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

**Instructional Programming**

**2021-2022**

**SECTION A: Background & Purpose**

**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:

* Programming is aligned with the READ Act assessments.
* Have been 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.
* Evidence based or scientifically based
* Aligned with the preschool through elementary and secondary education standards for reading.
* Provide 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 Advisory List Review Submission is to solicit professional development products and evidence-based instructional programming including core, supplemental, and intervention in both Spanish and English, for inclusion on the READ Act Advisory Lists of Instructional Programming, pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209. This is not a competitive process and will be used to provide an advisory list for Colorado school districts.

**Advisory list information:**

The 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).*

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

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

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

The department may revise its criteria over time as needed. Providers on the current advisory lists may be removed from the list if their instructional programming is found to no longer meet the criteria.

**SECTION B: Process & Timeline**

**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 provider list for instructional programming. In order for a provider to submit materials to the CDE for full review of programs, each vendor must establish that the program submitted meets the criteria outlined in the *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* submission form. Vendors must submit a separate *Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply* for each advisory list, core, supplemental, and intervention, for the product to be reviewed for multiple advisory lists. Only those vendors that have completed the *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* application and have been asked to move forward with a full review will be considered.

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

**Completion of *Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply* does not guarantee a vendor will be approved. Vendors meeting *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* must still complete the *Part II - Program Review* and be approved before final inclusion in the READ Act Program Advisory List. Programs that meet *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* criteria will receive the *Part II - Program Review* application by email from CDE.**

Part II- Program Review

Upon approval of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply,* providers will be notified and will receive the *Part II – Program Review* application with instructions to submit materials for the second stage of the Advisory List Submission for Review. It is important to note that Part II of the Advisory List Submission for Reviewwill include a component requiring vendors to explicitly state the location of required components within the submission materials. **All application and program materials must be submitted in digital or online format. No hard copies of application or program materials will be accepted or reviewed.** Programs 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.*

**Timeline:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply** |
| October 18, 2021  | Notification of *Part - I Letter of Intent to Apply* for Instructional Programming.  |
| October 21, 2021  | Technical Assistance Webinar Thursday, October 21, 2021, at 10:00 AM MTTo register: <https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_dJF0xfT3SF618NUNCBTfDA>  |
| November 5, 2021 | All *Part I -Letter of Intent to Apply* submissions for Instructional Programming due to CDE by 4:00 PM MT |
| November 8, 2021 – November 12, 2021 | CDE review of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* for Instructional Programming |
| November 15, 2021 | Vendor notification of *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* decision. Applications distributed to eligible vendors for *Part II – Program Review*. |
| **Part II - Program Review**  |
| November 15, 2021 | Notification sent to vendors. Vendors eligible for *Part II – Program Review* receive the *Part II – Program Review* application from CDE. Application period open. |
| December 15, 2021 | Application for *Part II - Program Review* deadline. |
| January 5, 2022 – January 28, 2022 | CDE Review of *Part II - Program Review* for Instructional Programming |
| January 31, 2022 | Vendor notification of inclusion of instructional programming on CDE Advisory List |
| January 31, 2022-February 15, 2022 | Vendor appeal window. |
| March 15, 2022 | Anticipated deadline for appeal response from the CDE. |

*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:** The following version of the *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* application is intended only as a reference document for instructions and planning purposes.

*Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* applications will be submitted online via Smartsheet form.

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

**Section C: Letter of Intent to Apply**

All requested information in *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* must be included to advance on to *Part II – Program Review* of the *Advisory List Submission for Review*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Publisher:**        | **Product Title and Edition (publication year):**        |
| **Contact Person for the Review Submission:**        | **Email:**        |
| **Telephone:**        | **Mailing Address:**        |
| **Publisher Webpage:**        | **Product Webpage:**       The webpage that is specifically related to the program materials for review. |
| **Instructional Program Submission Overview** |
| **Submitting for review and inclusion on the following Advisory List:** *Indicate below which advisory list this program is being submitted for:* *Select one.** CORE
* SUPPLEMENTAL
* INTERVENTION

*Note: Vendors must submit a separate Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply for each advisory list request for the product to be reviewed for those advisory lists.* | **Program Language:***Select one.** English
* Spanish
* Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
 |
| **Target Audience:** *Select all that apply.** Kindergarten
* First Grade
* Second Grade
* Third Grade
* English Language Learners
 | **Instructional Focus:** *Select all that apply.** Phonological Awareness
* Phonics
* Vocabulary
* Comprehension
* Fluency

*Note: To be considered for core programming, all components must be included within the scope and sequence.* |
| **Meets READ Act Requirements:****Verification of understanding that all programs on the advisory list must meet READ Act requirements.** 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. If a program is aligned to or promotes Balanced Literacy or Whole Language instructional practices in the program materials or on the program website, it will not be approved.***Type your name to provide an electronic signature to verify understanding of the READ Act requirements.*** |
| **Program Summary:** Provide a short summary (1-2 pages) of the program that:* Describes the program, its instructional focus and target audience.
* Demonstrates that the program meets the READ Act requirement that instructional programs must be scientifically and evidence-based.
* If applicable, describe the change in materials and the grades or areas not previously approved that will be submitted for review.
* If the approach used in this program to teach reading has changed from past editions, include a description of how the program has changed. (i.e., relied the on Three Cueing Systems Model of Reading but now is based on the Science of Reading)

**Use the Program Summary form posted on the** [**2021-2022 Instructional Programming Review Process webpage**](http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/2022-read-act-instructional-programming-process) **and upload this document to the 2021-2022 Part I – Letter of Intent to Apply submission form.***The Program Summary must be submitted in a PDF format. Format the filename as follows:* * ***publisher name\_program name\_core\_2022\_Summary***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_supplemental\_2022\_Summary***
* ***publisher name\_program name\_intervention\_2022\_Summary***
 |
| **Digital Submission:****Verification that all program materials must be submitted digitally or in an online format for the *Part II - Program Review application*.**Only electronic versions of the completed application and program materials will be accepted. The electronic submission must be submitted in PDF form. Any materials submitted must be either available online or submitted as a PDF. Hard copies of materials cannot be accepted and will not, under any circumstances, be reviewed. ***Type your name to provide an electronic signature to verify understanding of the digital or online format submission requirements for the Part II – Program Review application.*** |

|  |
| --- |
| **All *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* submissions must be received by Friday, November 5, 2021, at 4:00 PM MT.****Submit the *Part I - Letter of Intent to Apply* through the Smartsheet form** [**https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/356d1be94e604a4f8a30442552c764fb**](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/356d1be94e604a4f8a30442552c764fb)For questions, please contact READAct@cde.state.co.us.  |

**Appendix A: 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; 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) | Lots of reading in leveled books and trade books; reading aloud by the teacher and nondirective discussion. Words important to the meaning of a text are pretaught, explained during reading, and practiced after reading. |
| **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)*  | The structure of both narrative and expository text is taught directly. Strategies are overtly modeled and practiced in a planned progression. Subskills such as main idea and theme are also taught and applied. 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)
* 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)

**Appendix B: 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**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Appendix D: Attributes of Effective Universal Instruction,** *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,** *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.
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