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Colorado READ Act

Application for Review of an Educator Preparation Program Course to Meet the Evidence-Based Teacher Training Requirement

This application is for **educator preparation programs** to submit a course for review that is designed to meet the Evidence-Based Teacher Training requirement for their teacher candidates.
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# SECTION A: Background & 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 in 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 a requirement that, by the beginning of the 2021-22 school year and continuing for each school year thereafter, each Local Education Provider (LEP) that receives per-pupil intervention money or a grant through the early literacy grant program in any budget year starting with the 2019-20 budget year shall ensure that each teacher employed to teach kindergarten or any of grades one through three successfully completes or has successfully completed evidence-based training in teaching reading as described in C.R.S. 22-7-1208(6)(a).

### **Pathways for Demonstrating Successful Completion of the Evidence- Based Training in Teaching Reading**

A teacher is deemed to have successfully completed evidenced-based training in teaching reading if evidence is submitted that the teacher completes one of the following:

* successfully completed a CDE-provided reading training designed to meet this training requirement and passed the end of course assessment of learning
* passed a CDE-approved undergraduate or graduate reading course and passed the end of course assessment of learning
* passed a CDE-approved district or BOCES reading course or a course appropriate for license renewal and passed the end of course assessment of learning
* holds a state of Colorado endorsement as a [Reading Teacher or Reading Specialist](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeprof/endorsementrequirements)
* successfully completed a training program included on the department’s [advisory list of professional development programs](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/option-advisorylistofpd) and passed the end of course assessment of learning. (1 CCR 301-92,13.01(C)(2))

If a teacher completes one of the evidence-based training options listed but lacks proof of passing an end of course assessment, the teacher may take and pass an alternate assessment authorized by the State Board aligned to the expectations of this section. (1 CCR 301-92,13.01(C)(3)) [The Praxis Teaching Reading: Elementary (5205) content exam](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/boardapprovedalternativeassessments) has been approved by the State Board of Education as the alternate assessment option.

### **Coursework Alternate Pathway**

There are several options to meet the criteria for evidenced-based training in teaching reading required for K-3 teachers including providing evidence of coursework completion that aligns with the teacher training requirements. A teacher is deemed to have successfully completed evidenced-based training in teaching reading if the teacher submits evidence that they passed a CDE-approved undergraduate or graduate reading course or a course appropriate for license renewal and passed the end of course assessment of learning (1 CCR 301-92, 13.01(C)(2)(b) and (c)).

Completion and submission of this application will provide the CDE with the information needed to thoroughly review and determine if the undergraduate or graduate course submitted will be approved to meet the requirements of the evidence-based training in teaching reading.

### **Criteria**

***The department may revise its criteria over time as needed.***

Applicants are advised that they must review all statute and rule requirements related to this option. Any applications that do not address all requirements will be denied. The educator preparation program course(s) submitted for review must meet the following criteria:

* addresses all content of the Colorado Educator preparation literacy standards referenced in [1 CCR 301-101, section 4.02(5) through 4.02(12)](https://www.sos.state.co.us/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=8527&fileName=1%20CCR%20301-101#page=12)
* focuses on or aligns with the science of reading, including teaching in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills, and reading comprehension pursuant to 22-7-1209(2)(c)(I).

■ is based on the science of teaching reading as articulated in the work of the National Reading Panel (NRP) and subsequent, up-to-date, peer-reviewed, evidence-based research in reading instruction.

* Any course submitted with content that does not align with the science of teaching reading as described above will be denied.
* is aligned to the requirements of the [Colorado READ Act](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readactstatuteandstateboardrules) and the K – 3 Colorado Academic Standards in reading, writing, and communicating.
* includes information on how the brain learns to read and the nature of reading difficulties (e.g. dyslexia, generalized language learning disorders) as well as special considerations for supporting culturally and linguistically diverse learners with learning to read.
* includes a minimum of 45 hours of content (1 CCR 301-92, 13.01(C).
  + internship/student teaching hours are will not be considered for inclusion in this minimum of 45 content hours.
* includes rigorous evaluations of learning throughout and at the end of the course that a person taking the course must pass to successfully complete the course pursuant to 22-7-1208(6)(b) and 22-7-1209(2)(c)(II).
  + Submitted applications must include a copy of the end of course assessment, with correct answers indicated and an outlined passing score. This assessment must reflect student competency with the required course content.
* Applicants who plan to submit multiple courses as part of a series to fulfill this requirement must contact CDE at [readact@cde.state.co.us](mailto:readact@cde.state.co.us) prior completing the application.

**\*An application missing any of the above items will not be reviewed.**

### **Overview of the Review Process**

Each application will be submitted once and reviewed in **two phases**.

In **Phase 1** reviewers will evaluate course alignment with:

* Minimum Colorado statute and rule requirements
* Scientifically-based reading research
* Effective course model & delivery

Courses that meet criteria in *Phase 1* will move on to *Phase 2*.

The **Phase 2** review involves evaluating the extent to which the course(s) is aligned to effective instructional practices and the Colorado Educator preparation literacy standards referenced in [1 CCR 301-101, section 4.02(5) through 4.02(12)](https://www.sos.state.co.us/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=8527&fileName=1%20CCR%20301-101#page=12)

### **Educator Preparation Program Application Review Timeline**

Rolling Application – no set due date

This application is on a rolling timeline and can be submitted for review at any time. All applications will be reviewed in the order in which they were received.

**Note:** The following version of the application is intended only as a reference document for instructions and application planning purposes.

Applications will be submitted online via [Smartsheet Form](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e).

Submission of application materials either in hard copy or via e-mail will not be accepted.

# **APPLICATION PHASE 1: SECTIONS B-E**

# SECTION B: Applicant Information

|  |
| --- |
| **Contact Information**  *\*\*\*to be completed on the electronic* [*smartsheet application form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)*\*\*\** |
| Educator Preparation Program Name: |
| Department or College (if applicable): |
| Primary Contact Person for this Review Submission: |
| Primary Contact Telephone: |
| Primary Contact Email: |
| Title of Course(s): |
| Instructor(s) of Record: |
| Catalog/Website link (if available): |

# SECTION C: Minimum Statute and Rule Requirements

*\*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic smartsheet application form*\*\*\*

Pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209 (2)(V)(c) please ensure the following components are present within the course(s) submitted:

**Minimum of 45 content hours**

List the number of content hours required to successfully complete the course(s).

*\*Internship/student teaching hours will not be considered for inclusion in this minimum of 45 content hours.*

**Includes rigorous evaluation of learning throughout the course**

Please include a short description of the rigorous evaluation of learning throughout the course. In the description include, at a minimum:

1. the types of assessment
2. the frequency
3. how they are scored and what makes them rigorous.

*Please describe where these assessments can be located within the course materials submitted for review.*

**An end of course evaluation that must be passed to successfully complete the course.**

Please submit a copy of the end of course evaluation as well as include a short description of how the evaluation will be administered (format) and scored (how data is collected/reviewed).

*Please describe where this assessment can be located within the course materials submitted for review.*

# SECTION D: Reading Development Theory

*\*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic* [*smartsheet application form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)\*\*\*

Research shows that reading instruction that is focused on the foundational reading skills of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills, and reading comprehension is highly effective in teaching young children to read. It is essential that all approved courses align to Colorado’s focus on scientifically and evidence-based reading practices. This is essential to ensure knowledge and transfer to practice.

**Write a summary describing how the course aligns to the criteria outlined below.**

### **Theoretical Models of Reading Acquisition**

* The theoretical model(s) the course is grounded in and how that aligns with the evidence base of how children learn to read and the science of reading, including teaching in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, reading fluency including oral skills and reading comprehension
* Include the author(s) of the model(s) as well as a citation for the model(s)

### **Cognitive Science**

* How the brain learns to read
* The nature of reading difficulty
* What is required to ensure all students develop reading competency by the end of 3rd grade

### **Science of Reading and Evidence-Based Practices**

* How the course directly supports understanding of the science of reading and evidence-based practices

*\*Inclusion of material that is not in alignment with the science of reading and evidence-based practices will result in denial of the application. See Appendix A for more support.\**

# SECTION E: Course Model & Delivery

*\*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic* [*smartsheet application form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)\*\*\*

### **Syllabus/Course Outline**

Provide a complete syllabus or outline that describes the scope & sequence and objectives for learning that clearly explain the content of the course(s). The syllabus should include books, articles, videos, and all other resources used in the course.

### **Summary of Educator Preparation Course(s)**

Provide a clear and concise summary of the course. This summary must include, but is not limited to, the following:

* An explanation of evidence-based instructional strategies introduced throughout the course(s).
* A description of how demonstration of new learning and opportunities for practice are provided (e.g. instructor modeling, videos, etc.) and
  + how participants will transfer this knowledge to teaching practices (see Appendix B
* Delivery format (e.g. face-to-face, online only, online with a face-to-face component, etc.) and pacing.
* A description of the overall course design

### **Alignment to the Colorado READ Act and K-3 Colorado Academic Standards**

Clearly and concisely describe how the course aligns to:

* The [Colorado READ Act](http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readactstatuteandstateboardrules)
* [K-3 Colorado Reading, Writing, and Communicating Standards](http://www.cde.state.co.us/coreadingwriting/reading-writing-and-communicating-academic-standards).

### **Alignment with Adult Learning Theory**

Provide a clear and concise summary of how this course aligns with adult learning theory. See Appendix B for additional support.

### **Evaluation of Effectiveness in Delivery**

Describe the opportunities that participants have to give feedback on the course content and delivery and how this information will be used. See Appendix C for additional support.

# **APPLICATION PHASE 2: SECTION F**

# **SECTION F: Alignment to Colorado Educator Preparation literacy standards referenced in** [**1 CCR 301-101, section 4.02(5) through 4.02(12)**](https://www.sos.state.co.us/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=8527&fileName=1%20CCR%20301-101#page=12)

*\*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, clearly labeled, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic* [*smartsheet application form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)\*\*\*

**Instructions:**

In each section of the Phase 2 Worksheet (Appendix G), provide notes in the space titled *evidence* detailing the location in the submitted materials where the reviewers may locate content. Please ensure the notes provided are explicit and succinct. *The written expression section is optional and will not be scored during review.*

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

***NOTE: Applicants may use the worksheet in Appendix G as a template or choose to create their own template. If the applicant chooses to create their own template, all features and content must be addressed in the order presented in the template in Appendix G.***

# SECTION G: Assurances

*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, clearly labeled, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic* [*smartsheet application form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)\*\*\*

1. Standardization of course content and supports (e.g. presenter materials, delivery formats, etc.)

2. Documentation that the syllabus has been authorized by the university or college

3. Statement assuring that the syllabus will not be adjusted after approval

# SECTION H: Educator Preparation Program Review & Agreement of Application Completion

*\*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic smartsheet application form*\*\*\*

**Educator Preparation Program Review**

Each Educator Preparation Program that submits a course(s) for review is required to complete an internal review of their course(s). The internal review should be completed by a team comprised of a variety of stakeholders representing various roles within your system. This team will utilize the CDE K-3 evidence-based teacher training rubric to score the application and materials being submitted.

This team will be required to complete the rubric and provide notes to the CDE for each rating selected for each criterion throughout the rubric.

This pre-scored rubric will be submitted to the CDE within electronic application.

**Agreement of Completion**

An agreement of completion form will be provided online with the application materials. This form will include the information below in this section. Please complete this form and submit with this section of the application.

**To be reviewed, the following sections must be completed within the application:**

*Check each box and sign below to indicate each required section has been included and is complete.*

* Section C: Minimum Statute Requirements
* Section D: Reading Development Theory
* Section E: Course Model & Delivery
* Section F: Phase 2 Worksheet
* Section G: Assurances
* Section H: Educator Preparation Program Review & Agreement of Application Completion
* Section I: Course Materials

# SECTION I: Course Materials

*\*\*\*All components in this section need to be completed, saved as a PDF with the appropriate title and uploaded to the electronic* [*smartsheet application form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)\*\*\*

The application should include course materials necessary for review, including but not limited to:

* Course slide presentations with instructor notes
* Reference List (list of all referenced articles, books, videos, etc.)
* List of course assignments/activities not included in the course outline/syllabi
  + Description of course assignments/activities
* Course discussion topics
* Copies of rigorous evaluation of learning throughout the course (quizzes with correct answer keys, assignment rubrics, etc.)
* End of course assessment with correct answer key/rubric

# SECTION J: Required Format & Submission Details

**Electronic Submission Requirements:**

*An electronic version of the completed application must be submitted.* Please submit this application, in full, to the smartsheet form. You will receive a confirmation notice once the application has been submitted to the form. **An incomplete application will not be reviewed by the CDE.**

*The application attachments must be submitted in a PDF form in the “Application Attachments” section of the* [*smartsheet form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/e02440fefe194a8d97f7a257d91f866e)*.*

Format the filenames as follows:

*EPPname = Educator Preparation Program Name*

**SECTION C:** EPPname\_EBTT\_SecC\_minimum

**SECTION D:** EPPname\_EBTT\_SecD\_readingdevtheory

**SECTION E:** EPPname\_EBTT\_SecE\_coursemodel

**SECTION F** (**Phase 2 Worksheet)**: EPPname\_EBTT\_SecF\_worksheet

**SECTION G:** EPPname\_EBTT\_SecG\_assurances

**SECTION H:** EPPname\_EBTT\_SecH\_rubric

**SECTION H:** EPPname\_SecH\_AgreementofCompletion\_signature

**SECTION I (Course Materials):** EPPname\_EBTT\_coursematerials

All files (except for the scored rubric) above need to include:

* PDF format
* A footer with the following: *Ed Prep Program Name, date of submission, and page numbers*

If the supporting materials for your application are too large to be attached to the smartsheet form, please reach out to Marisa Calzadillas at [Calzadillas\_m@cde.state.co.us](mailto:Calzadillas_m@cde.state.co.us).

*Once your application submission has been received within the smartsheet form you will receive a confirmation response. Should the department need any additional information to determine the decision, an email will be sent to the contact provided within the application*.

**Application Questions:**

Please submit all questions related to the application process to the READ Act email address: [readact@cde.state.co.us](mailto:readact@cde.state.co.us).

# Appendices

**Appendix A: Comparison of Reading Approaches**

This chart was adapted from a guide which Dr. Louisa Moats 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 understanding of Scientifically Based Reading Research and evidence-based practices are linked in the final row of the chart.

**Comparison of Reading Approaches**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories** | **Scientifically Based Practices** | **Not Scientifically Based Practices** |
| **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 that are 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 by:   * Directly teaching the structure of both narrative and expository text. * Overtly modeling strategies and practicing in a planned progression. * Directly addressing subskills such as choice 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/) * [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*   Attributes of Effective Targeted and Intensive Instructional Intervention, *CCR 301-92 7.00* | | |
|  |  |  |

Adapted from  [*Moats, 2007*](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498005) *and* [*Shanahan, 2019*](https://shanahanonliteracy.com/blog/why-not-teach-reading-comprehension-for-a-change)

**Appendix B: Principles of Evidence-Based Professional Development**

Principles of Evidence-Based Professional Development Research on effective professional development provides solid guidance on evidence-based practices when designing and delivering professional learning for teachers. The findings have repeatedly pointed to four specific features that have the strongest evidence of yielding high gains and rates of transfer. These critical elements include 1. Presentation 2. Demonstration 3. Practice with Feedback 4. Ongoing Support. While each of these components is beneficial, they must all work together to have the strongest impact (Joyce & Showers, 2002). The following table provides additional information about each of these elements and its role within the professional learning model. Professional development that adheres to these suggestions and fits into the overall school plan has been proven to improve student achievement through enhanced teacher practice.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Elements of Effective Professional Development**  (Joyce & Showers, 2002) | |
| **Presentation of theory/strategy** | When presenting a theory, concept, or strategy, participants must be actively engaged by the presenter. Teachers must be informed of the rationale for the learning and should only be exposed to strategies that are evidence-based and grounded in solid research of proven effectiveness. In this way, teachers gain an understanding of the underlying research base for the new instructional strategy, skill, or concept being presented and the purpose for including it in their instructional practice. |
| **Demonstration of new learning** | After explaining the concept, it should be modeled through live demonstration or video examples that enable the teachers to see the strategy in action. Modeling allows for observation and feedback leading to improved teacher buy-in and understanding. When teachers see the value of the strategy, they are more likely to work toward full implementation of the learning. |
| **Practice and feedback** | It is important that all participants have an opportunity to experiment with the focus strategies presented during the professional development session. Built-in opportunities to practice through role play and peer support are a critical component that sets apart traditional “sit and get” professional development from the more effective models described here. Each opportunity for practice should be combined with immediate and specific feedback on implementation of the new learning. |
| **Ongoing support** | Changes in teaching do not result from a single workshop. Teachers need authentic opportunities to experiment with the new learning and discuss success or barriers with peers. Teachers who receive ongoing support through coaching and/or peer observation while implementing new strategies have a much greater likelihood of effectively transferring the new learning to the classroom. This ongoing support is the most important element to make the leap from teacher knowledge to teacher use in the classroom. Research suggests up to a 95% transfer of new when ongoing coaching is included in the professional development model. |

**Source**: Adapted from [AZ DOE Professional Development Guide](https://cms.azed.gov/home/GetDocumentFile?id=5a5e6b413217e10d64eaa33e)

**Additional Resources to Consider in Implementation**

* [Four Domains for Rapid School Improvement Implementation Framework](https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/sites/nirn.fpg.unc.edu/files/resources/Four%20Domains%20for%20Rapid%20School%20Improvement.pdf)
* [Implementing Evidence-based Literacy Practices](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/infographics/pdf/REL_SE_Implementing_evidencebased_literacy_practices_roadmap.pdf)

**Appendix C: Adult Learning Theory**

Adult learning refers to a collection of theories and methods for describing the conditions under which the processes of learning are optimized. The research review conducted by Donovan et al. (1999) identified three key elements of the “science of learning.” These were: (1) new material and information is more easily

learned when it is related to existing learner knowledge and is relevant to the learner, (2) mastery of new material and information requires application of the knowledge in the context of a conceptual, procedural, or practical framework, and (3) ongoing monitoring of learning and self-assessment of progress facilitates deeper understanding and continued application of new knowledge or practice. When considering these three key elements, it’s important to keep in mind those leading the learning have an essential role in assisting learners to engage their understanding, building upon other learners’ understanding, correcting misconceptions, and observing and engaging with the learners during the process of learning.

Donovan, M. et al. (1999)

Trivette, C. M., Dunst, C. J., Hamby, D. W., & O'Herin, C. E. (2009)

**Six Characteristics Identified in How People Learn**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | ***Planning***    **Introduce** | | **Illustrate** | | |  | | --- | | Engage the learner in a preview of the material, knowledge or practice that is the focus of instruction or training | | Demonstrate or illustrate the use or applicability of the material, knowledge or practice for the learner. | |
| |  | | --- | | ***Application***    **Practice** | | **Evaluate** | | |  | | --- | | Engage the learner in the use of the material, knowledge or practice | | Engage the learner in a process of evaluating the consequences or outcome of the application of the material, knowledge, or practice | |
| |  | | --- | | ***Deep Understanding***    **Reflection** | | **Mastery** | | |  | | --- | | Engage the learner in self-assessment of his or her acquisition of knowledge and skills as a basis for identifying “next steps” in the learning process | | Engage the learner in a process of assessing his or her experience in the context of some conceptual or practical model or framework, or some external set of standards or criteria | |

[Donovan, M. et al. (1999)](http://www.signetwork.org/content_pages/175-evidence-based-professional-development)

Trivette, C. M., Dunst, C. J., Hamby, D. W., & O'Herin, C. E. (2009)

**Appendix D: Additional Resources**

[**READ Act**](http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/crsreadact2019)**:** 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.

[**READ Act Rule**](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/1-ccr-301-92_clean-final)**s:** Rules for the administration of the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act

**The Elementary Teacher Literacy Standards** are part of the [Elementary Education Endorsement (K-6) outlined in the Colorado State Board of Education Rules](https://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/docs/cdeprof/4.02%20Elementary%20rules%20%28301-101%29.pdf). An Elementary Education Endorsement is intended for educators interested in teaching at the elementary level in Colorado. In 2016, the endorsement was updated in State Board Rules to ensure alignment to both the Colorado Academic Standards as well as the Reading to Ensure Academic Success Act (READ Act). The Elementary Teacher Literacy Standards outline and describe practices and competencies for all K-6 teachers to teach students to read proficiently. The Elementary Teacher Literacy Standards are required for K-6 educators in addition to the [Teacher Quality Standards](https://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/rev-resourceguide).

[**The Colorado Academic Standards**](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coreadingwriting/2020cas-rw-introduction) are organized by content area. The four standards of reading, writing, and communicating include:

1. Oral Expression and Listening
2. Reading for All Purposes
3. Writing and Composition
4. Research Inquiry and Design

**Appendix E: 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 F: 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 G: Course submission worksheet**

|  |
| --- |
| The phase 2 worksheet must be completed for courses submitted for review.  **Instructions:**  In each section, provide notes in the space titled *evidence* detailing the location in the submitted materials where the reviewers may locate content. Please ensure the notes provided are explicit and succinct. *The written expression section is optional and will not be scored during review.*  A “comments” section is provided at the bottom of each section on the worksheet. This provides a space for any additional applicant comments to be made. The information on this worksheet will ensure that reviewers do not overlook critical content.  ***NOTE: Applicants may use the worksheet in Appendix G as a template or choose to create their own template. If the applicant chooses to create their own template, all features and content must be addressed in the order presented in the template in Appendix G.*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phase 2 Worksheet: Alignment to the Colorado Educator Preparation literacy standards referenced in** [**1 CCR 301-101, section 4.02(5) through 4.02(12)**](https://www.sos.state.co.us/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=8527&fileName=1%20CCR%20301-101#page=12) | |
| **Name(s) of Course(s):**  **Align evidence to your course(s) below describing how each component is addressed. If you are detailing more than one course in this worksheet, clearly mark which course is being described in the evidence box.** | |
| **Section J: CHILD DEVELOPMENT**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| documented and proven theories of child development and learning as appropriate for all learners including, but not limited to, exceptional and linguistically diverse learners.  *\*Child development as related to reading* |  |
| differentiated instructional strategies that address stages of individual development, language diversity and exceptionality.  *\*as related to reading* |  |
| family, culture, economic and societal influences that affect students' learning and academic progress. |  |
| documented and proven theories of child development and learning as appropriate for all learners including, but not limited to, exceptional and linguistically diverse learners.  *\*Child development as related to reading* |  |
| **Section K: ADMINISTRATION AND INTERPRETATION OF ASSESSMENTS| 1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(7)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| effective administration of a wide variety of ongoing formal and informal assessments that are developmentally appropriate and responsive to the needs of diverse learners. |  |
| effective utilization of assessment results and related data to plan for appropriate student instruction. |  |
| the differences among screening, diagnostic, outcome and progress monitoring assessments. |  |
| basic principles of test construction including reliability, validity, norm-referencing and criterion-referencing. |  |
| the principles of progress monitoring and the use of graphs to indicate progress. |  |
| the range of skills typically assessed in terms of phonological skills, decoding skills, oral reading skills, spelling and writing. |  |
| the content and purposes of the most common diagnostic tests used by psychologists and educational evaluators. |  |
| Interpreting measures of reading comprehension and written expression to make appropriate instructional recommendations.  *(e.g. information a teacher can glean from a student’s writing to inform instruction)*. |  |
| **Section L: LITERACY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(5)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| How the brain learns to read and understanding that learning to read is not natural. |  |
| Understanding the nature of reading difficulties. |  |
| the language processing requirements of proficient reading and writing including phonological (speech sound) processing; orthographic (print) processing; semantic (meaning) processing; syntactic (sentence level) processing; discourse (connected text level) processing. |  |
| other aspects of cognition and behavior that affect reading and writing including attention, executive function, memory, processing speed and graphomotor control. |  |
| the environmental, cultural, and social factors that contribute to literacy development (e.g. language spoken at home, language and literacy experiences, cultural values). |  |
| phases in the typical developmental progression of oral language (semantic, syntactic, pragmatic); phonological skill; printed word recognition; spelling; reading fluency; reading comprehension; and written expression. |  |
| the known causal relationship among phonological skill, phonic decoding, spelling, accurate and automatic word recognition, text reading fluency, background knowledge, verbal reasoning skill, vocabulary, reading comprehension and writing. |  |
| how the relationships among the major components of literacy development change with reading development (i.e., changes in oral language, including phonological awareness; phonics and word recognition; spelling; reading and writing fluency; vocabulary; reading comprehension skills and strategies; written expression). |  |
| reasonable goals and expectations for learners at various stages of reading and writing development. |  |
| **Section M: PHONOLOGY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(8)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| the general goal of phonological skill instruction and how to explicitly state the goal of any phonological teaching activity. |  |
| the progression of phonological skill development (i.e., rhyme, syllable, onset-rime, phoneme differentiation). |  |
| the differences among various phonological manipulations, including identifying, matching, blending, segmenting, substituting and deleting sounds. |  |
| the principles of phonological skill instruction: brief, multisensory, conceptual and auditory-verbal. |  |
| the reciprocal relationship among phonological processing, reading, spelling and vocabulary. |  |
| the phonological features of a second language, such as Spanish, and how they interfere with English pronunciation and phonics. |  |
| **STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE - Phonology|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(6)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| Identification, pronunciation, classification and comparison of the consonant and vowel phonemes of English. |  |
| **Section N: PHONICS AND WORD RECOGNITION DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(9)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| the appropriate sequence of phonics concepts from basic to advanced. |  |
| principles of explicit and direct teaching; model, lead, give guided practice and review. |  |
| the rationale for multisensory and multimodal techniques. |  |
| the routines of a complete lesson format, from the introduction of a word-recognition concept to fluent application in meaningful reading and writing. |  |
| research-based adaptations of instruction for students with weaknesses in working memory, attention, executive function or processing speed. |  |
| **STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE - Orthography|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(6)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| the broad outline of historical influences on English spelling patterns, especially Anglo-Saxon, Latin (romance) and Greek. |  |
| defining grapheme as a functional correspondence unit or representation of a phoneme. |  |
| common orthographic rules and patterns in English, including:  · the difference between “high frequency” and “irregular” words.  · the six basic syllable types in English spelling. |  |
| **Section O: FLUENCY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(10)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| the role of fluency in word recognition, oral reading, silent reading, comprehension of written discourse and motivation to read. |  |
| reading fluency as a stage of normal reading development, as the primary symptom of some reading disorders and as a consequence of practice and instruction. |  |
| examples of text at a student’s frustration, instructional and independent reading level.  *(Selecting text at an appropriate level of accuracy and difficulty to support students in building fluency)* |  |
| sources of activities for building fluency in component reading skills. |  |
| instructional activities and approaches that are most likely to improve fluency outcomes. |  |
| techniques to enhance a student’s motivation to read. |  |
| appropriate uses of assistive technology for students with serious limitations in reading fluency. |  |
| the relationship between accuracy and reading fluency. |  |
| **Section P: VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(11)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| the role of vocabulary development and vocabulary knowledge in comprehension. |  |
| the role and characteristics of direct and indirect (contextual) methods of vocabulary instruction. |  |
| varied techniques for vocabulary instruction before, during and after reading. |  |
| the multifaceted nature of word knowledge. |  |
| the sources of wide differences in students’ vocabularies. |  |
| **STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE - Semantics|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(6)**  **Provide evidence that the course provided instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| examples of meaningful word relationships or semantic organization. |  |
| **STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE - Morphology|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(6)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| Common morphemes in English, including Anglo Saxon compounds, inflectional suffixes, and derivational suffixes; Latin-based prefixes, roots and derivational suffixes; and Greek-based combining forms. |  |
| **Section Q: TEXT COMPREHENSION DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(12)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| teaching strategies that are appropriate before, during and after reading and that promote reflective reading. |  |
| the characteristics of major text genres. |  |
| the similarities and differences between written composition and text comprehension, and the usefulness of writing in building comprehension. |  |
| the phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and “academic language” that could be a source of miscomprehension. |  |
| levels of comprehension including the surface code, text base and mental model (situation model). |  |
| factors that contribute to deep comprehension, including background knowledge, vocabulary, verbal reasoning ability, knowledge of literary structures and conventions, and use of skills and strategies for close reading of text. |  |
| **Section R: STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE - Additional|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(6)**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| defining and distinguishing among phrases, dependent clauses, and independent clauses in sentence structure. |  |
| the parts of speech and grammatical role of a word in a sentence. |  |
| **Discourse Organization**  **Provide evidence that the course provides instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| the major differences between narrative and expository discourse. |  |
| identification and construction of expository paragraphs of varying logical structures (e.g., classification, reason, sequence). |  |
| cohesive devices in text and inferential gaps in the surface language of text. |  |

**Appendix H: 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, 2.04*

**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, 2.09*

* **Oral Language**: The ability to produce and comprehend spoken language, including vocabulary and grammar. *CCR 301-92, 2.20*
* **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, 2.21*
* **Phonological Awareness:** Awareness of the sound structure of spoken words at three levels. *CCR 301-92, 2.22*
* **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, 2.23*
* **Fluency:** The capacity to read words in connected text with sufficient accuracy, rate, and prosody to comprehend what is read. *CCR 301-92, 2.11*
* **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, 2.03*
* **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, 2.35*

**Implementation:** Implementation is a process involving multiple decisions, actions, and corrections to change the structures and conditions necessary to successfully implement and sustain new programs and innovations. Implementation is not an event. Implementation is “a specified set of activities designed to put into practice an activity or program of known dimensions.” These activities occur over time in stages that overlap and that are revisited as necessary dimensions ([NIRN](https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/module-1/implementation-stages), n.d.)

**Professional Development:** Activities that develop an individual’s skills, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics as a teacher or educational professional. Such activities include but are not limited to, updating individuals’ knowledge of literacy in light of recent advances; updating individuals’ skills, attitudes, and approaches in light of the development of new teaching techniques and objectives, new circumstances, and new educational research; enabling individuals to apply changes made to curricula or other aspects of the teaching practice of literacy; enabling schools to develop and apply new strategies concerning the curriculum and other aspects of the teaching of literacy; and exchanging information and expertise among teachers and others. This definition recognizes that professional development can be provided in many ways, ranging from the formal to the informal and can be made available through external expertise in the form of courses, workshops or formal qualification programs, and through collaboration between schools or teachers across schools. *CCR 301-92, 2.24*

**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, 2.27*

* **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, 2.08*
* **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, 2.33*
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