Vocabulary**[ ] **Comprehension**[ ] Listening Comprehension[ ] Reading Comprehension[ ]  \***Fluency**  |
| \*Note: *Fluency needs to be addressed within the instructional program, however a specific progression for fluency does not need to be provided within the scope and sequence (Birsh, 2018, pgs. 467-469).*  |
| **Clearly identify the scope and sequence**Reviewers must be able to clearly identify the program scope and sequence. Applicants must clearly define and highlight where the scope and sequence is located in the materials submitted. Applicants are encouraged to use a sticky note or other means, flag the scope and sequence in the materials submitted. Below, explicitly state where the scope and sequence can be found within the materials and describe how it has been flagged. Click or tap here to enter text. |

## ESSA Level Evidence (required component)

Programs applied under Title I, Section 1003 (School Improvement) are required to have strong, moderate, or promising evidence (Levels 1–3) to support them. All other programs under Titles I–IV can rely on Tiers 1–4.

### Resources

* Overview video provided ([Understanding the ESSA Levels of Evidence](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1VRxZlUyn1k&feature=push-sd&attr_tag=7raF0W_esU_eI_Oc%3A6)) to ensure understanding
* To identify evidence level, consider using research clearing houses; a list of which is provided here:<https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/exploringebisstrength>
* Aligning Evidence-Based Clearinghouses with ESSA Levels (Tiers) via REL Midwest: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/pdf/eventhandout/ESSA-Clearinghouse-Crosswalk-Jan2018-508.pdf>

### Demonstrating ESSA Evidence

To be considered an evidence-based program (or practice), it is required to have **evidence** to show that the program is in fact effective at producing results and improving outcomes in reading when implemented.

**All components below must be completed and included:**

Identify evidence level alignment for the entirety of the program.

*If the program has not been included in a study which is comprehensive of the entirety of the program - including the grade levels being submitted for review, additional criteria must be submitted under the corresponding level to ensure response indicates ESSA level alignment to support the entire program being submitted for review.*

* Include the requested evidence described in the box under each evidence level selected
* Highlight within the provided evidence the information requested in the box under the evidence level selected
* Include a summary of the evidence being provided.

*If more than one evidence level is selected, ensure a clear description of what portions of the program are aligned to each level.*

***Select the corresponding evidence level(s) below:***

[ ]  **Level 1 – Strong Evidence**: Supported by an experimental or randomized control trial (RTC) study.

[ ]  **Complete program**

[ ]  **Partial**

**Level 1 Description:** To be supported by strong evidence, there must be at least one well designed and well-implemented experimental study (e.g., a randomized control trial, meets peer review requirements). Additionally, to provide strong evidence, the study should: 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the program on a student outcome or other relevant outcome; 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same program in other studies. 3) Have a large sample and a multi-site sample; and 4) Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) AND settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the program.

**Level 1 Supporting Documentation:** If Level 1 - Strong Evidence has been selected, please include in the submitted packet at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study on the program that (please check that the study includes the following):

[ ]  Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the program on a student outcome or other relevant outcome. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on the same program in other studies.

[ ]  Has a large sample and a multi-site sample. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  Has a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) AND settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the program. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  **Level 2 – Moderate Evidence**: Supported by at least one quasi-experimental study.

[ ]  **Complete program**

[ ]  **Partial**

**Level 2 Description:** To be supported by moderate evidence, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study on the program (e.g., peer reviewed). Additionally, to provide moderate evidence, the study should: 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the program on a student outcome or other relevant outcome; 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that program from other findings in studies with or without reservations or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences; 3) Have a large sample and a multi-site sample; and 4) Have a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) OR settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention.

**Level 2 Supporting Documentation**: If Level 2 - Moderate Evidence has been selected, please include in the submitted packet at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study on the program that:

[ ]  Shows a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the program on a student outcome or other relevant outcome. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  Is not overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that program from other findings in studies with or without reservations or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences

[ ]  Has a large sample and a multi-site sample. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  Has a sample that overlaps with the populations (i.e., the types of students served) OR settings (e.g., rural, urban) proposed to receive the intervention. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  **Level 3 – Promising Evidence**: Supported by at least one correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias.

[ ]  **Complete program**

[ ]  **Partial**

**Level 3 Description:** To be supported by promising evidence, there must be at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias on the program. A correlational study is considered to be “well-designed and well-implemented” if it uses sampling and/or analytic methods to reduce or account for differences between the group supported by the program and a comparison group. Additionally, to provide promising evidence, the study should: 1) Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the program on a student outcome or other relevant outcome; and 2) Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that program from findings in studies with or without reservations or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences.

**Level 3 Supporting Documentation:** If Level 3 - Promising Evidence has been selected, please include in the submitted packet at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias on the program that uses sampling and/or analytic methods to reduce or account for differences between the group supported by the program and a comparison group. Additionally, the study should:

[ ]  Show a statistically significant and positive (i.e., favorable) effect of the program on a student outcome or other relevant outcome. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  Not be overridden by statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) evidence on that program from findings in studies with or without reservations or are the equivalent quality for making causal inferences. **Evidence must be highlighted in the attached study.**

[ ]  **Level 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale**: Supported by relevant research or an evaluation which suggests that the intervention is likely to improve a student's outcome or other relevant outcome.

[ ]  **Complete program**

[ ]  **Partial**

**Level 4 Description:** To demonstrate a rationale, the program should include: 1) A well-specified logic model that is informed by research or an evaluation that suggests how the program is likely to improve relevant outcomes; and 2) An effort to study the effects of the program, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the program or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the program elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that program.

**Level 4 Supporting Documentation**: If Level 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale has been selected, please include in the submitted packet:

[ ]  A well-specified logic model that is informed by research or an evaluation that suggests how the program is likely to improve relevant outcomes.

[ ]  A summary that describes the effort to study the effects of the program, ideally producing promising evidence or higher, that will happen as part of the program or is underway elsewhere (e.g., this could mean another SEA, LEA, or research organization is studying the program elsewhere), to inform stakeholders about the success of that program.

|  |
| --- |
| **Provide a short summary of the evidence provided to support the ESSA level selected above.**Click or tap here to enter text. |

## Essential Program Components

Many programs come with additional resources/add-ons that may be necessary to achieve desired results and fully align with scientifically based or evidence-based practices. This section must include a bulleted list of the essential program components (program materials) necessary to ensure effective results and improving outcomes when implemented as demonstrated and a description of how components (program materials) are sold (e.g., as an all-inclusive kit, a la carte/individually, etc.)

**Bulleted list of essential program components (core must be by grade level) and a description of how the components are sold (e.g., as an all-inclusive kit, a la carte, etc.):**

Click or tap here to enter text.

# SECTION E: Anchor Conceptual Model(s)

|  |
| --- |
| Name and describe the theoretical model(s) the program is grounded in to support alignment with the understanding of how children learn to read. Include the author of the model as well as a citation for the model. Alignment to the science of reading is part of phase 1 criteria of the rubric.Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| If the program is constructed for learning to read in a language other than English, provide the conceptual and research foundations, as well as evidence that it is not merely a translation of an English program.Click or tap here to enter text. |

# SECTION F: Vendor Program Worksheet

Complete each section of the appropriate vendor worksheet(s) (Appendix F) that aligns with the program submitted. The vendor worksheet is aligned with the Instructional Program Review Rubric and will be used by stakeholders as a guide when reviewing the submitted program. If the vendor worksheet is not completed as requested, the program will not be reviewed. The Vendor worksheet and instructions for completing the vendor worksheet can be found in Appendix F.

# SECTION G: Alignment to 2020 Reading, Writing, and Communicating Standards

Provide the department a crosswalk of the instructional program alignment to the Colorado Academic Standards for Reading, Writing, and Communicating. While this review is designed to specifically ensure reading content is aligned to the science of reading, overall alignment to Colorado Academic Standards is essential to demonstrate and will be valuable information for consumer selection.

2020 Colorado Reading, Writing, and Communicating Standards - <https://www.cde.state.co.us/coreadingwriting/statestandards>

# SECTION H: Required Format & Submission Details

Please pay careful attention to this section. Applications that do not meet the submission requirements may not be accepted and may cause delay in the review process. Please initial to confirm that applicant has read and understands all of requirements of the submission process 

All applications need to include the following:

* Electronic: One electronic submission meeting the specifications outlined below
* Program Materials: Electronic or digital access to program materials submitted as scanned PDF documents or online account access according to the specifications outlined below.

**All *Part II - Program Review electronic* submissions must be received by Wednesday, December 15, 2021, at 4:00pm MT.**

***Only electronic versions of the completed application will be accepted. The electronic submission must be submitted through Smartsheet in a PDF form. Any program materials submitted must be either available online or submitted as a scanned PDF. Hard copies of materials cannot be accepted and will not under any circumstances be reviewed.***

## Electronic Submissions

Please initial that electronic application submissions will be submitted in the format below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Application Electronic Requirements for *Part II - Program Review* Components**All *Part II - Program Review* application components for Sections C through H must be submitted electronically in PDF format for review.Each section of the completed application must be clearly labeled. *The Part II – Program Review submission must be submitted in PDF format. Format the filename as follows:* * ***publisher name\_program name\_intervention\_2022\_submission***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_supplemental\_2022\_submission***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_core\_2022\_submission***

**All *Part II – Program Review* application submissions must be submitted****by 4:00pm MT on Wednesday, December 15, 2021.****Submit the *Part II – Program Review* application through the Smartsheet form**\**If the file submission is too large to submit through Smartsheet, contact Marisa Calzadillas (**Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us**) directly for further directions****. Please note dropbox, wetransfers etc. will not be accepted if emailed to Marisa without reaching out prior.*** Submissions will only be considered complete when the following have been received: * *Part II - Program Review* application documents in PDF format
* Program materials in scanned PDF format or online access (see below for program material submission requirements)
 |

## Program Materials Submissions

Please initial that program materials will be submitted in the format below:

|  |
| --- |
| **Program Materials Submission Requirements for *Part II- Program Review*:*** Program materials must be submitted electronically in scanned PDF format through Syncplicity or through an online/digital platform.
* **Upload all program materials and the *Part II – Program Review* application into the unique Syncplicity folder link you received from Marisa Calzadillas.** *If you are unable to find this link, contact Marisa Calzadillas (**Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us**) before the December 15, 2021 application deadline*.
	+ **All *Part II – Program Review* application components.**
	+ **All program materials must be clearly labeled with the program name and title of the material.**
	+ If the instructional program includes online/digital components to be reviewed include a document with a copy of links, passwords, user IDs, etc. for 5 users as needed to access the materials.
		- *Note: User (reviewer) access needs to be set up to ensure the user remains anonymous during the review and to allow ease of navigation throughout the instructional program materials.*
 |

# Appendix A: Comparison of Reading Approaches

**Comparison of Reading Approaches**

This chart was adapted from a guide which Dr. Moats, a recognized reading expert, created to help educators and parents gain awareness of programs that are aligned to the science of reading and those that are not. This chart has been included to offer additional guidance on what is and what is not considered Scientifically Based Reading Research. Additional resources to support the understanding of Scientifically Based Reading Research and evidence-based practices are linked in the final row of the chart.

**Comparison of Reading Approaches**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Components of Instruction** | **Scientifically Based Practices by Component of Instruction** | **Not Scientifically Based Practices by Component of Instruction** |
| **Phonological and Phoneme Awareness*****CCR 301-92, 2.22******CCR 301-92, 2.21******CCR 301-92, 5.01(A)******CCR 301-92, 5.01(B)******CCR 301-92, 5.02(A)******CCR 301-92, 5.03(A)******CCR 301-92, 5.04(A)***  | Explicit teaching of the speech sounds, distinct from the letters that represent them; attention called to sound and word pronunciation; emphasis on blending and separating sounds in spoken words.[***CO READ Act K-3 Minimum Competencies***](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/minimumcompetencylinkedmatrix) | Minimal or incidental instruction about speech sounds, their features or contrasts; insufficient instruction in separating and blending the sounds in a whole word; confusion of PA with phonics. Instructs teachers to avoid breaking words into their parts. |
| **Phonics and Word Study*****CCR 301-92, 2.23*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.01(D)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.01(E)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.02(C)******CCR 301-92, 5.03(B)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.04(B)***  | Explicit, systematic, cumulative teaching of phoneme-grapheme (sound-symbol) correspondences, syllable types, and meaningful word parts (prefixes, suffixes, roots and base words.) Word reading skills are then applied in text reading. “Sound it out” comes before “does it make sense?”[***CO READ Act K-3 Minimum Competencies***](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/minimumcompetencylinkedmatrix) | Children directed to pay attention to the sense of a sentence before guessing at a word from context and the first letter; “sounding out” the whole word is deemphasized. No systematic presentation of sound-symbol correspondences. Teacher-made “mini-lessons” to address student errors. Avoids phonic readers (also known as decodable readers); uses leveled books without phonically controlled vocabulary. |
| **Fluency*****CCR 301-92, 5.01(D)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.02(D)******CCR 301-92, 5.03(C)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.04(C)***  | Explicit, measurable goals by grade level for oral passage reading fluency and related subskills; criteria established by research. Rereading, partner reading, reading with a model are validated techniques.[***CO READ Act K-3 Minimum Competencies***](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/minimumcompetencylinkedmatrix) | Reading practice in “leveled” books; focus on “miscue analysis” rather than words read correctly. No emphasis on fluency in building subskills. Avoids measurement of words correct per minute. Believes students learn to read by reading, not by instruction on specific skills. |
| **Vocabulary*****CCR 301-92, 5.01(F)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.01(G)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.02(E)******CCR 301-92, 5.02(F)******CCR 301-92, 5.03(D)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.03(E)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.04(D)***  | Teachers preteach words important to the meaning of a text, explain during reading, and practice after reading. Teachers give structured practice using new words verbally and in writing. Teacher-student dialogue “scripted” in the teacher’s manual.[***CO READ Act K-3 Minimum Competencies***](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/minimumcompetencylinkedmatrix) | When engaging in text, the discussion by the teacher is nondirective. Although words important to the meaning of a text may be pretaught, explained during reading, and practiced after reading. No additional explicit instruction or practice is provided to understand word structure and meaning.  |
| **Comprehension Skills and Strategies*****CCR 301-92, 5.01(H) CCR 301-92, 5.02(A)******CCR 301-92, 5.03(F)*** ***CCR 301-92, 5.04(E)*** | Providing instruction that supports students with understanding ideas expressed in text—supporting their ability to negotiate the linguistic and conceptual barriers such as:* Directly teaching the structure of both narrative and expository text.
* Strategies are overtly modeled and practiced in a planned progression.
* Subskills such as choices of diction, grammatical structure, cohesive linkage, organization, and other ways that the author chooses to present ideas.

Teachers’ edition provides guidance.[***CO READ Act K-3 Minimum Competencies***](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/minimumcompetencylinkedmatrix) | Teachers instructed to use leveled book reading, big books, and independent trade book reading; teacher modeling (thinking aloud) is the primary instructional strategy. Also known as Reader’s Workshop approach. Student book choice emphasized.  |
| **Writing**  | Grammar, handwriting, spelling, punctuation taught systematically, along with many structured opportunities to practice composition. Builds sentence writing skills, paragraph formation, and knowledge of narrative and expository text structures. | Writer’s workshop approach. Emphasizes stages of the writing process and self-expression, rather than mastery of component skills through planned, cumulative practice. Correction given in individual conferences. “Journaling” is a favored activity, because students choose the topic they write about. |
| **Additional Resources for Understanding Scientifically Based Reading Research and Evidence-based Practices:*** [Ending the Reading Wars: Reading Acquisition From Novice to Expert.](https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271)
* [Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide/21)
* [The National Reading Panel](https://www.thereadingleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/NRP-Report.pdf)
* [The Science of Reading and Its Educational Implications](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4020782/pdf/nihms503624.pdf)
* [Brief overview provided by Dr. Stanislas Dehaene on how the brain transforms the shapes of letters and characters on a page into the sounds of spoken language.](https://youtu.be/wlYZBi_07vk)
* Attributes of Effective Universal Instruction, *CCR 301-92 6.00* (See Appendix D)
* Attributes of Effective Targeted and Intensive Instructional Intervention, *CCR 301-92 7.00* (See Appendix E)
 |

Adapted from [*Moats, 2007*](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498005) *and Shanahan, 2019*

# Appendix B: Elements of Design for Reading/Language Arts Instructional Materials

**Elements of design for reading/language arts instructional materials**

For elements of instructional design, understanding how a curriculum is created is important. That is, it is imperative that the review team understand how to identify a systematic scope and sequence, how goals and objectives are related, what the elements of an organized lesson are, and how to align materials and embed formative assessments. The content is what is taught during reading/language arts instruction (such as phonics, spelling, comprehension, and writing). Pedagogy is how the content is taught (such as explicitly using routines or differentiated instruction). Differentiated instruction materials include activities that address both intervention for students with special learning needs and extension/enrichment for students ready for further work. Salient features of instructional design, reading/language arts content, and pedagogy are shown in figure 1.



 **Source**: Foorman, Smith, Kosanovich, 2017

# Appendix C: Terminology: Acronyms, abbreviations, and other terminology

**Terminology:** **Acronyms, abbreviations, and other terminology**

Acronyms and abbreviations are defined at their first occurrence in this request for review. The following list is provided to assist the reader in understanding acronyms, abbreviations and terminology used throughout this document.

**Department:** The Colorado Department of Education, a department of the government of the State of Colorado. *C.R.S 22-7-1203 & CCR 301-92, 2.05*

**Evidence Based:** The instruction or item described is based on reliable, trustworthy, and valid evidence and has demonstrated a record of success in adequately increasing students' reading competency in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency, including oral skills, and reading comprehension. *C.R.S 22-7-1203 & CCR 301-92, 2.10*

* **Oral Language**: The ability to produce and comprehend spoken language, including vocabulary and grammar. *CCR 301-92, 2.22*
* **Phonological Awareness:** Awareness of the sound structure of spoken words at three levels. *CCR 301-92, 2.24*
* **Phonemic Awareness:** A subset of phonological awareness in which listeners are able to hear, identify, and manipulate phonemes, the smallest units of sound that can differentiate meaning. *CCR 301-92, 2.23*
* **Phonics:** A method of teaching reading and writing by developing learners’ phonemic awareness, that is, the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate the sounds (phonemes) in order to teach the correspondence between these sounds and the spelling patterns (graphemes) that represent them. *CCR 301-92, 2.25*
* **Vocabulary:** Knowledge of words and word meanings and includes words that a person understands and uses in language. Vocabulary is essential for both learning to read and for comprehending text. *CCR 301-92, 2.37*
* **Comprehension:** The process of extracting and constructing meaning from written texts. Comprehension has three key elements: (1) the reader; (2) the text; and (3) the activity. *CCR 301-92, 2.04*
* **Fluency:** The capacity to read words in connected text with sufficient accuracy, rate, and prosody to comprehend what is read. *CCR 301-92, 2.12*

**Explicit Instruction:** Instruction that involves direct explanation in which concepts are explained and skills are modeled, without vagueness or ambiguity. The teacher’s language is concise, specific, and related to the objective, and guided practice is provided. *CCR 301-92, 2.09*

**Instructional Programming:** Scientifically-based or evidence-based resources in reading instruction that local education providers are encouraged to use including but not limited to interventions, tutoring, and instructional materials that adequately teach students to read and may include materials used within a multi-tiered system of support including the universal/core level and supplemental and intensive interventions.*CCR 301-92, 2.15*

* **Core (Universal) Programming:** A reading program that is used to help guide both initial and differentiated instruction in the regular classroom. It supports instruction in the broad range of reading skills (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) required to become a skilled reader. It contains teacher’s manuals with explicit lesson plans, and provides reading and practice materials for students (FCRR, n.d.).
* **Supplemental Programming:** Instruction that goes beyond that provided by the comprehensive core program because the core program does not provide enough instruction or practice in a key area to meet the needs of the students in a particular classroom or school. For example, teachers in a school may observe that their comprehensive core program does not provide enough vocabulary or phonics instruction to adequately meet the needs of the majority of their students. They could then select a supplemental program in these areas to strengthen the initial instruction and provide practice to all students (FCRR, n.d.).
* **Intervention Programming:** The practice of providing scientifically-based, high-quality instruction and progress monitoring to students who are below proficient in reading. *CCR 301-92, 2.14*

**Scientifically Based:** The instruction or item described is based on research that applies rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain valid knowledge that is relevant to reading development, reading instruction, and reading difficulties. *C.R.S 22-7-1203 & CCR 301-92, 2.29*

* **Systematic Instruction**: A carefully planned sequence of instruction that is thought out and designed before activities and lessons are planned, maximizing the likelihood that whenever children are asked to learn something new, they already possess the appropriate prior knowledge and understandings to see its value and to learn it effectively. *CCR 301-92, 2.35*

**Significant Reading Deficiency:** means that a student does not meet the minimum skill levels for reading competency in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency, including oral skills, and reading comprehension established by the State Board pursuant to section 22-7-1209, C.R.S., for the student’s grade level. *C.R.S 22-7-1203 & CCR 301-92, 2.31*

# Appendix D: Attributes of Effective Universal Instruction

**Attributes of Effective Universal Instruction, *CCR 301-92, 6.00***

The attributes of a multi-tiered system of support contribute to more meaningful identification of learning problems related to literacy achievement, improve instructional quality, provide all students with the best opportunity to learn to read, assist with the identification of learning disabilities specific to learning to read, and accelerate the reading skills of advanced readers.

The following are attributes of effective universal instruction

* Addresses the five components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) appropriate to the age, grade, language of instruction and needs of students, recognizing the continuum of reading development and;
* Guided by the assessment of a student’s reading proficiency using a state board approved interim assessment and, based on a student’s level of risk, on an on-going basis through the use of interim assessment probes specific to the student’s diagnosed reading skill deficiencies throughout the academic year and;
* A minimum of 90 minutes of instruction and;
* Utilizes a scope and sequence that is delivered explicitly with judicious review, allowing for active and engaged students and;
* Driven by the Colorado Academic Standards

# Appendix E: Attributes of Effective Targeted and Intensive Instructional Intervention

**Attributes of Effective Targeted and Intensive Instructional Intervention,** *CCR 301-92, 7.00*

The attributes of a multi-tiered system of support contribute to more meaningful identification of learning problems related to literacy achievement, improve instructional quality, provide all students with the best opportunity to learn to read, assist with the identification of learning disabilities specific to learning to read, and accelerate the reading skills of advanced readers.

The following are attributes of effective targeted and intensive instructional intervention.

* Addresses one or more of the five components of reading with intentional focus on identified area(s) of deficit according to interim and diagnostic assessments (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) and;
* Delivered with sufficient intensity, frequency, urgency, and duration and;
* Guided by data from diagnostic, interim, and observational assessments focused on students’ areas of need and;
* Directed by an effective teacher in the teaching of reading and;
* Utilizes a scope and sequence that is delivered explicitly with judicious review, allowing for active and engaged students;
* Delivered in a small group format.

# Appendix F: Vendor Program Worksheet

|  |
| --- |
| **Vendor Program Worksheet****Instructions:** The vendor worksheet must be completed for each program submitted for review. In each section, provide notes in the space titled *Evidence* as to where in the submitted materials the reviewer is able to find content that addresses the particular section. Please make sure the notes provided are explicit and succinct.* All sections of the worksheet titled: *Required Features of Scientifically-Based or Evidence-Based Reading Programs* must be fully completed for all programs submitted for review.
* Select the worksheet(s) that aligns with the program type (core, supplemental, intervention) submitted for review.
* Complete all components that align with the program being submitted.
* **Evidence provided below must be specific.**Rationales must include directions for reviewers on where specifically to locate examples of what is declared to be present within the program (e.g., Located in Kinder Teacher’s Guide, page 23, under subheading “XXXXX”, or found at this link, under this subpage, in this grey “Teacher’s Tool Kit” etc.”. If located in hard materials, please tab by section and heading as well.

A comments section is provided at the bottom of each section on the vendor worksheets. This provides a space for any additional comments to be made. The information on this worksheet will ensure that reviewers do not overlook critical content. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase 1 Worksheet: Scientifically-Based or Evidence-Based Reading Programs***This worksheet must be completed for* ***all programs*** *submitted for review.* |
| **Name of Program:**  |
| **Section 1: EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION** ***Students are introduced to the new skill before they are asked to perform it.*** | **Evidence:** |
| Location of examples of instructional routines and/or scripts within lessons of the program. |  |
| Location of examples of routines which include language for the teacher to introduce, define or explain new skills through demonstration and modeling before students are asked to perform the skills. |  |
| Location of examples within lessons of multiple opportunities for students to practice new skills, with instructions for the teacher to give immediate corrective feedback. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **SECTION 2: SEQUENTIAL INSTRUCTION*****There is a detailed scope and sequence including a list of specific skills taught, a sequence for teaching the skills over the course of the year, and a timeline showing when skills are taught (by week, month, unit).***  | **Evidence:** |
| Describe where in the materials the scope and sequence can be found. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **SECTION 3: SYSTEMATIC & CUMULATIVE INSTRUCTION*****The structured lesson format includes a plan, procedure, or routine that is carried through the sequence of teaching skills.*** | **Evidence:** |
| Locations of examples within the program to demonstrate a clear and consistent lesson format. |  |
| Location of examples of a daily schedule of lessons noting suggestions for timing of each component and overall pacing. |  |
| Location of examples to support time spent in whole group and small group formats. |  |
| Location of examples that supports independent or group practice that occurs after teacher-led instruction on the skill. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **SECTION 4: COORDINATED COMPONENTS*****Elements of the program are clearly linked.*** | **Evidence:** |
| Location of examples that demonstrate the same routines, terminology, and procedures are used across skill areas and over time. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how foundational skills and higher order skills are integrated across areas (e.g., phonemic awareness and phonics, phonemic awareness and oral language).Include location of examples within the materials which align to the explanation provided. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiating instruction for students who are struggling or need enrichment, in the core program and in supplemental programs is addressed within the materials. Include location of examples within the materials which align to the explanation provided. |  |
| Location of examples of differentiation and support which are provided for supporting: * English Learners
* Students who are struggling
* Students who need acceleration.
 |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **SECTION 5: RELATED ELEMENTS*****The program contains features that are optimal for delivering effective instruction.*** | **Evidence:** |
| Location of examples of the following assessment tools:* Formative (e.g., progress monitoring)
* Summative (e.g., unit tests)
* Framework for data-based decision making
 |  |
| Location of examples of the following environmental considerations: * Classroom management to support small group instruction
* Motivation for students (e.g., built-in choice, charts/graphs of progress, immediate feedback on progress)
 |  |
| Please describe what professional development opportunities are available. Please indicate what is included with purchase and what would be an additional cost.  |  |
| **Only complete this section if vendor offers professional development** **on how to implement the submitted program.** To be considered for inclusion on the professional development list for program specific support, evidence of the following must be provided:* A clear scope and sequence with objectives for learning, to explain the content of the professional development.
* A description of how demonstration of learning is provided
* Opportunities for targeted practice of skills being taught as well as opportunities to reflect on the learning
* Built in interactive learning opportunities that align with the content (e.g., videos, application of content, required discussions, etc.)
* Rigorous evaluations of learning throughout the course
* A rigorous end of course evaluation
* Describe the opportunities participants have to give feedback on the course, content, and delivery.
 |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Required to complete if applying for program submissions in a language of instruction other than English.****[ ]  Spanish****[ ]  Other**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide location of examples where language of instruction is not a direct translation from English.  |  |
| Provide location of examples of language support which aid in bridging from language of instruction to English. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation within each core component of reading is aligned to research and linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation.  |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase 2 Worksheet: Scientifically-Based or Evidence-Based Core & Supplemental Reading Programs***Complete this worksheet for* ***core & supplemental programs*** *submitted for review. Please complete all sections that align with the program as stated in Section C of this application.***Select the appropriate box below:**[ ]  Completed for Core[ ]  Completed for Supplemental |
| **Name of Program:**  |
| **Kindergarten** |
| **SECTION 1: PHONOLOGICAL AND PHONEMIC AWARENESS** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonological and phonemic awareness skills progress from easier to more difficult, culminating in advanced skills such as addition, deletion and substitution of phonemes.
* new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples.
* when new skills are introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided.
* students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback.
* movement and/or manipulatives are used to make sounds in words concrete.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonemic awareness instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation.  |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Phonics and Word Study**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonics skills progress systematically from easier to more difficult and are adequately designed and addressed throughout the grade level.
* new skills are explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples before students practice and apply.
* skills are learned to automaticity through frequent and cumulative review.
 |  |
| Location of word lists, phrases and controlled decodable texts utilized to provide enough exposures to learned words that they become sight words (i.e., words known with automaticity). |  |
| Location of examples of:* how words are taught and learned in isolation before practiced in text;
* how words in texts used for independent reading have been taught in prior phonics lessons.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Vocabulary** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* words selected for instruction are rich, high-utility words (i.e., tier 2) that will appear in conversation and literature, those that must be learned to understand a concept or text, and words from content area instruction.
* new words are introduced with a student-friendly definition that includes multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples.
* words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts.
* there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words.
* morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to teach building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Listening Comprehension** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* students are taught to do an oral retelling of events or stories they listen to.
* story structure is modeled with multiple unambiguous examples.
* high-utility Tier 2 words are pre-selected and taught before, during and after reading aloud.
* selections include a variety of questions to model and ask while reading aloud.
 |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **First Grade** |
| **Section 1: Phonological and Phonemic Awareness**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonological and phonemic awareness skills progress from easier to more difficult, culminating in advanced skills such as addition, deletion and substitution of phonemes.
* new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples.
* when new skills are introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided.
* students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback.
* movement and/or manipulatives are used to make sounds in words concrete.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonemic awareness instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Phonics and Word Study**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonics skills progress systematically from easier to more difficult and are adequately designed and addressed throughout the grade level.
* new skills are explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples before students practice and apply.
* skills are learned to automaticity through frequent and cumulative review.
 |  |
| Provide the locations of example phonics lesson formats to ensure reviewers are able to confirm the following:* brief cumulative review of previously taught skills
* a phonological warm up
* phoneme-grapheme matching
* word reading accuracy
* fluency building at the word, phrase, sentence and passage level
* sentence dictation
* transfer to text
 |  |
| Location of examples to demonstrate repeated opportunities to read words in the context of controlled, decodable texts that contain the phonic elements and irregular words students have learned previously. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Vocabulary** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* words selected for instruction are rich, high-utility words that will appear in conversation and literature, those that must be learned to understand a concept or text, and words from content area instruction.
* new words are introduced with a student-friendly definition that includes multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples.
* words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts.
* there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words.
* morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to teach building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 4: Text Reading and Fluency** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide a description and location of examples of text selections that adhere to the following criteria:* Resources that support sentence and passage reading are introduced after students can accurately and automatically read a sufficient number of VC and CVC words along with a few high-utility irregular words.
* The text students are asked to read independently include only the letter-sounds, phonic elements and word types that have been previously taught in phonics lessons.
* Fluency building in connected text is done only with passages the student can read accurately.
* Materials are available for teachers to read aloud for the purpose of modeling fluent reading.
 |  |
| Location of examples to confirm there are sufficient numbers of controlled decodable texts that align to the phonics scope and sequence to allow students to practice to automaticity. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 5: Reading Comprehension** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide location examples to demonstrate there are multiple controlled, decodable texts by skill available to support independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction. |  |
| Provide a description and location of examples demonstrating how background knowledge is supported through various text types.  |  |
| Location of examples which demonstrate the following supports are provided:* Comprehension strategies are taught with multiple carefully designed, unambiguous examples.
* Comprehension strategies are practiced and cumulatively reviewed over time.
* Previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and text.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Grade 2 & 3** |
| **Section 1: Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Word Study**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonological awareness and phonics skills progress systematically from easier to more difficult and are adequately designed and addressed throughout the grade level.
* new skills are explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples before students practice and apply.
* skills are learned to automaticity through frequent and cumulative review.
* step by step routines teach new advanced phonics patterns.
 |  |
| Provide the locations of example phonics lesson formats in order for reviewers to confirm the following:* brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,
* a phonological warm up,
* phoneme-grapheme matching,
* word reading accuracy,
* fluency building at the word, phrase, sentence and passage level,
* sentence dictation,
* transfer to text
 |  |
| Provide location of examples which demonstrate students are able to practice to automaticity the full continuum of phonological and phonemic awareness skills from early (rhyming and onset-rime) to basic (segmenting and blending) to advanced (sound manipulation and deletion) that were previously learned in kindergarten and first grade. |  |
| Provide location of examples to demonstrate that text provided adheres to the following criteria:* Text for independent reading does not contain words that have phonics patterns that haven’t been taught in a prior phonics lesson.
* Repeated opportunities are provided to read words in the context of controlled decodable texts that contain the phonic elements and irregular words students have learned previously.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Vocabulary** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* words selected for instruction are rich, high-utility words that will appear in conversation and literature, those that must be learned to understand a concept or text, and words from content area instruction.
* new words are introduced with a student-friendly definition that includes multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples.
* words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts.
* there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words.
* morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to teach building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes.
 |  |
| Provide examples which demonstrate how students are asked to prove understanding of word meaning by using words in oral and written sentences. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Text Reading and Fluency** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide a description and location of examples for how text selection for the following purposes are supported:* Resources that support sentence and passage reading fluency
* Types of text for small group instruction
* Types of text to be utilized for whole group instruction (shared reading & read aloud)
* Types of text for independent reading assignments
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of oral reading fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Reading Comprehension** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations of examples across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* reading comprehension instruction progresses to more complex structures.
* multiple controlled decodable texts are provided for independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction until students can accurately read.
* reading comprehension is practiced with cumulative review over the course of the year.
* previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and text.
 |  |
| Provide a description and location of examples demonstrating how background knowledge is supported through the various text types.  |  |
| Provide location of examples within the program materials that provide support with the following:* comprehension strategies are taught with multiple carefully designed unambiguous examples and text selection
* comprehension strategies are practiced and cumulatively reviewed over time
* previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and text
 |  |
| Provide an explanation and location of examples that demonstrates the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year and how it maps out across the year. (3rd grade only)  |  |
| Provide location of examples of explicit instruction in analyzing elements of narrative text and comparing and contrasting elements within and among texts. |  |
| Provide location of examples of coherent sequence of questions and tasks supports students to examine language (vocabulary, sentences, and structure) and apply their knowledge and skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase 2 Worksheet: Scientifically-Based or Evidence-Based Intervention Reading Programs***(Complete this worksheet for* ***intervention programs*** *submitted for review)***Check the box for the appropriate category(s) below:**[ ]  Phonological awareness[ ]  Phonics[ ]  Fluency[ ]  Vocabulary[ ]  Comprehension |
| **Intervention Considerations** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide description and location of examples in how the following are established:* Student placement within materials
* Pacing (intensity) toward grade level outcomes
* Monitoring of student progress
* Resources to support alignment to other tiers of instruction (if applicable)
 |  |
| **Section 1: Phonological and Phonemic Awareness**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide location of examples across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonological and phonemic awareness skills progress from easier to more difficult, culminating in advanced skills such as addition, deletion and substitution of phonemes.
* new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples.
* when new skills are introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided.
* students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback.
* movement and/or manipulatives are used to make sounds in words concrete.
 |  |
| Provide location of examples within the program materials that students are able to practice to automaticity the full continuum of phonological and phonemic awareness skills from early (rhyming and onset-rime) to basic (segmenting and blending) to advanced (sound manipulation and deletion). |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonemic awareness instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Phonics and Word Study**  | **Evidence:** |
| Provide location of examples across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* phonics skills progress systematically from easier to more difficult and are adequately designed and addressed throughout the grade level.
* phonics skills are explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples before students practice and apply.
* phonics skills are learned to automaticity through frequent and cumulative review.
* step by step routines teach new advanced phonics patterns.
 |  |
| Location of examples of the following:* where words are taught and learned in isolation before practiced in text
* word lists, phrases and controlled decodable texts utilized to provide enough exposures to the learned words that they become sight words (i.e. words known with automaticity)
 |  |
| Provide location of examples that text provided adheres to the following criteria:* Text for independent reading does not contain words that have phonics patterns that haven’t been taught in prior phonics lesson.
* Repeated opportunities are provided to read words in context of the controlled decodable text that contains the phonic elements and irregular words students have learned previously.
 |  |
| Provide the locations of example phonics lesson formats in order for reviewers to confirm the following:* brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,
* a phonological warm up,
* phoneme-grapheme matching,
* word reading accuracy,
* fluency building at the word, phrase, sentence and passage level,
* sentence dictation,
* transfer to text
 |       |
| Provide location of examples within the program materials that supports that students are able to practice to automaticity the full continuum of phonological and phonemic awareness skills from early (rhyming and onset-rime) to basic (segmenting and blending) to advanced (sound manipulation and deletion) |       |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |       |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Vocabulary** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed location of examples to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* words selected for instruction are rich, high-utility words that will appear in conversation and literature, those that must be learned to understand a concept or text, and words from content area instruction.
* new words are introduced with a student-friendly definition that includes multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples.
* words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts.
* there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words.
* morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to teach building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes.
 |  |
| Provide location of examples in the program materials of how students are asked to demonstrate understanding word meaning by using words in oral and written sentences. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needsand progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Text Reading and Fluency** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide location of examples that text provided supports the following:* sentence and passage reading are introduced after students can accurately and automatically read a sufficient number of VC and CVC words along with a few high-utility irregular words.
* the text students are asked to read independently includes only the letter-sounds, phonic elements and word types that have been previously taught in phonics lessons (if applicable).
* includes a variety of levels of connected text passages for fluency building.
* materials are available for teachers to read aloud for the purpose of modeling fluent reading.
 |  |
| Location of examples to confirm there are sufficient numbers of controlled decodable texts to allow students to practice to automaticity. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| Provide a description of how text selection for the following purposes are supported:* Types of text for small group instruction
* Types of text to be utilized for whole group instruction (shared reading & read aloud)
* Types of text for independent reading assignments
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of oral reading fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 5: Listening and Reading Comprehension** | **Evidence:** |
| Provide detailed locations of examples across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* students are taught to do an oral retelling of events or stories they listen to.
* story structure is modeled with multiple unambiguous examples.
* high-utility Tier 2 words are pre-selected and taught before, during and after reading aloud.
* selections include a variety of questions to model and ask while reading aloud.
 |  |
| Provide location of examples of multiple controlled decodable texts for independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction until students can accurately read. |  |
| Provide a description and location of examples demonstrating how background knowledge is supported through various text types.  |  |
| Location of examples that materials provide support the following:* Comprehension strategies are taught with multiple carefully designed unambiguous examples and texts.
* Comprehension strategies are practiced and cumulatively reviewed over time.
* Previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and texts.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| Provide detailed locations of examples across the grade level to ensure reviewers are able to confirm that:* reading comprehension instruction progresses to more complex structures.
* multiple controlled decodable texts are included for independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction until students can accurately read are available.
* reading comprehension is practiced with cumulative review over the course of the year.
* previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and text.
 |  |
| Provide a description and location examples demonstrating how background knowledge is supported through the various text types.  |  |
| Location of evidence that materials provide support with the following:* Comprehension strategies are taught with multiple carefully designed unambiguous examples and texts.
* Comprehension strategies are practiced and cumulatively reviewed over time.
* Previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and text.
 |  |
| Provide an explanation of the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year and how it maps out across the year (if applicable).  |  |
| Provide location of examples of explicit instruction in analyzing elements of narrative text and comparing and contrasting elements within and among texts. |  |
| Provide location of examples of coherent sequences of questions and tasks that require students to examine language (vocabulary, sentences, and structure) and apply their knowledge and skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening. |  |
| Provide an explanation of how differentiation of comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. Include locations within materials for reviewers to verify explanation. |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reading Development Theory:** Write a summary describing the following: how the brain learns to read, why some students struggle, and what is required to ensure all students develop reading competency by the end of 3rd grade.  |
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