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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(2)(b):

* 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 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 or 2021-2022 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.

## Spanish Instructional Programs

The department has created new rubrics for the review of Spanish instructional programs. All Spanish core, supplemental and intervention that were previously approved must submit to be reviewed during the 2023-2024 review cycle. Spanish programs that are currently on the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming must be reviewed using the new Spanish application and rubric. **The application is bilingual, written in English and Spanish, and rubrics are written in Spanish (an English translation can be provided). Spanish instructional programs that are not reviewed and approved during the 2023-2024 will be removed from the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming.**

## 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.

Spanish instructional programs must submit to be reviewed using the new Spanish instructional program application and rubrics during the 2023-2024 review cycle. **Spanish instructional programs that do not submit for review will not be eligible to be included on the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming.**

Submitting a *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* does not obligate a vendor to submit a Part II – Program Review Application. Vendors seeking to remove an instructional program from the review process must submit a written request to READAct@cde.state.co.us.

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.** **All materials and components of a program must be submitted for review.**

**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.*

*The criteria for Spanish instructional programs have changed. All Spanish instructional programs that are currently on the advisory list must submit to be reviewed.*

## 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*).

## Vendor Submissions

*Part I – Letter of Intent* to Apply and *Part II – Program Review* submissions must be submitted in one comprehensive application and originate from one application point of contact.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) should not expect that materials from multiple vendors will comprise a complete core, supplemental or intervention program. LEAs should expect to purchase all needed materials from one vendor. Multiple vendors may work together to package materials, however, the purchase of program materials should ensure a complete package and come from one vendor.

## Vendor Interactions During Review Period

CDE is committed to conducting an unbiased review process and ensuring that conflicts of interest do not influence the results of the review. Throughout the instructional programming review process, official department communication with vendors will be via notices on the website or through email communication initiated by CDE.

The sole point of contact for the instructional program review process is READAct@cde.state.co.us. Vendors may not reach out to the evaluation team, or other CDE staff other than the sole point of contact unless the evaluation team, or other CDE staff initiate contact.

In the event that vendors reach out to the evaluation team, or other CDE staff other than the sole point of contact to discuss or influence the evaluation and review process, the vendor’s product may, in CDE’s sole discretion, not be considered for inclusion on the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming.

CDE will provide technical assistance with submitting the application documents but will not answer questions about how to respond to items within the application. CDE will not meet with individual applicants to discuss the results of the review. Applicants should rely on feedback given in the rubric to determine whether to submit an appeal.

## Vendor Interviews

During the review process, the review committee may, at its discretion, request one or all vendors to attend a web-based (video conference), or phone interview/demonstration. Alternatively, the review committee may decide that presentations/interviews/demonstrations are not needed and may recommend inclusion on the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming without such activities.

Not all vendors may be asked to attend such presentations/interviews/demonstrations. Vendors should not assume that they will have an opportunity for such activities, so they should submit thorough applications for review.

If the review committee decides to conduct presentations/interviews/demonstrations, the selection of vendors for such activities will be made at the sole discretion of the review committee.

The participating vendor’s interview team must include the contact person or persons identified in the application. Based on questions asked, additional vendor personnel may be requested to attend. Such interviews/demonstrations/access will be at the vendor's expense.

## External Evaluation

The READ Act requires an independent evaluation pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1208 (8) to identify and assess strategies that the state, local districts, and schools have taken to support Colorado students in achieving proficiency in reading pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1208(8). Part of this evaluation process requires the examination of programs submitted for review and inclusion on the READ Act Advisory List of Instructional Programming after the CDE reviews are complete. The external evaluator will conduct a review of all applications and materials submitted to CDE for review. Applicants may be asked to provide additional information, such as usernames and passwords for digital access or documentation that the program has been studied through formal research, to the external evaluator as part of this evaluation process during the 2024-2025 school year.

## Colorado Open Records Act

The Colorado Department of Education is committed to transparency and open government. All instructional program applications and materials submitted for review are part of public records and subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, C.R.S. Title 24, Article 72, Part 2. <https://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/corapolicy>

When submitting a program application and materials, the vendor may request restrictions on the use or inspection of material contained within the proposal if allowable pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA), C.R.S. Title 24, Article 72, Part 2.

If a vendor chooses to request confidentiality of information, the confidentiality of information must be submitted through a separate Syncplicity folder. The vendor must contact READAct@cde.state.co.us to request a confidential Syncplicity folder. The vendor must provide:

* A written statement indicating what specific exemption outlined in C.R.S. 24-72-204(2) or C.R.S. 24-72-204(3) applies to the suggested confidential/proprietary information which would allow for the material to be exempted from CORA. The letter must also specifically state what elements of the application and materials are to be considered confidential/proprietary.
* The entire program application and materials with all confidential/proprietary information **redacted**.

Therefore, if submitting a program application and materials with items redacted, the vendor must notify CDE to create a Syncplicity folder to provide the redacted version.

The vendor must provide one original version with no redactions and one version with all confidential information that confidentiality is being requested for redacted.

Submitting confidential/proprietary information with the application and material documents will nullify the confidential/proprietary status and will remove any restrictions on the use or inspection of the material.

Neither an application in its entirety nor the cost/price information will be granted confidential/proprietary status.

Upon completion of the review process, the applications and materials will be open to public inspection pursuant to the Colorado Open Records Act, subject to any continued prohibition on the disclosure of confidential data. If a CORA request is received by CDE after the review is concluded, CDE may reach out to the vendor to review the CORA request.

# SECTION B: Timeline

**Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date(s)** | **Activity** |
| ​October 16, 2023    | Notification of *Part I -Letter of Intent to Apply* for Instructional Programming. |
| ​October 19, 2023 | Technical Assistance Webinar  |
| ​ November 3, 2023  | All *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* submissions for Instructional Programming due to CDE by 4:00 PM MT |
| November 6, 2023 – November 13, 2023  | CDE review of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* for Instructional Programming |
| November 14, 2023   | 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**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date(s)** | **Activity** |
| ​November 14, 2023   |  Applications for *Part II - Program Review* distributed for eligible vendors for *Part II – Program Review.* |
| November 20, 2023 | Technical Assistance Webinar: English ProgramsMonday, November 20, 2023, at 9:00 AM MT **Register for Technical Assistance Webinar** *\*This webinar will be recorded, and a recording link will be emailed to program contacts.* |
| ​December 15, 2023  | Application for *Part* *II - Program Review* **due to CDE by 4:00 PM MT** |
| ​January 2, 2024 – February 6, 2024  | CDE Review of *Part II - Program Review* applications for Instructional Programming  |
| February 7, 2024   | Vendor notification of inclusion of instructional programming on CDE Advisory List |
| February 7, 2024-February 21, 2024   | Vendor appeal window. |
| March 22, 2024  | Anticipated deadline for appeal response from the CDE. |
| ​March 22, 2024   | 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(s) for notification of review outcome. Please include all contacts working within the state of Colorado:**  | **Email(s):**  |
| **Telephone:** | **Mailing Address:**  |
| **Publisher Webpage:**  | **Product Webpage:** The webpage that is specifically related to the program materials for review.  |
| **Instruction Presentation:** *Select all that apply.*  ​​☐​ Teacher-directed program ​​☐​ Computer-based or online program​​☐​ Combination of teacher-directed and computer based/online program  | **Online material access is included to support instruction:** [ ]  Yes[ ]  No |
| **ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet:**Applicants who have an aligned study for the program submitted in this application will complete the ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet. The ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet will be reviewed to verify ESSA Levels 1, 2 or 3. Programs that do not have an aligned study will be reviewed for ESSA Level 4 during the program review process. [ ]  This program has an aligned study that meets ESSA Levels 1, 2 or 3 [ ]  This program does not have an aligned study  |
| **If the instructional program is currently in use in Colorado, please provide the names of the districts in Colorado where the program is currently being used.**       |
| **If the instructional program is currently on another state’s approved/supported instructional programming advisory list, please indicate which state and the purpose of the state’s list.**       |
| **Instructional Program Submission for Review** |
| **Please select which program type is being submitted for review and inclusion on the Advisory List.**[ ] Core, English[ ]  Supplemental, English[ ]  Intervention, English***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[ ]  Essential Program Components[ ]  Section E: Anchor Conceptual Models [ ]  Section F: Vendor Program Worksheet[ ]  Completed Vendor Program Worksheets (Appendix F)[ ]  Phase 1 Worksheet: Scientifically Based or Evidence-based Reading Programs (completion required for all program type submissions)[ ]  Usability and Professional Development [ ]  Phase 2 Worksheet: Completed corresponding program type and required elements[ ]  Optional Worksheet: Supporting Students with Dyslexia (optional for all programs)[ ]  Section G: Alignment to 2020 Reading, Writing, and Communicating Standards [ ]  ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet (for ESSA Level 1, 2, or 3)[ ]  Signature - Confirming all parts above are included **Printed Name of Representative:**     Click here to enter a date.**Signature (required):**      |

# SECTION D: 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

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.

Instructional programs will be reviewed based on the component areas noted by the vendor in the application. Vendors should mark and complete the application based on the components included in the instructional program that include an explicit scope and sequence (i.e., phonics programs should not mark vocabulary and comprehension if these are not included in the instructional materials for 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 identify where the scope and sequence is located in the materials submitted. Below, explicitly state where the scope and sequence can be found within the materials. **Response:** |

## Program Background and Summary

**Provide a summary of the instructional program and how the program meets the requirements of the READ Act. Please include any information to support reviewers in understanding the instructional program.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

## ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet

Colorado READ Act Statute requires that all programs and interventions be evidence and scientifically based. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; 2015) establishes a four-tiered method of evaluating evidence. In this program review, determinations for evidence are based on a program that meets ESSA Level Evidence. Applicants will complete the ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet to share the ESSA Level of Evidence associated with the submitted program using the following steps:

* Review the worksheet and identify if the program can submit criteria to meet ESSA Level 1, 2 or 3.
* If appropriate because the program can meet ESSA Level 1, 2, or 3 complete the attached ESSA Level Evidence worksheet.
* If a program does not have ESSA Level 1, 2, or 3. Please check the box for Level 4.
	+ Level 4 determinations are completed as part of the review conducted by CDE during this application process.

Instructions for ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet.

* **Submit the ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet as a separate file named “ESSA Worksheet\_publisher name\_program name.”**
* **Submit research studies and evidence as a separate file named “ESSA research\_publisher name\_program name.”**

## Differentiation and Support

Instructional programs will be used to provide instruction to a wide range of students. Many instructional programs provide differentiation and supports for providing instruction for English Learners, students who are struggling, and those who need acceleration. In this section, describe and provide examples of the differentiation and supports that are provided in the instructional program. This information will be made available to districts to support their considerations of instructional programs.

**Describe how the materials provide evidence-based strategies and supports for multilingual students learning to read, write and speak in English. Include any suggestions and strategies to draw upon student home language to facilitate learning Instructional materials provide appropriate linguistic support (scaffolding) for English Learners and Culturally and Linguistically Diverse students. Include a description of how this guidance is provided to teachers within the materials.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

**Describe how the materials provide evidence-based differentiation to support students who struggle, including students with disabilities and students with dyslexia. Include a description of how this guidance is provided to teachers within the materials.**

**The *Optional Worksheet: Supporting Students with Dyslexia* (Appendix F) can be completed for any program. The Optional Worksheet will be made available to districts to support their consideration of instructional programs.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

**Describe how the materials provide evidence-based differentiation to support students who need acceleration. Include a description of how this guidance is provided to teachers within the materials.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

**Describe how materials and activities included in the instructional program are universally accessible. (Examples include screen reader compatible, appropriate color contrast ratio, text to speech and speech to text, highlighting tools, color overlays, captioned videos, and ASL videos, enlarged print or control of font size, voice command option, spell check, non-linguistic representations, braille, paper copy supplements available in multiple font sizes. For digital content: alt text for images, proper heading structures, able to navigate via keyboard or switch navigation).**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

**Include a description of how the instructional program offers guidance on how and when to use accessibility features or how to appropriately match accessibility features with student needs in conversation with a specialist (e.g., does the curricula meet the needs of students with cognitive disabilities and/or is it in alignment with the Colorado Extended Evidence Outcomes** [**https://www.cde.state.co.us/coextendedeo**](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coextendedeo)**).**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

## Assessment

**Describe how the informal assessments included in the program are used to guide instructional decisions such as placement in the program, to differentiate instruction, or demonstrate mastery of skills. This information will be made available to districts to support their consideration of instructional programs.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

## Pricing Structure & 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 are sold. A pricing sheet must be included with the materials submitted for review.

**Provide a bulleted list of essential program components (core must be by grade level), a description of how the components are sold (e.g., as an all-inclusive kit, a la carte, etc.), and price for each component. Include a pricing sheet in the materials submitted for review.**

**If multiple vendors are working together to package materials, include an explanation of how the program materials will be purchased to ensure purchase of a complete package coming from one vendor.**

**Submit the pricing sheet as a separate file named “Pricing Sheet\_publisher name\_program name.”**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

CDE seeks to ensure districts do not face an undue financial burden if materials approved on the READ Act advisory list and are currently in use change in ways that no longer support inclusion on the advisory list. To that end, CDE requests that vendors, submitting revised or updated materials, provide statements about how districts will receive transition support if materials are a) not submitted for this review or b) no longer meet the requirements of the review.

 **Applicants must describe how districts or schools that purchase the instructional program materials will be provided with materials and updates beyond the initial purchase. Additionally, applicants must describe a transition plan for a district facing the situation above. Applicants must be able to provide clear information to districts regarding how long the materials will be supported by the vendor and be available for purchase.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

# SECTION E: Anchor Conceptual Model(s) and Reading Development Theory

**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.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

**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.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Response:**  |
|        |

# SECTION F: Vendor Program Worksheets

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. **Submit as a separate file named “Section G: CAS\_publisher name\_program name.”**

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 a delay in the review process.

All applications need to include the following:

* Electronic: One electronic submission meeting the specifications outlined below
* Program Materials: Electronic or digital access to **all** 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 Friday, December 15, 2023, 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

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

Vendors will receive access to a Syncplicity folder to submit the application and instructional program materials for review.

|  |
| --- |
| **Smartsheet Form**All *Part II - Program Review* application components for Sections C through H and Appendix F 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\_2024\_submission***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_supplemental\_2024\_submission***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_core\_2024\_submission***

*If submitting ESSA Level 1, 2 or 3 evidence, the ESSA Level Evidence worksheet must be submitted in PDF format. Format the filename as follows:** ***ESSA Worksheet\_publisher name\_program name***

Submissions will only be considered complete when the following have been received:* *Part II - Program Review* application documents in PDF format
* *ESSA Level Evidence Worksheet* document in PDF format (if submitting ESSA Level 1, 2, or 3 evidence)
* All program materials in scanned PDF format or online access (see below for program material submission requirements)

**All *2023 Part II - Program Review*** **application submissions must be submitted by 4:00pm MT on Friday, December 15, 2023.****Submit the *2023 Part II - Program Review* application through the Smartsheet form.**\**If the file submission for Smartsheet 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. CDE can only accept secure submissions through Syncplicity.*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Syncplicity Folder**  **Upload all program materials and the *Part II - Program Review* application into the unique Syncplicity folder link you received from Marisa Calzadillas.** (The email will come from Syncplicity and will state “a file has been shared by Marisa Calzadillas”.) Vendors will receive a unique Syncplicity link from no-reply@syncplicity.com.   *If you are unable to find the Syncplicity folder link, contact Marisa Calzadillas (**Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us**) by December 8, 2023, at 4:00 PM MT to ensure the submission will meet the application deadline*. Upload all *Part II - Program Review* application components and all instructional program materials to the Syncplicity folder in a PDF format as follows.  **Application Folder** *The Part II - Program Review* *application submission must be submitted in PDF format. Format the filenames for the files as follows:* **Application*** ***publisher name\_program name\_intervention\_2024\_submission***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_supplemental\_2024\_submission***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_core\_2024\_submission***

**Other Files*** ***Pricing Sheet\_publisher name\_program name***
* ***Section G\_CAS Alignment\_publisher name\_program name***
* If submitting ESSA Levels 1, 2 or 3:
	+ ***ESSA Worksheet\_publisher name\_program name***
	+ ***ESSA\_publisher name\_program name***

**Materials Folder** *All instructional program materials included in the program must be submitted for review. Materials must be submitted electronically in scanned PDF format through Syncplicity or through an online/digital platform. Name each file as follows:* * ***material name\_publisher name\_program name***
* 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. Name the document as follows:
* ***passwords\_publisher name-program name***
* *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 materials.*

**Redacted Submission Folder: Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) (optional)**If a vendor chooses to request confidentiality of information, the confidentiality of information must be submitted through a separate Syncplicity folder named “Redacted Submission”. Include the following information in this folder:* A written statement indicating what specific exemption outlined in C.R.S. 24-72-204(2) or C.R.S. 24-72-204(3) applies to the suggested confidential/proprietary information which would allow for the material to be exempted from CORA.
* The entire application and materials with all confidential/proprietary information **redacted**.
 |

# 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, 2.06*

**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, 2.11*

* **Oral Language**: The ability to produce and comprehend spoken language, including vocabulary and grammar. *CCR 301-92, 2.23*
* **Phonological Awareness:** Awareness of the sound structure of spoken words at three levels. *CCR 301-92, 2.25*
* **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, 2.24*
* **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, 2.26*
* **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, 2.40*
* **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, 2.05*
* **Fluency:** The capacity to read words in connected text with sufficient accuracy, rate, and prosody to comprehend what is read. *CCR 301-92, 2.13*

**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, 2.10*

**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, 2.16*

* **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, 2.15*

**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, 2.32*

* **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, 2.38*

**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, 2.34*

# 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 Worksheets

|  |
| --- |
| **Vendor Program Worksheets****Instructions:** The vendor worksheets 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: *Phase 1 Worksheet: Scientifically-Based or Evidence-Based Reading Programs* must be fully completed for all programs submitted for review.
* All sections of the worksheet titled: *Usability and Professional Development* must be completed for all programs submitted for review.
* Select the Phase 2 worksheet that aligns with the program type (core, supplemental, intervention) submitted for review.
* Complete all components that align with the program being submitted.
* Vendors may choose to complete the worksheet titled: *Optional Worksheet: Supporting Students with Dyslexia.*
* **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.”. Vendors should provide multiple examples of evidence in a variety of locations throughout the program materials.

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.***NOTE: Applicants may use the worksheets as templates but must address all features and content in the order presented in the templates.***  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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: Research Alignment - The program reflects current and confirmed research in reading and cognitive science.** | **Evidence:** |
| For the grades for which the program is submitted, the program must include evidence of alignment to ESSA Evidence Level 1, 2, 3 or 4. If Level 4, then a logic model must be submitted. |  |
| The program provides evidence of grounding in conceptual research and theoretical models with reference to research articles and websites. If the program is constructed for learning to read in a language other than English, a conceptual model and research foundation, as well as evidence that it is not merely a translation of an English program is provided. |  |
| There is an obvious emphasis on teaching and learning the five essential early literacy skills.  |  |
| The program reflects the understanding that reading is a language-based skill and learning to read depends on mapping sounds to print. |  |
| Word recognition is explicitly taught through relating sounds to letters, and not visual memory, guessing, the shape of the word, or the use of context clues to decode words. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Explicit Instruction – Students are introduced to the new skill before they are asked to perform it.**  | **Evidence:** |
| Lessons include instructional routines and/or scripts that note what the teacher should say, include a step-by-step sequence, include procedures, and consistent academic language and vocabulary that relates back to grade level outcomes and standards. |  |
| Routines include language for the teacher to introduce, define or explain new skills through demonstration and modeling before students are asked to perform the skills. |  |
| There are multiple opportunities for students to practice new skills with instructions for the teacher to give immediate corrective feedback. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: 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:** |
| The scope and sequence for a skill **within** a grade shows a clear progression from easier to harder, and is appropriate for the grade for which the program is designed. |  |
| Advanced skills are not introduced before students have been taught pre-requisite skills. |  |
| The scope and sequence at each grade level articulates when skills are taught **across** grades. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Systematic & Cumulative Instruction – The structured lesson format includes a plan, procedure, or routine that is carried through the sequence of teaching skills.** | **Evidence:** |
| A clear and consistent lesson format is present in program lessons for each of the five foundational skill areas at each grade. |  |
| There is a daily schedule of lessons noting suggestions for the length of lessons and units. There is a daily schedule of lessons noting suggestions for the length of time dedicated to each of the foundational skill areas that is consistent across lessons and units. |  |
| Time is spent in whole group and small group formats, with the majority of instruction delivered in small, flexible, skill-based groups. |  |
| Independent or group practice occurs after teacher-led instruction on the essential skills, not before the teacher-led instruction and not without it or instead of it. |  |
| Lessons include instructional routines, noting what the teacher should say, which includes a step-by-step sequence, procedures, and consistent language across lessons and grades. |  |
| The teacher manual(s) include directions for how to implement lessons (e.g., materials, target skill, script or wording for how to teach, examples to use, specific content such as word lists or book list). |  |
| High-priority skills are cumulatively reviewed. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 5: Coordinated Components - Elements of the program are clearly linked.** | **Evidence:** |
| The same routines, terminology, and procedures are used across skill areas and over time. |  |
| There is a clear link between foundational skills and higher order skills. Skills are integrated across areas (e.g. phonemic awareness and phonics, phonemic awareness and oral language). |  |
| Lessons and materials are available for differentiating instruction for students who are struggling or need enrichment, in the core program and in supplemental programs.  |  |
| Differentiation and support are provided for supporting English Learners, students who are struggling, and those who need acceleration. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 6: Related Elements – The program contains features that are optimal for delivering effective instruction.** | **Evidence:** |
| Assessment·       Formative (e.g., progress monitoring)·       Summative (e.g., unit tests)·       Framework for data-based decision making |  |
| Environment·       Classroom management to support small group instruction·       Motivation for students (e.g., built-in choice, charts/graphs of progress, immediate feedback on progress) |  |
| Explicit links to state standards and grade level expectations. |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Usability and Professional Development***This worksheet must be completed for* ***all programs*** *submitted for review.* |
| **Section 5: Usability** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| materials are well organized and easy to locate |  |
| teacher editions are concise and easy to manage with clear connections between teacher resources |  |
| the reading selections are centrally located within the materials and the center of the focus |  |
| the content can be reasonably completed within a regular school year and the pacing of content allows for maximum student understanding |  |
| the materials provide guidance about the amount of time a task might reasonably take |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 6: Professional Development** |  |
| **In the core instructional program…** |  |
| Professional Development ·       Professional development and coaching are available to support implementing the program with fidelity. |  |
| Professional Development – Program Specific Advisory List·       Meets statute criteria·       Assurances signed |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase 2 Worksheet: Scientifically-Based or Evidence-Based Core or Supplemental Reading Programs***Complete this worksheet for* ***core or 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**Check the box for the appropriate category(s) below:**[ ]  Phonological awareness[ ]  Phonics[ ]  Fluency[ ]  Vocabulary[ ]  Comprehension*\*Note core programs must submit all components for review.* |
| **Name of Program:** |
| **Kindergarten** |
| **Section 1: Phonological and Phonemic Awareness**  |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| a detailed scope and sequence of phonological and phonemic awareness skills progresses from easier (e.g., blending compound words or segmenting onset-rime) to more difficult (e.g., segmenting phonemes), culminating in advanced skills such as addition, deletion and substitution of phonemes |  |
| new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples, where the new skill is introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided, students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| students are taught strategies to demonstrate and practice how sounds are connected to letters (e.g. phoneme-grapheme mapping) (working toward understanding of the alphabetic principle) |  |
| students analyze spoken words at the phoneme level, including segmenting individual phonemes |  |
| movement and/or manipulatives are used to make sounds in words concrete |  |
| the order of attention to phonemes in three-phoneme words is first sound, last sound, middle sound |  |
| instructional time is focused on high priority skills such as isolating beginning phoneme, blending, segmenting and manipulating phonemes |  |
| students are taught to blend and segment phonemes in three-, four- and five-phoneme words |  |
| students are taught to pull apart the two phonemes in consonant blends when segmenting |  |
| students spend time practicing orally producing the sounds in spoken words, not just identifying the sounds or matching the sounds using objects or pictures |  |
| the activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonemic awareness instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Phonics and Word Study**  |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of phonics skills that progresses from simple letter-sounds to more complex patterns |  |
| the phonics lesson format includeso   brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,o   a phonological warm up,o   phoneme-grapheme matching,o   word reading accuracy,o   fluency building at the word, phrase, and eventually simple sentence level,o   word dictation,o   transfer to simple decodable text |  |
| new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples, where the new skill is introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided, students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback (e.g. an explicit step by step routine is utilized) |  |
| letter-sound instruction starts with high-utility letters (i.e., m, s, a, r, t) |  |
| letter-sound instruction integrates the letter name, sound, and explicitly and systematically how to write the symbol |  |
| the letter that represents the sound is explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples before students practice and apply |  |
| letter-sound combinations are learned to automaticity through frequent and cumulative review |  |
| phonics lessons include segmenting at the level of individual phonemes then matching graphemes to phonemes |  |
| easily confused letters, letter-sounds and words (those that look or sound similar) are not taught in close sequence but are separated in time |  |
| a few short vowel letter-sounds are taught early so students can blend VC and CVC patterns to read and write words |  |
| there is an explicit strategy for blending letter sounds into words |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to practice blending letter sounds for the purpose of reading and writing words |  |
| students are taught and practice how to build regular words for which they know all letter sounds |  |
| students practice to automaticity in word lists, phrases and controlled decodable texts that provide enough exposures to the learned words that they become sight words |  |
| regular word types are introduced first (e.g., VC, CVC, CV) |  |
| irregularities are pointed out in high utility words (i.e., have, I, said) while still focusing attention on the predictable letter-sound combinations |  |
| irregular, high-utility words are introduced and practiced to automaticity |  |
| the number of irregular words introduced in a lesson is minimized |  |
| words are taught and learned in isolation before practiced in text; words in texts used for independent reading are the ones that have been taught in prior phonics lessons |  |
| there is cumulative review of known letter-sound combinations and words |  |
| there are repeated opportunities to read words in context of the controlled decodable text that contain the phonic elements and irregular words students have learned previously |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Vocabulary** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of vocabulary skills  |  |
| 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 explicitly modeled using student-friendly definitions, multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples, and students are given opportunity to practice using the words with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts |  |
| new words are integrated into sentences and students are prompted to use them in sentences across multiple domains |  |
| students are engaged in processing word meanings at deeper levels, to associate new words with known words |  |
| there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words |  |
| students are exposed to a wide range of words through teachers reading aloud from a wide range of stories and informational text |  |
| morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to support building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Listening Comprehension** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there a clear scope and sequence that guides listening comprehension instruction, in which the goals are explicitly stated and in which the ideas follow a logical order |  |
| students are explicitly taught to do an oral retelling of events or stories that were read to them |  |
| story structure (e.g., beginning, middle, end) is modeled with multiple unambiguous examples |  |
| high-utility (e.g., 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) words are pre-selected and taught before, during and after reading aloud |  |
| the materials support engaging in interactive discussion on a wide variety of topics to expand and deepen background knowledge |  |
| the text selections include model questions to ask while reading aloud |  |
| the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year is clearly stated, mapped out across the year, and prepares students for later grades |  |
| complex topics are introduced in a carefully planned sequence through teachers reading aloud, discussions, and projects, starting with a basic introduction and building towards a deeper understanding |  |
| differentiation of listening comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress. |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **First Grade** |
| **Section 1: Phonological and Phonemic Awareness**  |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of phonological and phonemic awareness skills that 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, where the new skill is 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 to demonstrate and practice how sounds are connected to letters (e.g. phoneme-grapheme mapping) (working toward understanding of the alphabetic principle) |  |
| students analyze spoken words at the phoneme level, including segmenting individual phonemes |  |
| the order of attention to phonemes in three-sound words is first, last, middle sound |  |
| instructional time is focused on high priority skills such as isolating beginning sound, blending, segmenting and manipulating phonemes |  |
| students are taught to blend and segment sounds in three-, four-, and five-phoneme words |  |
| students are taught to pull apart the two phonemes in consonant blends when segmenting |  |
| students spend time practicing orally producing the sounds in spoken words, not just identifying the sounds or matching the sounds using objects or pictures |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonemic awareness instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Phonics and Word Study**  |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of phonics patterns that progresses from simple word types, lengths, and complexities to more complex words and syllable types |  |
| the phonics lesson format includeso   brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,o   a phonological warm up,o   phoneme-grapheme matching,o   word reading accuracy,o   fluency building at the word, phrase, and eventually simple sentence level,o   word dictation,o   transfer to simple decodable text |  |
| new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples, where the new skill is introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided, students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback (e.g. an explicit step by step routine is utilized) |  |
| there is an explicit strategy for blending letter sounds into words that is taught with multiple unambiguous examples |  |
| easily confused letters, letter-sounds and words (those that look or sound similar) are not taught in close sequence but are separated in time |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to blend and read words, and to use letter-sound correspondence to read and write words (e.g. phoneme–grapheme mapping) |  |
| students are taught and practice how to build regular words for which they know all letter sounds |  |
| students practice to automaticity in word lists, phrases and controlled decodable text that provide enough exposures for the words to become sight words |  |
| regular word types are introduced first (e.g., VC, CVC, CV) |  |
| irregular, high-utility words are introduced and practiced to automaticity |  |
| irregularities are pointed out in high frequency words (e.g., have, I, said) while still focusing attention on the predictable letter-sound combinations |  |
| the number of irregular words introduced in a lesson is minimized |  |
| words are taught and learned in isolation before practiced in text; words in texts used for independent reading are the ones that have been taught in prior phonics lessons |  |
| there is cumulative review of known letter-sound combinations and words |  |
| there are repeated opportunities to read words in context of the controlled decodable text that contain the phonic elements and irregular words students have learned previously |  |
| instruction in patterns and word families is done after letter-sound correspondences in the unit |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Vocabulary** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| 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 explicitly modeled using student-friendly definitions, multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples, and students are given opportunity to practice using the words with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts |  |
| new words are integrated into sentences and students are prompted to use them in sentences |  |
| students are engaged in processing word meanings at deeper levels, to associate new words with known words |  |
| there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words |  |
| students are exposed to a wide range of words through reading aloud from a wide range of stories and informational text |  |
| morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to support building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Text Reading and Fluency** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| 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 texts students are asked to read independently are controlled to 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 decode accurately (without hesitation or guessing) |  |
| there are sufficient numbers of controlled decodable text that align to the phonics scope and sequence to allow students to practice to automaticity |  |
| materials are available for teachers to read aloud for the purpose of modeling fluent reading, building vocabulary and background knowledge, and exposing students to text more complex than students could read on their own |  |
| differentiation of fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 5: Listening and Reading Comprehension** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| a clear scope and sequence guides comprehension instruction, in which the goal of the comprehension unit is explicitly stated and in which the ideas follow a logical order |  |
| students use controlled decodable text for independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction until they can accurately reada.     one-syllable words in isolation that contain short vowels, digraphs and blends, silent e, r-controlled vowelsb.     two-syllable words with short vowels, silent e, schwac.     50 high-utility words with spelling patterns that haven’t been taught (e.g., go, he, said, are, to, was, you, they, there, from) |  |
| the background knowledge necessary to understand text, that is read to or by students, is explicitly taught or activated |  |
| comprehension strategies are taught with multiple carefully designed unambiguous examples and text selection |  |
| reading comprehension is practiced with cumulative review over the course of the year |  |
| students hear teachers modeling and thinking aloud to identify components of story structure, using story structure as a tool for prompting information to compare and contrast, organize information, and group related ideas to maintain a consistent focus |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to listen to and explore narrative and expository text forms and engage in interactive discussion of the meanings of text |  |
| previously taught content, skills, and strategies are connected with new content and texts |  |
| text used for initial instruction in reading comprehension uses:·       familiar vocabulary,·       only words students can read accurately and have been learned previously,·       previously learned content knowledge,·       simple sentences,·       short passages |  |
| text used for reading comprehension instruction has an explicit structure (obvious beginning, middle and end) |  |
| the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year is clearly stated, mapped out across the year, and prepares students for later grades |  |
| complex topics are introduced in a carefully planned sequence through teachers reading aloud, discussions, and projects, starting with a basic introduction and building towards a deeper understanding |  |
| differentiation of comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Second Grade** |
| **Section 1: Phonics and Word Study**  |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| a detailed scope and sequence of phonics patterns moves from simple word types, lengths, and complexities to more complex words, syllable types, and multi-syllable words |  |
| the phonics lesson format includeso   brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,o   a phonological warm up,o   phoneme-grapheme matching,o   word reading accuracy,o   fluency building at the word, phrase, and eventually simple sentence level,o   word dictation,o   transfer to simple decodable text |  |
| new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples, where the new skill is introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided, students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| phonics lessons include step by step routines to teach new advanced phonics patterns |  |
| students practice to automaticity the full continuum of the 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 |  |
| multi-syllable words are explicitly taught using prefixes, suffixes, syllable types and known word parts to aid in word recognition |  |
| larger, high-utility patterns (e.g., -ight, -ing) are taught explicitly and practiced to automaticity to increase fluency of word recognition |  |
| high-utility words are introduced and practiced to automaticity |  |
| phonics patterns and high-utility words are taught and learned in isolation before introduced in text that students read independently |  |
| text for independent reading doesn’t contain words that have phonics patterns that haven’t been taught in prior phonics lessons |  |
| the number of irregular words introduced in a lesson is minimized |  |
| instruction of similar, easily-confused letter patterns are separated in time |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to read the previously learned regular and irregular words in the context of controlled text (also known as decodable text) |  |
| instruction in irregular, high-utility words focuses on predictable letter-sound combinations and irregularities |  |
| regular and irregular words are cumulatively reviewed |  |
| spelling is integrated with the phonics instruction |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Vocabulary** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| 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 explicitly modeled using student-friendly definitions, multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples, and students are given opportunity to practice using the words with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts |  |
| new words are integrated into sentences and students are prompted to use them in sentences |  |
| students are engaged in processing word meanings at deeper levels, to associate new words with known words |  |
| there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words |  |
| students are exposed to a wide range of words through reading aloud from a wide range of stories and informational text |  |
| morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to support building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes |  |
| students are taught to predict meaning using antonyms and synonyms, words in compound words, and prefixes and suffixes |  |
| students are taught simple multiple meaning words |  |
| students are asked to demonstrate understanding word meaning by using words in oral and written sentences |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Text Reading and Fluency** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| sentence and passage reading is introduced after students can accurately and automatically read a sufficient number of regular and irregular words |  |
| the texts students are asked to read independently are controlled to include only the 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 decode accurately (without hesitation or guessing) |  |
| there are sufficient numbers of controlled decodable text that aligns to the phonics scope and sequence are available to allow students to practice to automaticity |  |
| materials are available for teachers to read aloud for the purpose of modeling fluent reading, building vocabulary and background knowledge, and exposing students to text more complex than students could read on their own |  |
| differentiation of oral reading fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Reading Comprehension** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a clear scope and sequence that guides comprehension instruction, in which the goal of the comprehension unit is explicitly stated and in which the ideas follow a logical order |  |
| the background knowledge necessary to understand text, that is read to or by students, is explicitly taught or activated |  |
| modeling and thinking aloud are used to identify components of story structure, using story structure as a tool for prompting information to compare and contrast, organize information, and group related ideas to maintain a consistent focus |  |
| text used for initial instruction in reading comprehension uses:·       familiar vocabulary,·       only words students can read accurately and have been learned previously,·       previously learned content knowledge,·       simple sentences,·       short passages |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to listen to and explore narrative and expository text forms and engage in interactive discussion of the meanings of text |  |
| previously taught content, skills, and strategies are connected with new content and texts |  |
| lessons include explicit instruction in the structure and use of conventions of informational text such as titles, headings, information from graphs and charts to locate important information |  |
| lessons include explicit instruction in analyzing elements of narrative text and comparing and contrasting elements within and among texts |  |
| a 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 |  |
| reading comprehension is practiced with cumulative review over the course of the year |  |
| the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year is clearly stated, mapped out across the year, and prepares students for later grades |  |
| differentiation of reading comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Third Grade** |
| **Section 1: Phonics and Word Study**  |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of phonics patterns that progresses from simple word types, lengths, and complexities to more complex words, syllable types, and multi-syllable words (orthographically larger and more complex units) |  |
| new skills are explicitly modeled using multiple unambiguous examples, where the new skill is introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided, students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| phonics lessons include step by step routines to teach new advanced phonics patterns |  |
| the phonics lesson format includeso   brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,o   a phonological warm up,o   phoneme-grapheme matching,o   word reading accuracy,o   fluency building at the word, phrase, and eventually simple sentence level,o   word dictation,o   transfer to simple decodable text |  |
| students practice to automaticity the full continuum of the 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 |  |
| multi-syllable words are explicitly taught using root words, prefixes, suffixes, syllable types and known word parts to aid in word recognition |  |
| there is sufficient practice in automatic reading of longer, more complex, multi-syllable words |  |
| high-utility words are introduced and practiced to automaticity |  |
| phonics patterns and high-utility words are taught and learned in isolation before being introduced in text that students read independently |  |
| text for independent reading doesn’t contain words that have phonics patterns that haven’t been taught in prior phonics lessons |  |
| the number of irregular words introduced in a lesson is minimized |  |
| instruction of similar, easily-confused letter patterns are separated in time |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to read the previously learned regular and irregular words in the context of controlled text (also known as decodable text) |  |
| instruction in irregular, high-utility words focuses on predictable letter-sound combinations and irregularities |  |
| regular and irregular words are cumulatively reviewed |  |
| spelling (encoding) is integrated with the phonics instruction |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 2: Vocabulary** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| 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 explicitly modeled using student-friendly definitions, multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples, and students are given opportunity to practice using the words with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts |  |
| new words are integrated into sentences and students are prompted to use them in sentences |  |
| students are engaged in processing word meanings at deeper levels, to associate new words with known words |  |
| there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words |  |
| students are exposed o a wide range of words through reading aloud from a wide range of stories and informational text |  |
| morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to support building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes |  |
| students are taught to predict meaning using antonyms and synonyms, individual words in compound words, and prefixes and suffixes |  |
| students are taught multiple meaning words |  |
| students are asked to demonstrate understanding word meaning by using words in oral and written sentences |  |
| students are taught to use grade-appropriate dictionaries |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 3: Text Reading and Fluency** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| sentence and passage reading is introduced after students can accurately and automatically read a sufficient number of regular and irregular words |  |
| the texts students are asked to read independently are controlled to include only the 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 decode accurately (without hesitation or guessing) |  |
| sufficient numbers of controlled decodable text that aligns to the phonics scope and sequence are available to allow students to practice to automaticity |  |
| materials are available for teachers to read aloud for the purpose of modeling fluent reading, building vocabulary and background knowledge, and exposing students to text more complex than students could read on their own. |  |
| differentiation of oral reading fluency instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |
| **Section 4: Reading Comprehension** |  |
| **In the instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a clear scope and sequence that guides comprehension instruction, in which the goal of the comprehension unit is explicitly stated and in which the ideas follow a logical order |  |
| the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year is clearly stated, mapped out across the year, and prepares students for later grades |  |
| reading comprehension is practiced with cumulative review over the course of the year |  |
| the background knowledge necessary to understand text, that will be read to or by students, is explicitly taught or activated |  |
| modeling and thinking aloud are used to identify components of story structure, using story structure as a tool for prompting information to compare and contrast, organize information, and group related ideas to maintain a consistent focus |  |
| text used for reading comprehension instruction uses:·       familiar vocabulary·       only words students can read accurately·       previously learned content knowledge·       more complex sentence structure·       longer passages |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to listen to and explore narrative and expository text forms and engage in interactive discussion of the meanings of text |  |
| previously taught content, skills and strategies are connected with new content and text |  |
| topics from science, social studies, math and the arts are integrated into the content studied through text read aloud by the teacher and independent reading |  |
| lessons include explicit instruction in the structure and use of conventions of informational text such as titles, headings, information from graphs and charts to locate important information |  |
| lessons include explicit instruction in analyzing elements of narrative text and comparing and contrasting elements within and among texts |  |
| a coherent sequence of questions and tasks support students to examine language (vocabulary, sentences, and structure) and apply their knowledge and skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening |  |
| complex topics are introduced in a carefully planned sequence including teachers reading aloud, discussions, and projects, starting with a basic introduction and building towards a deeper understanding |  |
| differentiation of reading comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **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** |  |
| **In the intervention instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of phonological and phonemic awareness skills that 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 examples, where the new skill is introduced, defined and/or explained, a model or demonstration is provided, students are given opportunity to practice orally with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| segmenting at the level of individual phonemes is an instructional focus in second half of Kindergarten |  |
| students analyze spoken words at the phoneme level |  |
| movement and/or manipulatives are used to make sounds in words concrete |  |
| the order of attention to phonemes in three-phoneme words is first sound, last sound, middle sound |  |
| instructional time is focused on high priority skills such as isolating beginning phoneme, blending, segmenting and manipulating phonemes |  |
| students are taught to blend and segment phonemes in three-, four- and five-phoneme words |  |
| students are taught to pull apart the two phonemes in consonant blends when segmenting |  |
| students spend time practicing orally producing the sounds in spoken words, not just identifying the sounds or matching the sounds using objects or pictures |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness, instruction is linked to assessment data |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 2: Phonics and Word Study**  |  |
| **In the intervention instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| there is a detailed scope and sequence of phonics patterns that moves from simple word types, lengths, and complexities to more complex words, syllable types, and multi-syllable words |  |
| the phonics lesson format includeso   brief cumulative review of previously taught skills,o   a phonological warm up,o   phoneme-grapheme matching,o   word reading accuracy,o   fluency building at the word, phrase, sentence and passage level,o   sentence dictation,o   transfer to text |  |
| letter-sound (grapheme-phoneme) instruction starts with high-utility letters (i.e., m, s, a, r, t) |  |
| letter-sound (grapheme-phoneme) instruction integrates the letter name, sound, and explicitly and systematically how to write the symbol |  |
| the letter(s) (grapheme) that represents the sound (phoneme) is explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples before students practice and apply |  |
| letter-sound (grapheme-phoneme) combinations are learned to automaticity through frequent and cumulative review |  |
| easily confused letters, letter-sounds (grapheme-phoneme) and words (those that look or sound similar) are not taught in close sequence but are separated in time |  |
| a few short vowel letter-sounds (grapheme-phoneme) are taught early so students can blend VC and CVC patterns to read and write words |  |
| there is an explicit strategy for blending letter sounds (grapheme-phoneme) into words that is taught with multiple unambiguous examples (e.g., an explicit step-by-step routine is utilized) |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to practice blending letter sounds for the purpose of reading and writing words (e.g, phoneme-grapheme mapping) |  |
| students are taught and practice how to build regular words for which they know all letter sounds |  |
| students practice to automaticity in word lists, phrases and controlled decodable texts that provide enough exposures to the learned words that they become sight words |  |
| regular word types are introduced first (e.g., VC, CVC, CV) |  |
| irregularities are pointed out in high utility words (i.e., have, I, said) while still focusing attention on the predictable letter-sound combinations |  |
| irregular, high-utility words are introduced and practiced to automaticity |  |
| the number of irregular words introduced in a lesson is minimized |  |
| phonics patterns and high-utility words are taught and learned in isolation before practiced in text; words in texts used for independent reading are the ones that have been taught in prior phonics lessons |  |
| there is cumulative review of known letter-sound combinations and words |  |
| there are repeated opportunities to read words in context of the controlled decodable text that contain the phonic elements and irregular words students have learned previously |  |
| phonics lessons include step by step routines to teach new advanced phonics patterns |  |
| multi-syllable words are taught using prefixes, suffixes and known word parts that are taught explicitly |  |
| larger, high-utility patterns (e.g., -ight, -ing) are taught explicitly and practiced to automaticity to increase fluency of word recognition |  |
| word knowledge (e.g., morphology and origin) skills are taught and learned in isolation before introduced in text that students read independently |  |
| spelling (encoding) is integrated with the phonics instruction |  |
| there is sufficient practice in automatic reading of longer, more complex, multi-syllable words |  |
| differentiation of phonics instruction is linked to assessment data, with flexible grouping based on students’ needs and progress |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 3: Vocabulary** |  |
| **In the intervention instructional program…** | **Evidence:**  |
| 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 explicitly modeled using student-friendly definitions, multiple unambiguous examples and non-examples, and students are given opportunity to practice using the words with immediate corrective feedback |  |
| words that have been taught are repeated multiple times in a variety of contexts |  |
| new words are integrated into sentences and students are prompted to use them in sentences |  |
| students are engaged in processing word meanings at deeper levels, to associate new words with known words |  |
| there is cumulative review and practice of previously learned words |  |
| students are exposed to a wide range of words through reading aloud from a wide range of stories and informational text |  |
| morphemic analysis is taught explicitly and systematically to teach building word meaning through knowledge of root words, prefixes and suffixes |  |
| students are taught to predict meaning using antonyms and synonyms, words in compound words, roots, base words, prefixes and suffixes |  |
| students are taught simple multiple meaning words |  |
| students are asked to demonstrate understanding word meaning by using words in oral and written sentences |  |
| activities and materials are designed to elicit high levels of responding and engagement |  |
| differentiation of vocabulary instruction is linked to assessment data |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 4: Text Reading and Fluency** |  |
| **In the intervention instructional program…** | **Evidence:** |
| 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 |  |
| fluency building in connected text is done only with passages the student can read accurately |  |
| there are sufficient numbers of controlled decodable text that align to the phonics scope and sequence to allow students to practice to automaticity |  |
| materials are available for teachers to read aloud for the purpose of modeling fluent reading |  |
| differentiation of oral reading fluency instruction is linked to assessment data |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 5: Listening and Reading Comprehension** |  |
| **In the intervention instructional program…** |  |
| ***Listening Comprehension*** | **Evidence:** |
| there a clear scope and sequence that guides listening comprehension instruction, in which the goals are explicitly stated and in which the ideas follow a logical order |  |
| students are explicitly taught to do an oral retelling of events or stories they listen to |  |
| story structure is explicitly modeled with multiple unambiguous examples |  |
| high-utility words are pre-selected and taught before, during and after reading aloud |  |
| the materials support engaging in interactive discussion on a wide variety of topics to expand and deepen background knowledge |  |
| the text selections include model questions to ask while reading aloud |  |
| the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year is clearly stated, mapped out across the year, and prepares students for later grades |  |
| complex topics are introduced in a carefully planned sequence through teachers reading aloud, discussions, and projects, starting with a basic introduction and building towards a deeper understanding |  |
| differentiation of listening comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data |  |
| ***Reading Comprehension*** | **Evidence:** |
| a clear scope and sequence guides comprehension instruction, in which the goal is explicitly stated and in which the ideas follow a logical order |  |
| students use controlled decodable text for independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction until they can accurately and fluently read to comprehenda.     one-syllable words in isolation that contain short vowels, digraphs and blends, silent e, r-controlled vowelsb.     two-syllable words with short vowels, silent e, schwac.     50 high-utility words with spelling patterns that haven’t been taught (e.g., go, he, said, are, to, was, you, they, there, from) |  |
| students use controlled decodable text for independent, small group or scaffolded reading instruction until they can accurately and fluently apply advanced phonics skills in reading to comprehend |  |
| the background knowledge necessary to understand text, that is read to or by students, is explicitly taught or activated |  |
| there are multiple opportunities to listen to and explore narrative and expository text forms and engage in interactive discussion of the meanings of text |  |
| previously taught skills and strategies are connected with new content and text |  |
| text used for initial instruction in reading comprehension uses:·       familiar vocabulary,·       only words students can read accurately and have been learned previously,·       previously learned content knowledge,·       simple sentences,·       passages that increase in length |  |
| lessons include explicit instruction in analyzing elements of narrative text and comparing and contrasting elements within and among texts |  |
| a 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 |  |
| the specific content knowledge students will learn throughout the year is clearly stated, mapped out across the year, and prepares students for later grades |  |
| lessons include explicit instruction in the structure and use of conventions of informational text such as titles, headings, information from graphs and charts to locate important information |  |
| complex topics are introduced in a carefully planned sequence including teachers reading aloud, discussions, and projects, starting with a basic introduction and building towards a deeper understanding |  |
| differentiation of reading comprehension instruction is linked to assessment data |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Optional Worksheet: Supporting Students with Dyslexia**The [Colorado Department of Education Dyslexia Handbook](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/codyslexiahandbook)  identifies indicators of dyslexia by grade level. Vendors can choose to complete this *Optional Worksheet: Supporting Students with Dyslexia* to provide districts with information on how the program supports students with dyslexia. Programs, as determined by the vendor, may complete this worksheet to demonstrate evidence as applicable in each section. 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 that particular section. Please make sure the notes provided are explicit and succinct. Please note that CDE is not scoring this using a rubric but will be verifying evidence noted and providing that evidence to the field. Reviewers are looking for clear evidence that these items are included. Reviewers will be verifying that the items are Met or Not Met. This information will be made available to districts to support their consideration of instructional programs. |
| **Name of Program:** |
| **Kindergarten** |
| Research indicates that kindergarten screening measures are most successful when they include assessment of the following areas (Catts et al., 2015; Jenkins & Johnson, 2008): | **Evidence:** |
| • letter name and letter sound knowledge |  |
| • phonological awareness, including phoneme segmentation, blending, onset and rime; |  |
| • rapid automatic naming, including letter-naming fluency; |  |
| • letter-sound association; |  |
| • phonological memory, including nonword repetition; and |  |
| • oral expressive and receptive language, including vocabulary, syntax and comprehension. These should also be considered since oral language development can be predictive of later reading outcomes. |  |
| **Comments:**  |  |
| **First Grade**  |
| Research indicates first-grade screening measures are most successful when they include assessment of the following areas (Compton et al., 2010; Jenkins & Johnson, 2008): | **Evidence:** |
| • letter name and letter sound knowledge |  |
| • phoneme awareness, specifically phoneme segmentation, blending, and manipulation tasks; |  |
| • letter naming fluency; letter-sound association; |  |
| • phonological memory, including nonword repetition; |  |
| • oral vocabulary; and |  |
| • word recognition fluency (i.e., accuracy and rate). |  |
| The Center on Response to Intervention’s screening briefs suggest that: |  |
| • oral reading fluency should be added by the mid-first grade; and |  |
| • oral expressive and receptive language (including vocabulary, syntax and comprehension) should also be considered since oral language development can be predictive of later reading outcomes. |  |
| **Comments:**  |
| **Second and Third Grades** |
| The Center on Response to Intervention’s screening briefs indicate that in second grade, screening assessment should include: | **Evidence:** |
| • word identification, including real and nonsense words; |  |
| • oral reading fluency; |  |
| • reading comprehension; and |  |
| • consideration of oral expressive and receptive language (including vocabulary, syntax and comprehension) since oral language development can be predictive of later reading outcomes. |  |
| **Comments:** |
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