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# SECTION A: Information

### Background

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

### Advisory List Information

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 advisory list of evidence-based or scientifically based instructional programming in reading includes 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.

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 will be 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).

### Advisory List Review

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 the review cycle, new and existing providers have the opportunity to apply to be added to the advisory list. Providers on the current advisory lists may be removed from the list if their instructional programming is found to no longer meet the criteria. The purpose of this Advisory List Review Submission, is to solicit evidence-based instructional programming including: core, supplemental and intervention in both Spanish and English, for inclusion on the 2019-2020 READ Act Advisory Lists of Instructional Programming, pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209.

The Advisory List Review Submission is not a competitive process and will be used to provide an advisory list for Colorado school districts. The Advisory List Review Submission is comprised of two parts; Part I Eligibility Application and Part II Program Review. This submission is for Part I only.

# SECTION B: Process & Timeline

### Part I - Eligibility

Vendors will submit a Part I Eligibility application for each program (core, intervention, supplemental) requested for consideration on the Advisory List. Separate applications are required for each program type.

Part I of the Advisory List Review Submission will lead to the determination of eligibility to apply Part II and, after the completion of Part II possible inclusion on the advisory list for instructional programming. To submit materials to the CDE to complete Part II and receive a full review of instructional programs, each vendor must establish that the program submitted meets the eligibility criteria outlined in this, Part I-Eligibility submission form.

Section C, he Agreement of Completion must be complete as it assures the department, to the best of the applicant’s knowledge, all required portions of Part I-Eligibility have been submitted. Only those vendors that have completed this application and who have been asked to move forward will be considered for Part II for a final review.

**IMPORTANT NOTE: Completion of requirements for Part I-Eligibility does not guarantee a vendor will receive final approval for the advisory list. Vendors meeting Part I Eligibility must still complete the Part II Program Review to be approved before final inclusion in the READ Act Program Advisory List.**

### Part II- Program Review (to be completed after approval of Part I and in a separate application)

Upon acceptance of Part I Eligibility*,* providers will be notified and will receive 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 require vendors to explicitly state the location of required components within their submission materials. Vendors meeting criteria of Part I Eligibility and Part II Program Review may be considered for inclusion on the Advisory List for which the program was submitted for review.

**IMPORTANT NOTE: All providers interested for inclusion on the advisory lists, both current and prospective, must submit for a review.**

#### Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Part I-Eligibility Application Timeline** | |
| September 30, 2019 | Notification of *Part I Eligibility* for Instructional Programming. |
| October 14 , 2019 | Technical Assistance Webinar at 10:00 AM MT  To register: <https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Wx0LNunxQD6N-x4QpulIrg> |
| October 30, 2019 | All eligibility proposal submissions for Instructional Programming due to CDE by 4:00 PM MT |
| November 1, 2019 - December 13, 2019 | CDE review of *Part I Eligibility* for Instructional Programming |
| December 16, 2019 | Vendor notification of *Part 1 Eligibility* decision. Applications distributed for eligible vendors for Part II. |
| **Part II Program Review** | |
| December 16, 2019 | Notification and application sent to vendors. Application period open. |
| January 17, 2019 | Application for *Part* 2 *Program Review* deadline. |
| January 21, 2019 - February 14, 2020 | CDE Review of *Part 2 Program Review*  for Instructional Programming |
| February 19, 2020 | Vendor notification of inclusion of instructional programming on CDE Advisory List |
| February 19, 2019 - March 2, 2019 | Vendor appeal window. |
| April 1, 2019 | Deadline for appeal response from the CDE. |

# Part I Eligibility Application Materials

# SECTION C: Cover Page

All requested information in Part I Eligibility must be included to advance on to Part II of the Advisory List Submission for Review.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of Publisher** | |
| **Product Title and Edition (publication year):** | |
| **Contact Person for the Review Submission:** | |
| **Mailing Address:** | **Webpage:** |
| **Telephone:** | **Email:** |
| **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:*  CORE  English  Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  SUPPLEMENTAL  English  Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  INTERVENTION  English  Other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **IMPORTANT NOTE: A separate application must be submitted for each advisory list request inclusion and program review.** | **Target Audience:**  *Select all that apply*  Kindergarten  First Grade  Second Grade  Third Grade  English Language Learners |
| **Brief Description of Product:** Describe core components of the program/product, i.e., the key elements of the product that make the product unique.  *Please do not exceed 300 words.* | |
| **If currently on another state’s advisory list, please indicate which state and the purpose of the advisory list.** | |
| **Agreement of Completion** | |
| **In order to be considered to be reviewed in this Part I Eligibility Review, the following must be completed:**  **Check each box and sign below to indicate each required section has been included and is complete.**  Section C: Completed Cover Page  Section D: Scope and Sequence  Section E: Documentation - ESSA Level Alignment  Section F: Usability  Section G:Pricing Structure  Signature - Confirming all parts above are included  **IMPORTANT NOTE: If submission to *Part 1 Eligibility* is sufficient to move forward to *Part ii Program Review*, but Part ii submission does not substantiate the claims above from Part i, the program submission will be denied and will not be reviewed (see Appendix F).**    **Printed Name of Representative:**    **Signature**  Click here to enter a date. | |

# SECTION D: Scope & Sequence (required component)

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

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

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Programming**  In order to be considered for core programming, all components below must be included within the scope and sequence. | **Supplemental Programming** | **Intervention Programming** |
| Check the boxes to indicate which components are;   * explicitly taught within the program and, * have an aligned scope and sequence. | |
| **Phonological Awareness**  Early  Basic  Advanced  **Phonics**  Basic  Advanced  **Vocabulary**  **Comprehension**  Listening Comprehension  Reading Comprehension  \***Fluency** | **Phonological Awareness**  Early  Basic  Advanced  **Phonics**  Basic  Advanced  **Vocabulary**  **Comprehension**  Listening Comprehension  Reading Comprehension  \***Fluency** | **Phonological Awareness**  Early  Basic  Advanced  **Phonics**  Basic  Advanced  **Vocabulary**  **Comprehension**  Listening Comprehension  Reading Comprehension  \***Fluency** |
| **IMPORTANT NOTE: Fluency needs to be addressed within the instructional program, however a specific progression for fluency does not need to be provided within the scope and sequence (Birsh, 2018, pgs. 467-469).** | | |

Embedded within and clearly identifiable for customers to locate and use for planning

Aligned with developmentally appropriate progression of skills

Supports explicit and systematic instruction (see Appendix C)

Delineates grade level progression

Is scientifically base and evidence-based (see Appendix C)

**Briefly describe where each Scope and Sequence is located within program materials:**

*Please do not exceed 300 words.*

# SECTION E: Evidence of Effectiveness

This section must include a clear and concise summary of evidence that the program is producing effective results and improving outcomes when implemented. An ESSA Level of evidence must be provided with citations.

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

Identify the evidence level supporting the instructional program being submitted. Please watch the brief overview video provided ([Understanding the ESSA Levels of Evidence](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1VRxZlUyn1k&feature=push-sd&attr_tag=7raF0W_esU_eI_Oc%3A6) ) to ensure understanding of what is needed to meet each level. To identify evidence level, consider using research clearing houses; a list of which is provided here:<https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements>

The CDE will verify the citations meet the following criteria which are aligned to ESSA levels (see Appendix F).

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

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

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

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

**Provide baseline understanding of evidence-basis, and verify that evidence basis.**

**· Clear explanation of the program (core components)**

**· Hyperlink to study or clearinghouse page (OR) study name, researcher(s), year**

**· Notes on fit (student pop, grade level, setting)**

*Please do not exceed 300 words. You may include external links.*

# SECTION F: Usability

This section must include a clear and concise description of the following:

* Delivery format (e.g. face-to-face, online only, online with a face-to-face component, etc.)
* Required components necessary to ensure effective results and improving outcomes when implemented and how they are sold. (e.g. as an all inclusive kit, a la carte, etc.)

**Concise Description of Usability:**

*Please do not exceed 300 words.*

# SECTION G: Pricing Structure & Essential Program Components

This section must include a clear and concise description of the pricing structure. This would include all required program components (student, teacher, and system materials) needed to meet the criteria established in Section F.

**Concise Description of Pricing Structure and Essential Program Components:**

*Please do not exceed 300 words.*

# SECTION H: Required Format & Submission Details

* All *Part I Eligibility* submissions must include Sections B- Section G in PDF Format.
* Applicants must email Sections B – Section G. All electronic submission must be submitted to [Calzadillas\_M@cde.state.co.us](mailto:Calzadillas_M@cde.state.co.us) by **October 30, 2019 4:00pm MT**
* The electronic submission cannot have any hyperlinks and must be submitted in a PDF form. The filename will need the following format:
  + publisher name\_program name \_2019 EPsubmission.
* Emailed versions of the Part I Eligibility application must be submitted along with five hard copies. All hard copies must be received by **October 30, 2019 4:00pm MT**
  + Mail five hard copies to:

Colorado Department of Education

Attn: Office of Literacy; Marisa Calzadillas

201 E. Colfax Ave., Room 106

Denver, Co. 80203

* Eligibility submissions will only be considered complete when the following have been received; electronic document of Part I Eligibility in PDF format and five hard copies

# 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**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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*** | Providing instruction that supports students with understanding ideas expressed in text—supporting their ability to negotiate the linguistic and conceptual barriers such as:   * Directly teaching the structure of both narrative and expository text. * Strategies are overtly modeled and practiced in a planned progression. * Subskills such as choices of diction, grammatical structure, cohesive linkage, organization, and other ways that the author chooses to present ideas.   Teachers’ edition provides guidance.  [***CO READ Act K-3 Minimum Competencies***](https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/minimumcompetencylinkedmatrix) | Teachers instructed to use leveled book reading, big books, and independent trade book reading; teacher modeling (thinking aloud) is the primary instructional strategy. Also known as Reader’s Workshop approach. Student book choice emphasized. |
| **Writing** | Grammar, handwriting, spelling, punctuation taught systematically, along with many structured opportunities to practice composition. Builds sentence writing skills, paragraph formation, and knowledge of narrative and expository text structures. | Writer’s workshop approach. Emphasizes stages of the writing process and self-expression, rather than mastery of component skills through planned, cumulative practice. Correction given in individual conferences. “Journaling” is a favored activity, because students choose the topic they write about. |
| **Additional Resources for Understanding Scientifically Based Reading Research and Evidence-based Practices:**   * [Ending the Reading Wars: Reading Acquisition From Novice to Expert.](https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100618772271) * [Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide/21) * [The National Reading Panel](https://www.thereadingleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/NRP-Report.pdf) * Attributes of Effective Universal Instruction, *CCR 301-92 6.00* (See Appendix D) * Attributes of Effective Targeted and Intensive Instructional Intervention, *CCR 301-92 7.00* (See Appendix E) | | |

Adapted from [*Moats, 2007*](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498005) *and* [*Shanahan, 2019*](https://www.google.com/url?q=https://shanahanonliteracy.com/blog/why-not-teach-reading-comprehension-for-a-change&sa=D&ust=1569434767156000&usg=AFQjCNFWtB7pGYb11a5BXs06AbvGHq1A0w)

# 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.*



# 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, 2.04*

**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*

**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*

**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, 2.14*

* **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, 2.13*

**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*

* **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*

**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, 2.29*

# 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.

# Appendix F: Part 1 - Eligibility Requirements

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name** | | | |
| **Section** | **Required** | **Verification**  Must meet all criteria for inclusion in Part 2 - Program Review | **Notes** |
| **C: Completed Cover Page**  Including signature on Agreement of Completion | Every section within Cover Page template completed | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet |  |
| **D: Scope and Sequence** | Selected Aligned scope and sequence components that apply.  Selected all required attributes  Provided brief description on where to locate within programming | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet |  |
| **E: Documentation - ESSA Level Alignment** | Selected Tier Level  Provided Summary of Evidence  Evidence verified - CDE will ensure submitted evidence is aligned to program submission and meets identified ESSA level selection | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet |  |
| **F: Usability** | clear and concise description of Delivery format  clear and concise description of Required components necessary to ensure effective results and improving outcomes when implemented and how they are sold. | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet |  |
| **G: Pricing Structure & Essential Components** | clear and concise description of the pricing structure  includes all required program components | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet |  |
| **H. Format Requirements** | Submission is appropriately formatted.  Pages are standard letter size, 8-1/2” x 11”  1-inch margins  Electronic document in PDF format  additional hard copy submitted via mail | Meets  Partially Meets  Does Not Meet |  |
| **Instructional Program Recommendation** | Eligible to Submit for Part 2 of the Advisory List Review Process  Not Eligible  **Comments:** | | |
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