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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 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 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
* successfully completed a training program included on the department’s advisory list of professional development programs and passed the end of course assessment of learning. (1 CCR 301-92,13.01(C)(2))

In the event that 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 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 or course appropriate for license renewal 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.***

The course submitted for review must meet the following criteria:

* addresses the content of the Colorado Educator preparation literacy standards referenced in 1 CCR 301-101, section 4.02(5) through 4.02(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 and subsequent, up-to-date, peer-reviewed, evidence-based research in reading instruction.

* is aligned to the requirements of the Colorado READ Act 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 (1 CCR 301-92, 13.01(C).
* 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).

# 

# **SECTION B: Applicant Information**

All requested information must be included to be considered for review.

|  |
| --- |
| Contact Information  \*\**\*to be completed on the* [*electronic survey*](https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5694901/University-Course-in-Teaching-Reading)\*\*\* |
| Full Legal Name (as written on driver’s license): |
| Date of Birth (MM/DD/YYYY): |
| Telephone:  Email: |
| District: |
| School: |
| Position Title: |
| Colorado Teacher License Number (if applicable): |
| Professional Development/Course(s) Title and Number: |
| Year Completed:  Number of Course Hours:  *-Minimum statute requirement 45 course hours*  *-1 credit hour is equal to 15 course hours* |
| Professional Development Provider/Institution: |
| PD Provider/Institution Address:  Webpage: |

# **SECTION C: Minimum Statute and Rule Requirements**

Provide supporting documentation (e.g. course syllabus, transcripts, end of course assessment, etc.) for how the professional development/course met the minimum statute requirements as detailed in the READ Act.

The following criteria must be met:

* a minimum of 45 hours (transcript or certificate of completion)
* address the content of the Educator Preparation Literacy Standards (see Section F)
* included rigorous evaluations of learning throughout the course. (demonstrated through course syllabus, outline, copies of assessments, etc.)
* documentation of successful completion of the course and end of course assessment (e.g. certificate or transcript and copy of scored end of course assessment)

# **SECTION D: Reading Development Theory**

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. **Use *Part 1 Reading Development Theory* of the submission worksheet to 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 professional development/course directly supports understanding of the science of reading and evidence-based practices

# 

# **SECTION E: Professional Development/Course Model**

## Syllabus or Outline

Provide a complete syllabus or outline that describes the scope & sequence and objectives for learning that clearly explain the content of the professional development/course.

## Summary of Professional Development/Course

**In part 2 of the submission worksheet, write a clear and concise summary of the professional development/course.** This summary must include, but is not limited to, the following:

* An explanation of evidence-based instructional strategies introduced throughout the professional development/course
* A description of how demonstration of new learning was provided (e.g. modeling, videos, etc.) and opportunities for targeted practice.

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

**In part 2 of the submission worksheet, clearly and concisely describe how the professional development 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).

# **SECTION F: Alignment to Colorado Elementary Education Endorsement Standards 1 CCR 301-101**

**Use part 3 Alignment to the Colorado Teacher Standards of the submission worksheet to provide evidence of how the professional development/ course aligns to the** [**Colorado Elementary Education Endorsement Standards**](https://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/docs/cdeprof/4.02%20Elementary%20rules%20%28301-101%29.pdf)**.** A sample of this worksheet is found in Appendix C and can be downloaded from the CDE webpage housing this application.

# **SECTION G: Required Format & Submission Details**

**Electronic Submission Requirements:**

Please submit this application, in full, through the linked form. You will receive a confirmation notice once the application has been submitted and received. **An incomplete application will not be reviewed by the CDE.**

***The application attachments must be submitted through the electronic application in a PDF format.***

Format the filenames as follows:

**Scored End of Course Assessment:** last name\_course/PD title\_(ECA)\_date

**Submission Worksheet Parts 1, 2 and 3:** last name\_course/PD title\_(SW)\_date

**Syllabus/outline:** last name\_course/PD title\_(SS)\_ date

**Transcript (*college courses only*):** last name\_course/PD title\_(T)\_date

**Certificate of completion *(professional development course only):*** last name\_course/PD title\_(C)\_date

All files above need to include:

* PDF format

Once your application submission has been received, 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 [this survey](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/dbfe355c806c45178ee27cdd012c170f). A CDE literacy staff member will be updating a FAQ on the application website and will follow up with individual submissions in a timely manner.

# **Appendices**

# **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**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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: 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 C: Professional development/course submission worksheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Part 1: Reading Development Theory** |
| **Write a summary describing the criteria outlined below and how it aligns to the professional development/course**  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 professional development/course directly supports understanding of the science of reading and evidence-based practices |
| Response: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Part 2: Professional Development/Course Model** |
| Summary of Professional Development/Course Write a clear and concise summary of the professional development/course. This summary must include, but is not limited to, the following:   * An explanation of evidence-based instructional strategies introduced throughout the professional development/course * A description of how demonstration of new learning was provided (e.g. modeling, videos, etc.) and opportunities for targeted practice. |
| Response: |
| Alignment to the Colorado READ Act and K-3 Colorado Academic Standards Clearly and concisely describe how the professional development 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/statestandards). |
| Response: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Part 3: Alignment to the Colorado Teacher Standards** | |
| **Instructions:** The Alignment to the Colorado Elementary Education Endorsement Standards worksheet will need to be completed for the professional development/course being submitted for review. In each section, provide explicit and detailed notes describing how each of the components listed were addressed within the professional development/course in the space titled *evidence*. Complete all the sections of this worksheet.  ***NOTE: Applicants may use this worksheet 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 this worksheet.*** | |
| **Name of Professional Development:** | |
| **Section I: CHILD DEVELOPMENT**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 J:**  **ADMINISTRATION AND INTERPRETATION OF ASSESSMENTS| 1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(7)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 K: LITERACY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(5)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 L: PHONOLOGY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(8)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 professional development/course provided instruction in:** | **Evidence:** |
| Identification, pronunciation, classification and comparison of the consonant and vowel phonemes of English. |  |
| **Section M:**  **PHONICS AND WORD RECOGNITION DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(9)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 professional development/course provided 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 N: FLUENCY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(10)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 O: VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(11)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 professional development/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 professional development/course provided 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 P: TEXT COMPREHENSION DEVELOPMENT|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(12)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 Q: STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE - Additional|1 CCR 301-101, 4.02(6)**  **Provide evidence that the professional development/course provided 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 professional development/course provided 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 D: 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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