COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
FOR TEACHING READING IN HAWAII SCHOOLS

Developed pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 110
Adopted at the Twenty-Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii
Regular Session of 2010

and

Presented by the Working Group created pursuant to SCR No. 110

The Members of the Senate and House of Representatives
Twenty-Eighth Legislature, Regular Session of 2013
State of Hawaii

Date: January 13, 2013

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In 2010, we were tasked by Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 110 (SCR 110) to develop a comprehensive plan to improve awareness of, and strengthen support for persons with, dyslexia. We have been meeting monthly since the time we received certified copies of SCR 110 from the Clerk of the Senate in 2010.

We regret we were unable to meet the provision of SCR 110 requiring submission of the comprehensive plan prior to the convening of the Regular Session of 2012. However, we now respectfully submit the attached comprehensive plan, together with proposed legislation, for your consideration.

Attached is the Comprehensive Plan for Teaching Reading in Hawaii Schools which we have prepared pursuant to SCR 110. Although we realize that the Comprehensive Plan is not intended to have the force of law, it is our intent and hope that it serve as a guideline on how to teach reading to and improve the literacy of struggling readers, including those with dyslexia and other reading disabilities, in Hawaii schools, and increasing public awareness of dyslexia in Hawaii. The Comprehensive Plan contemplates improving the quality of teacher preparation in subjects relating to the development of literacy skills, adopting new teacher licensure standards and requirements that specifically address literacy skills, requiring data-validated, evidence-based literacy instruction for students in all schools, and increasing awareness about dyslexia by making available information to educators, students, parents, and the community. It includes recommendations, some which should be achievable in the short term and which we address in the proposed legislation, and others which should be targeted for longer term implementation.

We believe the Comprehensive Plan represents our best thinking after having reviewed established scientific knowledge, national trends, best practices, national literature and recommendations from national professional associations, policies of the United States Department of Education, Partnership For Reading, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute for Literacy, National Reading Panel, and licensing practices in other states. We are, however, aware that financial, practical, and other constraints may make implementation of some recommendations difficult at this time. Thus, the Comprehensive Plan is an aspirational plan – one which will hopefully be embraced and implemented to the fullest extent practicable as a guide to literacy instruction and increasing public awareness in Hawaii. Furthermore, we recognize the subject of literacy instruction is evolving with continued research and development of best practices. Thus, the Comprehensive Plan should, over time, evolve with such updated research and developments.

Please note the members of the Working Group do not agree on every detail of the

2

Comprehensive Plan and the proposed legislation. For example, the Hawaii Department of Education, does not support the proposed legislation that accompanies this Comprehensive Plan. However, we do generally agree that efforts to improve literacy skills of students in Hawaii with dyslexia, characteristics of dyslexia, or with other literacy challenges should be guided by principles and practices described in the attached Comprehensive Plan. We also agree that statewide support and awareness of dyslexia will result in enhanced participation and contributions by adults and youth with dyslexia in Hawaii.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS DESIGNATED PURSUANT TO SCR 110:

Gerald Suyama, former principal of Pearl City High School, Chair

University of Hawaii System, represented by Bobbie Martel, Coordinator, Associate of Arts in Teaching Program, Leeward Community College

State of Hawaii Department of Education, represented by Dale Asami, Personnel Specialist, Office of Human Resources, and Patricia Nichols, Educational Specialist in the Special Education Section of the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Student Support, Curriculum and Instruction Branch

Teacher Education Coordinating Committee, represented by Christine Sorensen, Professor and former Dean of the College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Special Education Advisory Council, represented by Patricia Sheehey, Professor, University of Hawaii - Special Education Department

Learning Disabilities Association of Hawaii, represented by Joseph Kernan III, Esq., Parent Consultant

Hawaii Association of Independent Schools, represented by Jyo Bridgewater, Esq., Principal, K-8 Assets School

Dyslexia Tutoring Center of Hawaii, Inc. represented by Margarette Pang and Angel Pang, both of whom are Certified Dyslexia Testing Specialists, Certified Barton Tutors, and Dyslexia Screening Specialists

Hawaii Branch of the International Dyslexia Association (HIDA), represented by Sheila Watts-Voit (aka Sue Voit), Fellow of the Academy of Orton-Gillingham Practitioners, Reading Intervention Teacher, Chair of Program Committee and a past president of HIDA; Elizabeth Ann Ishii, Esq., Board member and a past president of HIDA; and Mary Wong, Esq., Board member of HIDA

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
FOR TEACHING READING IN HAWAII SCHOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
FOR TEACHING READING IN HAWAII SCHOOLS**

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Dyslexia is a specific learning disability that is neurological in origin. It is characterized by difficulties with accurate or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities. These difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities and the provision of effective classroom instruction. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.

It is estimated that up to 20% of the population has dyslexia or another reading disability.[1] That translates into as many as 280,000 people in Hawaii,[2] many of whom are children. Furthermore, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics, 41% of Hawaii's fourth graders and 32% of Hawaii's eighth graders read below basic reading levels in 2011.[3] All of these statistics are reflective of the number of students in Hawaii facing literacy challenges which may include (a) difficulties with understanding or using language, spoken or written, such as phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency or comprehension; or (b) one or more of the basic neurobiological or psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations. These students, Hawaii's Struggling Readers, encompass all social groups and include students with dyslexia, other reading disabilities, or other specific learning disabilities, English language learners and students with limited English proficiency, and economically disadvantaged youth.

The ultimate goal of this Comprehensive Plan is for students, including Struggling Readers, to graduate from high school; succeed in workforce training programs, academic college courses, and employment and entrepreneurial opportunities; and reach their full potential as contributing members of the community. To that end, students should meet or exceed grade-level reading proficiency in all content subjects. This requires following literacy skills:

> *Foundational Reading skills*, which are directed toward fostering students' understanding and working knowledge of concepts of print, the alphabetic principle, phonics, reading fluency, and other basic conventions of the English writing system.

---

[1] See http://www.interdys.org/FAQHowCommon.htm.

[2] Calculation based on 2011 United States census which indicates there were 1,374,810 people in Hawaii. See http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/15000.html.

[3] See 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) at http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2011/state_g4.asp and http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2011/state_g8.asp.

Reading literacy skills, which allow students to approach printed material with critical analysis, inference, and synthesis; read with accuracy and coherence; and use information and insights from text as a basis for informed decisions and creative thought.

Writing literacy skills, which allow students to convey ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.

Speaking, listening, and language skills, which allow students to approach material presented orally with critical analysis, inference, and synthesis; listen with accuracy and coherence; and use information and insights from oral text as a basis for informed decisions and creative thought. They also allow students to verbally convey ideas, concepts, and information clearly.

Four fundamental changes are required to permit schools and teachers to effectively teach literacy skills to Struggling Readers.

First, with as much as 20% of the population having dyslexia or other reading disabilities, and much higher percentages reading below basic reading levels, the difficulties of Struggling Readers must, to the greatest extent possible, be addressed in general education classrooms. Not all Struggling Readers should, can, or must be referred to special education. Therefore, all teachers must have specific knowledge and skills in best practices for literacy instruction, strategy, and research-validated intervention in order to effectively teach literacy skills to all students, and to address literacy challenges experienced by Struggling Readers in general education classrooms.

Second, schools must require that all teachers utilize these best practices in general education instruction including research-validated interventions, consistent with the principles of universal design for learning, response to intervention (RTI), and a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS), as well as the requirements of Common Core State Standards Initiative adopted by the Hawaii Department of Education (Common Core State Standards). This is particularly important in grades K through 3 (and PK where offered), when informed and effective general classroom instructional intervention can prevent or at least effectively address and limit the severity of reading and writing problems.[4]

---

[4] Scientists, using multiple brain imaging techniques, have found that the brain activity of children with dyslexia while they read is different from that of typical readers. They have also found that after receiving reading interventions and instruction similar to what is contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan, individuals' brain activation patterns changed to become more similar to those of typical readers. This is because of the brain's plasticity – its ability to adapt and reorganize neural pathways as a result of new experiences or learning. In other words, reading interventions and instruction actually cause changes in a dyslexic child's brain, resulting in a more efficient reading circuit. Early childhood offers a valuable opportunity to make a meaningful impact on reading development since: (1) brain plasticity decreases over time; (2) the quality of early brain architecture establishes either a sturdy or fragile foundation for other capabilities and behaviors to follow; and (3) increasingly complex neural circuits and skills are built on simpler circuits and skills over time. (Wolf, M. (2007). *Proust and the squid:*

Third, all students should be administered early and ongoing assessments so educators and parents can monitor the progress of their developing literacy skills. This is particularly important in grades K through 3 (and PK where offered) because scientific research is clear that these years represent a sensitive period in the development of foundational reading skills. Furthermore, such assessments are necessary to identify those Struggling Readers who should be referred for more intensive or individualized reading skills instruction in special education, including those diagnosed with dyslexia or another specific learning disability. Related, research is similarly clear on the importance and efficacy of early identification and instructional interventions in grades K through 3 (and PK where offered).[5]

Fourth, each school must have a Literacy Specialist[6] who is licensed by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board (HTSB) as an expert in the subject of teaching literacy skills, including diagnostics and instruction. The Literacy Specialist shall assist all teachers in implementing appropriate literacy instruction methods, strategies and research-validated interventions in their classrooms. The Literacy Specialist shall also work with teachers to identify Struggling Readers whose literacy challenges cannot be adequately addressed in the general classroom, and who qualify for special education and shall, together with special education teachers, work directly with Struggling Readers receiving special education services to address their literacy challenges.

To accomplish these four fundamental changes, this Comprehensive Plan contemplates that:

1. all teachers shall have specific knowledge and skills in best practices for literacy instruction, strategy, and research-validated intervention in order to effectively teach literacy skills to all students. The categories and types of teachers, and their respective required levels of knowledge and skills are as follows:

The story and science of the reading brain. New York, USA: HarperCollins Publishers; Shaywitz, S. E. (2003). *Overcoming Dyslexia*. Random House Inc., NY.; Dehaene, S. (2009). *Reading in the brain: The science and evolution of a human invention*. New York, USA: Viking Adult Publishers; Shonkoff, J. P., Phillips, D., & National Research Council (U.S.). Committee on Integrating the Science of Early Childhood Development. (2000). *From neurons to neighborhoods : the science of early child development*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.).

[5] See footnote 4.

[6] The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board is presently considering the requirements for a license and/or license field for teachers qualified as experts in the subject of teaching literacy skills, including diagnostics and instruction. It is not clear whether it will create a new license and/or license field, or modify the requirements of an existing license and/or license field. It has not selected a name for that license/field but is considering names such as "Literacy Specialist," "Dyslexia Specialist," and "Reading Specialist" – although, with regard to the name "Reading Specialist," there is already an existing Reading Specialist License and the HTSB's present thought is to retain the Reading Specialist License as a separate license/license field. For purposes of this Comprehensive Plan, the term "Literacy Specialist" is used to describe teachers qualified as experts in the subject of teaching literacy skills, including diagnostics and instruction. However, that term shall be replaced by whatever name is ultimately selected by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board.

(a)   Elementary Teachers, who are teachers licensed by the HTSB to teach in grades K (or in some instances PK) through 5 (or in some instances 6), or subsets of those grades, in preschool or elementary school settings in Hawaii. In addition to being licensed in the relevant grade-levels, all Elementary Teachers shall meet the requirement set by the HTSB for Teachers of Reading[7], indicating they are qualified to teach foundational reading skills;

(b)   Content Area Teachers, who are teachers licensed by the HTSB to teach specific subjects required in the curricula and across curricula in secondary grades 6 (or in some instances 7) through 12, or subsets of those grades, or who have content licenses in specific areas such as physical education or music in grades K through 12 in Hawaii. Content Area Teachers shall be qualified to teach reading skills in their content areas;

(c)   Teachers of Special Subjects, who are teachers licensed by the HTSB in specialized areas targeted to teaching specific populations such as English Language Learners and students with limited English proficiency, or special education students across grade-levels K (or in some instances PK) through 12, or subsets of those grades, in Hawaii. In addition to being licensed in the specialized areas for relevant teaching grade-levels, all Teachers of Special Subjects (with the exception of Literacy Specialists described below) shall meet the requirements set by the HTSB for Teachers of Reading, indicating they are qualified to teach foundational reading skills;[8] and

(d)   Literacy Specialists, who are individuals licensed by the HTSB as experts in teaching literacy skills, including diagnostics and instruction, in grades K (or in some instances PK) through 12, or subsets of those grades, shall be added to the category of Teachers of Special Subjects;[9]

2.   teacher preparation programs provided by the University of Hawaii and other universities and colleges in Hawaii which offer degrees in education shall include basic, foundational, or advanced language instruction curriculum content and practicum experience, appropriate to the level and license for which candidates are being prepared, addressing the knowledge and skills necessary for Elementary Teachers to teach foundational reading skills; Content Area Teachers to teach reading skills in their content areas; Teachers of Special Subjects to teach foundational reading skills to their targeted populations, and Literacy Specialists to be experts in teaching literacy skills (including diagnostics and instruction), in all cases consistent

---

[7] The Hawaii Teacher Standards Board is presently considering the requirements for a license and/or license field for teachers qualified to teach foundational reading skills. It is not clear whether it will create a new license and/or license field, or modify the requirements of an existing license and/or license field. It has not selected a name for that license/license field. For purposes of this Comprehensive Plan, the term "Teacher of Reading" is used to describe teachers qualified to teach foundational reading skills. However, that term shall be replaced by whatever name is ultimately selected by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board.

[8] The terms "Content Area Teachers," "Elementary Teachers," and "Teachers of Special Subjects" are intended to be descriptive of categories of licenses and license fields that are offered or are under consideration by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board. The terms are not, themselves, the names of actual licenses or license fields.

[9] See footnote 6 and footnote 8.

with applicable provisions of the *Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading* prepared by the International Dyslexia Association (IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards), requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, as amended (IDEA), and other applicable federal statutes, and the Common Core State Standards;

3.   the HTSB shall implement licensure requirements relating to the teaching of literacy skills for Elementary Teachers (who shall meet the requirements of a Teacher of Reading, indicating they are qualified to teach foundational reading skills); Content Area Teachers (who shall meet the requirements to teach reading skills in their content areas); Teachers of Special Subjects (who, with the exception of Literary Specialists, shall meet the requirements of a Teacher of Reading, indicating they are qualified to teach foundational reading skills); and Literacy Specialists (who shall meet requirements consistent with advanced, comprehensive, and in-depth preparation for teaching literacy skills). The literacy skills requirements shall be consistent with applicable provisions of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards;

4.   the Hawaii Department of Education shall offer or make available professional development to educators to support the enhancement of reading, writing, and spelling skills of Struggling Readers (including students with dyslexia or other literacy challenges), to supplement and reinforce pre-service curriculum relating to the development of literacy skills;

5.   all teachers and schools shall provide opportunities for students to practice their foundational reading skills, reading literacy skills, writing literacy skills, and speaking, listening, and language skills in all content areas. Specifically, reading instruction programs in all schools, including reading instruction programs for students in general education classrooms, shall require teachers to utilize best practices for literacy instruction, strategy, and intervention. The best practices must include direct, explicit, structured, and systematic instruction in oral and written language with (i) early screening and assessment for identification of students with literacy challenges, including those displaying risk factors for dyslexia, (ii) a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) including multisensory structured language education (MSL) and other research-validated interventions, within the response to intervention (RTI) model with varying levels of intensity and duration which connects general, compensatory, exceptional, gifted and talented, and special education programs, implemented and matched to individual student strengths and needs, and (iii) evidence-based progress monitoring that provides students, parents, and educators with data on student performance and improvements, and that uses this data in evaluations and decisions for instructional changes[10];

6.   there shall be at least one Literacy Specialist available in each school in Hawaii; and

7.   the Hawaii Department of Education and other departments, agencies, and

---

[10] Preschool programs and adult reading, writing or other literacy classes offered by the Department of Education should also include appropriate literacy instruction, strategy, intervention, assessment, identification, intervention, etc. consistent with National Standards.

instrumentalities of the State of Hawaii, the private sector, and the Hawaii community shall promote awareness of dyslexia, and strengthen support for individuals with dyslexia, in the State of Hawaii.

Implementation of this Comprehensive Plan shall enable teachers and schools to teach Hawaii's Struggling Readers to read and develop literacy skills.

SECTION 1
DEFINITIONS

This Section 1 contains definitions used in the Comprehensive Plan.

1.1 **Accommodations** – Accommodations shall mean alterations in the way tasks are presented that allow students with learning disabilities to complete the same assignments as other students. Accommodations do not fundamentally alter content, performance standards or tests, and do not give students an unfair advantage or, in the case of assessments, change what a test measures. They make it possible for students with learning disabilities to show what they know without being impeded by their disability.[11]

1.2 **ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act)** – ADA shall mean the federal statute known as the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, as it may have been or may be further amended from time to time, and as set forth in 42 U.S.C. section 12101, *et seq.*, or any successor statute thereto.

1.3 **Advanced Exam (Advanced Reading Instruction Competence Examination)** – Advanced Exam shall mean the an Advanced Reading Instruction Competence Examination or any successor examination approved by the HTSB to assess advanced reading instruction competence with respect to the specialized and advanced knowledge and skills in reading instruction required for licensure of Literacy Specialists, as further described in section 5.11 of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.4 **Assistive technology device** – Assistive technology device shall mean any item, piece of equipment, or product system, not including a medical device that is surgically implanted, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of an individual with a disability.

1.5 **Basic Exam (Basic Reading Instruction Competence Examination)** – Basic Exam shall mean a Basic Reading Instruction Competence Examination approved by the HTSB to assess basic reading instruction competence with respect to the proficiency and knowledge of the foundations of reading development, development of reading comprehension, reading instruction and assessment, and integration of knowledge and understanding required for licensure of

---

11 See National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2006, at http://www.ncld.org/at-school/general-topics/accommodations/accommodations-for-students-with-learning-disabilities.

Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects (not including Literacy Specialists), and other Teachers of Reading, as further described in section 5.10 of this Comprehensive Plan.[12]

1.6   Common Core State Standards – Common Core State Standards shall mean the standards contained in the Common Core State Standards Initiative, or any successor thereto, adopted by the Department of Education.[13]

1.7   Content Area Teachers – Content Area Teachers shall mean teachers who are licensed by the HTSB to teach specific subjects required in the curricula and across curricula in secondary grades 7 (or in some instances 6) through 12, or subsets of those grades, or who have content licenses in specific areas such as physical education or music in grades K (or in some instances PK) through 12 in Hawaii. Content Area Teachers shall be qualified to teach reading skills in their content areas, and shall have preparation and meet standards for basic content as established in Level 1 of Section I the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. Note that the term "Content Area Teachers" does not, itself, refer to a license or license field offered by the HTSB – it is descriptive of a collection of licenses and/or license fields offered by the HTSB.

1.8   Department of Education – Department of Education shall mean the State of Hawaii Department of Education.

1.9.   Differentiation – Differentiation shall mean a way of thinking about teaching and learning that seeks to recognize, learn about, and address the learning needs of all students. To that end, teachers use varied approaches for curriculum, instruction, and assessment that promote learning opportunities and outcomes across learning environments.

1.10   Diverse learners – Diverse learners shall mean students who have difficulty learning to read due to certain mild limitations in cognition and communication. Any student characterized by difficulties or differences in learning academic skills that are not consistent with the individual's chronological age, intellectual capacity, or educational opportunities, and that cannot be explained by the presence of an intellectual disability, sensory disorder, or emotional disorder, may be termed a diverse learner. Diverse learners are a subset of Struggling Readers,

1.11   Dyslexia – Dyslexia shall mean a specific learning disability that is neurological in origin and is characterized by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities. These difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive

---

[12] See National Center for Learning Disabilities, 2006, at http://www.ncld.org/at-school/general-topics/accommodations/accommodations-for-students-with-learning-disabilities.

[13] National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers, Common Core Standard State Standards, Washington (2010), at http://www.corestandards.org/.

abilities and the provision of effective classroom instruction. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.

1.12   Economically disadvantaged youth - Economically disadvantaged youth shall mean the students who, because of familial financial circumstances, often enter school significantly behind and less prepared than students from families with greater financial resources. Their academic disadvantage may be apparent in areas such as impoverished language input in early childhood (letter awareness and spoken vocabulary) and number awareness. Many of these students are "Title I Eligible" and receive "Free and/or Reduced Lunch," meaning the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act that provides financial assistance to local educational agencies and schools with many students from low-income families.

1.13   Educators – Educators shall mean Department of Education salaried employees or contracted individuals, including teachers, directly providing or coordinating instruction to students.

1.14   Elementary Teachers – Elementary Teachers shall mean teachers who are licensed by the HTSB to teach in grades K (or in some instances PK) through 5 (or in some instances 6), or subsets of those grades, in preschool or elementary school settings in Hawaii. Elementary Teachers shall include teachers who hold Early Childhood licenses from the HTSB. Each Elementary Teacher shall have a Teacher of Reading License Field added to a license in the relevant grade-levels, or a separate Teacher of Reading License, issued by the HTSB. The Teacher of Reading status indicates the teacher is qualified to teach foundational reading skills. Note that the term "Elementary Teachers" does not, itself, refer to a license or license field offered by the HTSB – it is descriptive of a collection of licenses and/or license fields offered by the HTSB.

1.15   English language learners and students with limited English proficiency – English language learners and students with limited English proficiency shall mean students who have recently immigrated to the U.S., have parents who speak a foreign language in their homes, or who have received poor instruction often due to cultural-linguistic perception differences.

1.16   ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) – ESEA shall mean the federal statute known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as it may have been amended or may be further amended from time to time, and as set forth in 20 U.S.C. section 70 *et seq*., or any successor statute thereto.

1.17   Federal and State law requirements – Federal and State law requirements shall mean federal educational and related services under IDEA, Rehabilitation Act, ADA, or under Title I, Title II, or Title III of ESEA and other laws pursuant to which students with specific learning disabilities, including dyslexia, may qualify for specialized instruction and related services. References to federal and state law requirements and eligibility shall include each of the foregoing statutes as they may be further amended, any successor statutes, and any other federal or state laws relating to the rights of, and responsibilities with respect to, students with specific

learning disabilities including dyslexia.

1.18   Foundational reading skills - Foundational reading skills shall mean skills which are directed toward fostering students' understanding and working knowledge of concepts of print, the alphabetic principle, phonics, reading fluency, and other basic conventions of the English writing system.

1.19   HTSB (Hawaii Teacher Standards Board) – HTSB shall mean the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board which issues licenses to teach in the State of Hawaii.

1.20   IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards – IDA Knowledge and Practices shall mean the *Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading* prepared by the International Dyslexia Association, Professional Standards and Practices Committee 2010 (Louisa Moats-Committee Chair, Suzanne Carreker, Rosalie Davies, Phyllis Meisel, Louise Spear-Swerling and Barbara Wilson), a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix A, as it may be amended from time to time, or any successor thereto.

1.21   IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) – IDEA shall mean the federal statute known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, as amended, and as set forth in 20 U.S.C. section 1400 et seq., or any successor statute thereto.

1.22   In-service teacher – In-service teacher shall mean a teacher who is teaching in a school under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education.

1.23   Literacy - Literacy shall mean the lifelong, intellectual process of gaining meaning from printed text. Key to all literacy is reading development, which involves a progression of skills that begins with the ability to understand spoken words and culminates in the deep understanding of text. Reading development involves a range of complex language underpinnings including awareness of speech sounds (phonology), spelling patterns (orthography), word meaning (semantics), grammar (syntax), and patterns of word formation (morphology), all of which provide a necessary platform for reading fluency and comprehension. Once these skills are acquired the reader can attain reading literacy.

1.24   Literacy challenges – Literacy challenges shall mean difficulties experienced by individuals diagnosed with dyslexia or who have characteristics of dyslexia including difficulties with (1) understanding or using language, spoken or written, including without limitation in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency or comprehension; or (2) one or more of the basic neurobiological or psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations.

1.25   Literacy failure - Literacy failure shall mean reduced ability in any portion of the spectrum of literacy skills for the applicable grade-level that, if not corrected, may significantly impede literacy.

1.26   Literacy skills – Literacy skills shall mean foundational reading skills, reading literacy skills, writing literacy skills, and speaking, listening, and language skills.

1.27   Literacy skills teacher training programs - Literacy skills teacher training programs shall mean teacher training programs approved by the HTSB and available to in-service teachers to prepare for the Basic Exam or Advanced Exam, and/or to prepare and qualify for a Teacher of Reading License or Teacher of Reading License Field, or a Literacy Specialist License or Literacy Specialist License Field, as described in section 5.7 of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.28   Literacy Specialist License[14] - Literacy Specialist License shall mean a license issued by the HSTB, as described in section 5.5 of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.29   Literacy Specialist License Field[15] - Literacy Specialist License Field shall mean a license field added to a teaching license issued by the HTSB, as described in section 5.5 of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.30   Literacy Specialists[16] – Literacy Specialists shall mean individuals who are experts in teaching literacy skills, including diagnostics and instruction and hold a Literacy Specialist License or a Literacy Specialist License Field added to a teaching license issued by the HTSB. Literary Specialists shall be authorized to teach and work in grades K (or in some instances PK) through 12, or subsets of those grades, in schools in Hawaii[17] Literacy Specialists shall have advanced preparation and meet more rigorous standards for comprehensive and in-depth content as established in Levels 1 and 2 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. Literacy Specialists fall under the category of Teachers of Special Subjects.

1.31   Modifications – Modifications shall mean changes in the course, standards, test preparation, location, timing, scheduling, expectations, student response, and/or other attributes which facilitate participation for a student with a disability. Modifications fundamentally alter content, performance standards or tests.

1.32   Multisensory structured language education (MSL) - Multisensory structured language education or MSL shall mean an approach to education of individuals with dyslexia or other literacy challenges that is consistent with IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards and provides instruction in the skills of reading, writing, and spelling through program content that includes phonology and phonological awareness, sound and symbol association, syllables, morphology, syntax, and semantics, and follows principles that include simultaneous multisensory instruction (including visual-auditory-kinesthetic-tactile instruction), structured, systematic, cumulative instruction, explicit instruction, diagnostic teaching to automaticity, and

---

[14] See footnote 6 re the name "Literacy Specialist."

[15] See footnote 6 re the name "Literacy Specialist."

[16] See footnote 6 re the name "Literacy Specialist."

[17] The HTSB presently contemplates that Literacy Specialist Licenses shall exist for grades K through 6, grades 7 through 12, and grades K through 12.

synthetic and analytic instruction.

1.33   Multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) – Multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) shall mean a comprehensive system of differentiated supports that includes evidence-based instruction, universal screening, progress monitoring, formative assessments, summative assessments, research-validated interventions matched to student needs, and educational decision-making using academic progress over time.

1.34   National Reading Panel Report – National Reading Panel Report shall mean the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1.35   National standards – National standards shall mean then-prevailing national standards established the United States Department of Education, Partnership For Reading, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the National Institute for Literacy, National Reading Panel, International Dyslexia Association, or other national professional organizations recognized by the Hawaii Department of Education or HTSB that use research-validated methodology for dyslexia instruction or assessment.

1.36   Phonemic awareness – Phonemic awareness shall mean the ability to focus on and manipulate phonemes which are smallest unit of sound in a spoken word that makes a difference in the word's meaning.

1.37   Professional development – Professional development shall mean a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving educators' effectiveness in raising student achievement.

1.38   Reading literacy – Reading literacy shall mean the ability to approach printed material with critical analysis, inference, and synthesis, read with accuracy and coherence, and use information and insights from text as a basis for informed decisions and creative thought. Reading literacy goes beyond reading's required development of active and interactive skill attainment and beyond comprehension of text. Reading literacy implies there is a capacity for reflection on written material that initiates personal experiences and memories as well as cognitive function. Reading literacy moves from the school room to the workplace, to citizenship, to lifelong learning, and is central to achieving an individual's aspirations. .

1.39   Reading literacy skills – Reading literacy skills shall mean skills that allow students to approach printed material with critical analysis, inference, and synthesis, read with accuracy and coherence, and use information and insights from text as a basis for informed decisions and creative thought. Reading literacy instruction should expose students to a range of texts and tasks, and rigor should be infused through the requirement that students read increasingly complex texts through the grades. Thus, grade-level reading proficiency is required for each grade. Students advancing through the grades are expected to meet each year's grade-specific

standards for reading literacy skills, and retain and further develop reading literacy skills and understandings mastered in preceding grades.

1.40   Recognized, certified instructor – Recognized, certified instructor shall mean an individual who has met all the requirements of the level he or she supervises, but who has additional content knowledge and experience in implementing and observing instruction with dyslexia and other reading difficulties in varied settings. A recognized, certified instructor has been recognized or certified by an approved trainer mentorship program that meets these standards and has been approved by the Standards and Practices Committee of the International Dyslexia Association (IDA), International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council (IMSLEC), Academy of Orton-Gillingham Practitioners and Educators, or other nationally recognized organizations accrediting literacy specialists, dyslexia specialists, or reading specialists and language therapy programs. This individual may, but need not hold a license issued by the HTSB.

1.41   Rehabilitation Act – Rehabilitation Act shall mean the federal statute known as the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as it may have been amended or may be further amended from time to time, and as set forth in 29 U.S.C. § 701 *et seq*., or any successor statute thereto.

1.42   Research-validated interventions, practices, programs, instruction, methodologies, etc. - Research-validated interventions, practices, programs, instruction, methodologies, etc. shall mean interventions, practices, programs, instruction, methodologies, etc. that are scientifically based on, and validated by, significant evidence-based research and data.

1.43   Response to intervention (RTI) – Response to intervention (RTI) shall mean a system that integrates assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and to reduce behavioral problems. With response to intervention, schools use data to identify students at-risk for poor learning outcomes, monitor student progress, provide evidence-based interventions and adjust the intensity and nature of interventions depending on a student's responsiveness, and identify students with learning or other disabilities. The four essential components of response to intervention are (1) a school-wide, multi-level instructional and behavioral system for preventing school failure; (2) screening; (3) progress monitoring; and (4) data-based decision making for instruction, movement within the multi-level system, and disability identification (in accordance with Federal and State law requirements).[18]

1.44   Speaking, listening, and language skills – Speaking, listening, and language shall mean skills that allow students to approach material presented orally with critical analysis, inference, and synthesis; listen with accuracy and coherence; and use information and insights from oral text as a basis for informed decisions and creative

---

[18] National Center on Response to Intervention (March 2010). *Essential Components of RTI – A Closer Look at Response to Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention.

thought. They also allow students to verbally convey ideas, concepts, and information clearly. Students advancing through the grades are expected to meet each year's grade-specific standards for speaking, listening, and language skills, and retain and further develop speaking, listening, and language skills and understandings mastered in preceding grades.

1.45   Special education - Special education shall mean the specially designed instruction to meet the unique learning needs of students who require individualized education programs. Special education services (e.g. speech and language therapy, occupational therapy, etc.) may be delivered in a variety of settings based on the student's needs.

1.46   Specific learning disability - Specific learning disability shall mean a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Specific learning disability does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.[19]

1.47   Struggling Readers - Struggling Readers shall mean students who have difficulty developing reading skills for a myriad of reasons and are at-risk for attaining proficient, grade-level reading and literacy abilities. They include students with dyslexia, other reading disabilities, or other specific learning disabilities, English language learners and students with limited English proficiency, and economically disadvantaged youth, diverse learners, and others. Any student characterized by difficulties or differences in learning academic skills that are not consistent with the individual's chronological age, intellectual capacity, or educational opportunities, and that cannot be explained by the presence of an intellectual disability, sensory disorder, or emotional disorder, may be termed a Struggling Reader.

1.48   Teacher of Reading License[20] – Teacher of Reading License shall mean a license issued by the HSTB, as described in section 5.4 of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.49   Teacher of Reading License Field[21] – Teacher of Reading License Field shall mean a license field added to a teaching license issued by the HTSB, as described in section 5.4 of this Comprehensive Plan.

1.50   Teachers – Teachers shall mean teachers in grades K (and sometimes PK) through 12, also sometimes referred to herein by the categories: Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Reading, Teachers of Special Subjects, and Literacy Specialists.

---

[19] See Section 602(30) of IDEA.

[20] See footnote 7 re the name "Teacher of Reading."

[21] See footnote 7 re the name "Teacher of Reading."

1.51   Teachers of Reading[22] – Teachers of Reading shall mean teachers who are qualified to teach foundational reading skills and hold a Teacher of Reading License issued by the HTSB or another teaching license issued by the HTSB which includes a Teacher of Reading License Field. Teachers of Reading shall have preparation and meet the standards for foundational content as established in Levels 1 and 2 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards.

1.52   Teachers of Special Subjects – Teachers of Special Subjects shall mean teachers who specializes in teaching English language learners and students with limited English proficiency (ELL Specialist) and/or special education students (special education teacher), and Literacy Specialists, who are licensed by the HTSB to teach in those categories in preschool, elementary, middle, and high schools in Hawaii. Note that the term "Teachers of Special Subjects" does not, itself, refer to a license or license field offered by the HTSB – it is descriptive of a collection of licenses and/or license fields offered by the HTSB.

1.53   Transition planning, services and support – Transition planning, services and support shall mean the transition planning, services and support for students moving from preschool into elementary school, elementary school into middle school, from middle school into high school, and from high school into employment, post-school education, independent living, and community participation. IDEA sets forth specific transition requirements for youth with disabilities that includes development of an individualized personal transition plan.

Transition services means a coordinated set of activities for an individual with a disability that (a) is designed to be within a results-oriented process, that is focused on improving the academic and functional achievement of the individual with a disability to facilitate the individual's movement from school to post-school activities, including postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation; and (b) is based on the individual individual's needs, taking into account the individual's strengths, preferences, and interests, and includes (i) instruction; (ii) related services; (iii) community experiences; (iv) the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives; and (v) if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and provision of a functional vocational evaluation.[23]

Transition support minimizes interruptions in student learning. Effective transitions are smooth and coordinated. The school should have clearly written and fully implemented transition plans. All students who receive services shall have transition plans in place to support smooth and effective transitions between settings. Planned supports shall provide for (a) support for immigrant and second-language programs, counseling, and linkages with community and military agencies; (b) movement between schools and between school and community programs (both private and public); e.g., pre-school to kindergarten, community-based, private agency, etc.; (c) mass transfers from preschool to elementary school, elementary school to middle school,

---

[22] See footnote 7 re the name "Teacher of Reading."
[23]   Section 300.43(a) of IDEA.

and middle school to high school; (d) movement between grade-levels; (e) movement between plans or programs within the school; e.g., into or from special education, special motivation programs, etc.; and (f) procedures for welcoming new students and beginning the new school year.[24]

1.54   Universal design for learning – Universal design for learning shall mean a scientifically valid framework for guiding educational practice that (a) provides flexibility in the ways information is presented, in the ways students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills, and in the ways students are engaged; and (b) reduces barriers in instruction; provides appropriate accommodations, supports, and challenges; and maintains high achievement expectations for all students, including students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency.[25]

1.55   Writing literacy skills - Writing literacy skills shall mean skills that students use to convey ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content. Writing literacy skills involve multiple components of discipline that reflect requirements to accurately write informative and explanatory texts and narratives that develop real or imagined experiences or events, using effective techniques, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences. Each year students should demonstrate increasing sophistication in all aspects of language use, from vocabulary and syntax to the development and organization of ideas, and they should address increasingly demanding content and sources. Students advancing through the grades are expected to meet each year's grade-specific standards for writing literacy skills, and retain and further develop writing literacy skills and understandings mastered in preceding grades.

SECTION 2
DYSLEXIA AWARENESS

The Department of Education and other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the State of Hawaii, the private sector, and the Hawaii community shall promote awareness of dyslexia, and strengthen support for individuals with dyslexia, in the State of Hawaii.

This Section 2 describes the commitment to promoting public awareness of dyslexia in the State of Hawaii.

2.1   Department of Education and Dyslexia Awareness. The Department of Education shall promote awareness of dyslexia, and strengthen support for individuals with dyslexia, by developing or adopting materials to be used as a reference for its educators, students, and parents. Materials shall include the definition of dyslexia and information about common indicators including challenges often faced by students with dyslexia, accommodations,

---

[24] Department of Education, State of Hawaii (revision of RS 00-0294/04-0395), 2009.

[25] Section 103(a)(24) of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315), enacted on August 14, 2008 and reauthorizes the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended**.**

modifications and interventions, response to intervention, screening and assessment, applicable Federal and State law requirements, services and options available to students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia and applicable procedures.

2.2   Other Departments and Agencies of the State of Hawaii and Dyslexia Awareness. Where appropriate, other departments and agencies of the State of Hawaii shall promote public awareness of dyslexia in the context of their programs, particularly in the areas of health, welfare, education, and employment, including interdepartmental and interagency programs which may also include participation with the private sector

2.3   Private Sector and Hawaii Community and Dyslexia Awareness. Where appropriate, the private sector and Hawaii community shall be encouraged to promote public awareness of dyslexia in the context of their programs, particularly in the areas of health, welfare, education, and employment of people in Hawaii.

SECTION 3
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Department of Education shall make available to educators professional development to support the enhancement of reading, writing, and spelling skills of students with dyslexia and other literacy challenges.

This Section 3 describes the Departments of Education's commitment to providing professional development opportunities to educators.

3.1   Department of Education and Professional Development. The Department of Education shall offer or make available to all in-service teachers, and to other educators designated by the Department of Education, professional development to support the enhancement of reading, writing, and spelling skills of students with dyslexia and other literacy challenges. Professional development shall include but not be limited to the following areas:

(a)   increasing awareness of dyslexia, including without limitation, with regard to the definition of dyslexia and information about common indicators including challenges often faced by students with dyslexia, applicable Federal and State law requirements, Department of Education services and options available to students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, and applicable procedures, and Department of Education contact information for inquiries about dyslexia;

(b)   accommodations, modifications, interventions, and assistive technology devices;

(c)   early screening and assessment for identification of students with dyslexia or other literacy challenges, including those displaying characteristics of dyslexia;

(d)   a multi-tiered system of research-validated interventions and supports, including without limitation multisensory structured language education, within the response to

intervention model, that (i) implements structured, direct, explicit, structured, systematic, and cumulative instruction in oral and written language, including reading, writing, and spelling, through program content that includes phonology and phonological awareness, sound and symbol association, syllables, morphology, syntax, and semantics; (ii) addresses the needs of students with dyslexia or other literacy challenges; and (iii) is consistent with standards and guidelines of the United States Department of Education and other applicable national standards for the instruction of students with dyslexia in oral and written language; and

(e)   evidence-based progress monitoring that provides students, parents, and educators with data on student performance and improvements, and that uses this data in evaluations and decisions for instructional changes.

SECTION 4
TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

"Teacher expertise is the single most important factor in determining student achievement and fully trained teachers are far more effective with students than those who are not prepared."[26]

This Comprehensive Plan requires that all teachers have specific knowledge and skills to use best practices in literacy instruction, strategy, and intervention in order to be able to effectively teach literacy skills to all students, and to address literacy challenges experienced by Struggling Readers. It also requires that each school have at least one Literacy Specialist who is an expert in the subject of teaching literacy skills, including diagnostics and instruction.

Accordingly, the University of Hawaii and other universities and colleges in Hawaii which offer teacher preparation programs, shall create new teacher preparation programs, or expand existing teacher preparation programs, to include basic, foundational, or advanced language instruction curriculum content and practicum experience, appropriate to the level and license for which candidates are being prepared, addressing the knowledge and skills necessary for Elementary Teachers to teach foundational reading skills; Content Area Teachers to teach reading skills in their content areas; Teachers of Special Subjects to teach foundational reading skills to their targeted populations, and Literacy Specialists to be experts in teaching literacy skills (including diagnostics and instruction).

This Section 4 describes the teacher preparation programs for Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, and Literacy Specialists, as they relate to teaching literacy skills to students.[27]

---

[26] National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1997). What matters most: Teaching for America's future. Reading Today, 14(4), 3.

[27] See definitions of Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, and Literacy Specialists.

4.1   Curriculum and Practicum Requirements of Teacher Preparation Programs for Content Area Teachers.

(a)   The curriculum requirements for teaching literacy skills in teacher preparation programs for Content Area Teachers shall include basic knowledge of, and experience with, research-validated best practices in teaching reading in the content area that shall enable teaching candidates to effectively address reading difficulties of students in their content classes. The curriculum shall comply with national standards related to content area reading such as those identified in the 2010 International Reading Association Standards for the Content Classroom Teacher and Level 1 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. For example, basic content:

(i)   on the definition and characteristics of dyslexia;

(ii)   to meet the requirements of "Content Knowledge" and the requirements of Level 1 of "Application" and "Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties," as set forth in all of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. For example, basic content on:

A.   foundational concepts about oral and written learning:

(1)   language processing requirements of proficient reading and writing;

(2)   other aspects of cognition and behavior that affect reading and writing;

(3)   environmental, cultural, and social factors that contribute to literacy development;

(4)   typical developmental progression in language development;

(5)   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;

(6)   major components of literacy development changes with reading development; and

(7)   reasonable goals and expectations for learners at various stages of reading and writing; and

B.   the structure of language:

(1)   phonology (the speech sound system);

25

(2)   orthography (the spelling system);

(3)   morphology;

(4)   semantics;

(5)   syntax; and

(6)   discourse organization;

(iii)   on accommodations and modifications that may apply to students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, or other Struggling Readers, and the development of literacy skills;

(iv)   on response to intervention (RTI) and its application to students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, or other Struggling Readers, and the development of literacy skills;

(v)   on universal design for learning and its application to students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, or other Struggling Readers, and the development of literacy skills;

(vi)   on differentiation and its application to students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, or other Struggling Readers, and the development of literacy skills;

(vii)   on research-validated best practices in reading and writing including, without limitation, multisensory structured language education, which are consistent with national for the instruction of students with dyslexia and/or other literacy challenges;[28]

(viii)   on assistive technology devices that may assist students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, or other Struggling Readers;

(ix)   on Federal and State law requirements and eligibility relating to grades K through 12 education of students with reading disabilities; and

(x)   on services available for learners with specific or special needs.

(b)   The practicum component of teacher preparation programs for Content Area Teachers shall include basic work with students with dyslexia or other Struggling Readers, utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and interventions, as adapted for use in the

---

[28] In addition to the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, this would include the standards of the International Reading Association and those prescribed by IDEA.

general education classroom, consistent with national standards related to content area reading such those identified in the 2010 International Reading Association Standards for the Content Classroom Teacher, and the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards.

4.2   Curriculum and Practicum Requirements for Elementary Teachers.

        (a)   The curriculum requirements for teaching literacy skills in teacher preparation programs for Elementary Teachers shall include foundational knowledge of, and experience with, research-validated best practices in reading and writing that shall enable candidates to effectively teach reading and writing literacy skills. The curriculum shall prepare Elementary Teacher candidates for the Basic Exam, and to meet the HTSB's other requirements for a Teacher of Reading License or Teacher of Reading License Field that would be added to a license to teach in the relevant grade-levels. The curriculum shall comply with national standards for the preparation of teachers of reading such as those identified in Level 1 and Level 2 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. For example, foundational content:

        (i)   on the subjects described in section 4.1(a) of this Comprehensive Plan, including the requirements of "Content Knowledge" and the requirements of Level 1 of "Application" and "Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties," as set forth in all of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards;

        (ii)   to meet the requirements of Level 2 of the "Application" and "Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties," as set forth in all of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards;

        (iii)   on strategies for continuously interpreting and administering student assessments and evaluations, and communicating the student's reading progress and needs to design and implement ongoing interventions; and

        (iv)   on reading acquisition and instructional practices that are research-validated and appropriate for teaching reading strategies to students and, by way of contrast, other practices which are not research-validated or otherwise not appropriate for teaching reading strategies to students.

        (b)   The practicum component of teacher preparation programs for Elementary Teachers shall include advanced work with students with dyslexia or other Struggling Readers, utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and interventions, as adapted for use in the general education classroom, consistent with national standards such as Level I of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. For example:

        (i)   a comprehensive program to comply with all requirements for Level I Status as set forth in Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards (Guidelines Pertaining to Supervised Practice of Teachers of Students with Documented Reading Disabilities or Dyslexia who Work in School, Clinical, or Private Practice Settings); and

27

(ii)	instruction and practicum experience in lesson planning, teaching reading skills in general education classrooms, delivering interventions to individual or small groups of Struggling Readers, documenting student progress with formal and informal assessments, and completing an educational assessment of a student with a suspected reading disability needing diagnostic assessment for special education support services, consistent with the requirements of Level I of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards (Guidelines Pertaining to Supervised Practice of Teachers of Students with Documented Reading Disabilities or Dyslexia who Work in School, Clinical, or Private Practice Settings).

(c)	Curriculum and practicum requirements for PK teachers shall address similar criteria, adjusted for age appropriateness.

**4.3	Curriculum and Practicum Requirements for Teachers of Special Subjects (not including Literacy Specialists).**

(a)	The curriculum requirements for teaching literacy skills in teacher preparation programs for all Teachers of Special Subjects (not including Literacy Specialists) shall at minimum be the same as for Elementary Teachers as set forth in section 4.2(a) of this Comprehensive Plan, but shall be adapted, as appropriate, for teaching reading and writing literacy skills to English language learners and students with limited English proficiency, special education students, and other students who generally receive instruction from such Teachers of Special Subjects. The curriculum shall prepare such Teacher of Special Subjects applicants (not including Literacy Specialists) for the Basic Exam, and to meet the HTSB's other requirements for a Teacher of Reading License, or Teacher of Reading License Field that would be added to a license to teach in the relevant grade-levels. The curriculum shall comply with national standards for the preparation of teachers of reading such as those identified in Level 1 and Level 2 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, as further described in section 4.2(a) of this Comprehensive Plan.

(b)	The practicum component of teacher preparation programs for Teachers of Special Subjects (not including Literacy Specialists) shall be the same as for Elementary Teachers as set forth in section 4.2(b) of this Comprehensive Plan, and shall include advanced work with students with dyslexia or other Struggling Readers (including English language learners and students with limited English proficiency, special education students, and other students who generally receive instruction from such Teachers of Special Subjects), utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and interventions consistent with national standards such as Level I of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, as further described in section 4.2(b) of this Comprehensive Plan.

**4.4	Curriculum and Practicum Requirements for Literacy Specialists.**

(a)	The curriculum requirements for all teacher preparation programs for Literacy Specialists shall include advanced, comprehensive, in-depth knowledge of, and extensive experience with, research-validated best practices in reading and writing that shall enable Literacy Specialists to be proficient in the assessment and instruction of students with dyslexia or

other documented reading disabilities, to implement and adapt research-validated programs to meet the needs of individual students, and to assist and supervise Content Area Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, Elementary Teachers, and other Teachers of Reading in matters relating to the development of reading literacy for Struggling Readers. The curriculum shall prepare Literacy Specialist candidates for the Advanced Exam, to meet the HTSB's other requirements for a Literacy Specialist License, or Literacy Specialist License field that would be added to a license to teach in the relevant grade-levels. The curriculum shall comply with national standards for the preparation of literacy specialists, dyslexia specialists, or reading specialists such as those identified in Level 1 and Level 2 of Section I the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. For example, advanced, comprehensive, and in-depth content:

(i)   on the subjects described in section 4.1 of this Comprehensive Plan, including the requirements of "Content Knowledge" and the requirements of Level 1 of "Application" and "Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties," as set forth in all of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards;

(ii)   to meet the requirements of Level 2 of the "Application" and "Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties" requirements, as set forth in all of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards;

(iii)   on strategies for continuously interpreting and administering student assessments and evaluations, and communicating the student's reading progress and needs to design and implement ongoing interventions;

(iv)   on reading acquisition and instructional practices that are research-validated and appropriate for teaching reading strategies to students and, by way of contrast, other practices which are not research-validated or otherwise not appropriate for teaching reading strategies to students;

(v)   on the variety of available diagnostic tools, including without limitation, for testing of phonological components, and respective eligibility criteria;

(vi)   on transition planning, services and support students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, and other Struggling Readers;

(vii)   on specific resources necessary for support of students with dyslexia or who display characteristics of dyslexia, and other Struggling Readers; and

(viii) on collaboration strategies and skills enabling the Literacy Specialists to work effectively with and support Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, and Teachers of Special Subjects with Struggling Readers.

(b)   The practicum component of teacher preparation programs for Literacy Specialists shall include comprehensive and in-depth work with students with dyslexia and other Struggling Readers, utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and interventions as

adapted for use in general education classrooms and with special education students, consistent with national standards such as Level II of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards. For example:

   (i) a comprehensive program to comply with all requirements for Level II Status as set forth in Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards (Guidelines Pertaining to Supervised Practice of Teachers of Students with Documented Reading Disabilities or Dyslexia who Work in School, Clinical, or Private Practice Settings); and

   (ii) instruction and practicum experience in lesson planning, teaching reading skills instruction in classrooms, delivering interventions to individual or small groups of Struggling Readers, documenting student progress with formal and informal assessments, and completing an educational assessment of a student with a suspected reading disability needing diagnostic assessment for special education support services, consistent with the requirements of Level II of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards (Guidelines Pertaining to Supervised Practice of Teachers of Students with Documented Reading Disabilities or Dyslexia who Work in School, Clinical, or Private Practice Settings).

4.5 HTSB Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs.

  (a) All curriculum and practicum requirements described in Section 4 of this Comprehensive Plan shall be included in applicable State approved teacher education programs.[29]

  (b) All teacher preparation programs described in Section 4 of this Comprehensive Plan are subject to the approval of the HTSB.

<div align="center">

SECTION 5
LICENSURE OF TEACHERS

</div>

  This Comprehensive Plan requires that all teachers have specific knowledge and skills to use best practices in literacy instruction, strategy, and intervention in order to be able to effectively teach literacy skills to all students, and to address literacy challenges experienced by Struggling Readers. Accordingly, the HTSB shall require all teacher candidates to demonstrate knowledge and skill in the teaching of literacy skills including best practices for literacy instruction, strategy, and research-validated intervention that are appropriate to the respective license or license field being sought. Furthermore, the HTSB shall create new license fields or licenses, or shall revise the requirements of existing license fields or licenses, as it deems necessary or advisable to accomplish the foregoing.

  Without limiting the HTSB's discretion described in the preceding paragraph, the HTSB

---

[29] The term "Teacher Education Programs" shall soon be changed to "Education Program Providers." The HTSB has sole authority to approve Teacher Education Programs.

shall implement licensure requirements relating to the teaching of literacy skills for Elementary Teachers (who must also have a Teacher of Reading License or Teacher of Reading License Field, indicating they are qualified to teach foundational reading skills); Content Area Teachers (who shall meet the requirements to teach reading skills in their content areas); Teachers of Special Subjects (who, with the exception of Literary Specialists, must also have a Teacher of Reading License or Teacher of Reading License Field, indicating they are qualified to teach foundational reading skills); and Literacy Specialists (who shall meet requirements consistent with advanced, comprehensive, and in-depth preparation for teaching literacy skills). Specifically, the HTSB shall create a new Teacher of Reading License Field and/or Teacher of Reading License[30], and shall create a new license field and/or license, or shall revise the requirements of an existing license field and/or license, to create a Literacy Specialist License Field and/or Literacy Specialist License.[31]

This Section 5 describes the licensure requirements for Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, and Literacy Specialists, as they relate to teaching literacy skills to students.[32]

5.1   Licensure Requirements for Content Area Teachers Relating to Literacy Instruction. In addition to all other requirements established by the HTSB, the HTSB shall require all initial and renewal candidates for Content Area Teacher licenses to:

(a)   demonstrate basic knowledge of, and experience with, research-validated best practices in teaching reading in the content area that shall enable candidates to effectively address reading difficulties of students in their content classes, consistent with the requirements of national standards related to content area reading such as those identified in the 2010 International Reading Association Standards for the Content Classroom Teacher and Level 1 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, and as described in section 4.1(a) of this Comprehensive Plan; and

(b)   demonstrate practicum experience including basic work with students with dyslexia or other Struggling Readers, utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and interventions, as adapted for use in the general education classroom, consistent with national standards related to content area reading such as those identified in the 2010 International Reading Association Standards for the Content Classroom Teacher, and IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, and as described in section 4.1(b) of this Comprehensive Plan.

5.2   Licensure Requirements for Elementary Teachers Relating to Literacy Instruction. In addition to all other requirements established by the HTSB, the HTSB shall require all initial and renewal candidates for Elementary Teacher licenses to hold or qualify for the issuance of a

---

[30] See footnote 7 re the name "Teacher of Reading."

[31] See footnote 6 re the name "Literacy Specialist."

[32] See definitions of Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, and Literacy Specialists.

Teacher of Reading License Field as part of a license to teach in the relevant grade-level or a Teacher of Reading License, as described in section 5.4 of this Comprehensive Plan.

5.3   Licensure Requirements for Teachers of Special Subjects (not including Literacy Specialists) Relating to Literacy Instruction. In addition to all other requirements established by the HTSB, the HTSB shall require all initial and renewal candidates for Teacher of Special Subjects licenses to hold or qualify for issuance of a Teacher of Reading License Field as part of a license to teach in the relevant grade-level or a Teacher of Reading License, as described in section 5.4 of this Comprehensive Plan. Provided however, this section 5.3 shall not apply to candidates seeking to become Literacy Specialists.

5.4   Licensure Requirements for Teachers of Reading Relating to Literacy Instruction. In addition to all other requirements established by the HTSB, the HTSB shall require initial and renewal candidates for Teacher of Reading License Fields or Teacher of Reading Licenses to:

(a)   demonstrate foundational knowledge of, and experience with, research-validated best practices in reading and writing that shall enable candidates to effectively teach reading and writing literacy, consistent with national standards for the preparation of teachers of reading, such as those identified in Level 1 and Level 2 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, as described in section 4.2(a) or section 4.3(a) of this Comprehensive Plan, as applicable;

(b)   demonstrate practicum experience including advanced work with students with dyslexia or other Struggling Readers, utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and interventions, as adapted for use in the general education classroom, consistent with national standards such as those identified in Level I of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, as described in section 4.2(b) or section 4.3(b) of this Comprehensive Plan, as applicable; and

(c)   pass the Basic Exam described in section 5.10 of this Comprehensive Plan.

5.5   Licensure Requirements for Literacy Specialists Relating to Literacy Instruction. In addition to all other requirements established by the HTSB, the HTSB shall require initial and renewal candidates for Literacy Specialist Licenses or Literacy Specialist License Fields:

(a)   to demonstrate advanced, comprehensive, in-depth knowledge of, and extensive experience with, research-validated best practices in reading and writing that shall enable candidates to be proficient in the assessment and instruction of students with dyslexia or other documented reading disabilities, to implement and adapt research-validated programs to meet the needs of individual students, and to assist and supervise Content Area Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, Elementary Teachers, and other Teachers of Reading in matters relating to the development of reading literacy for Struggling Readers, consistent with national standards for the preparation of literacy specialists, dyslexia specialists, and/or reading specialists such as those identified in Level 1 and Level 2 of Section I of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, as described in section 4.4(a) of this Comprehensive Plan;

(b)	to demonstrate practicum experience including advanced, comprehensive, and in-depth work with students with dyslexia and other Struggling Readers, utilizing appropriate literacy instruction, strategies, and including interventions as adapted for use in general education classrooms and with special education students, consistent with national standards such as those identified in Level II of Section II of the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, as described in section 4.4(b) of this Comprehensive Plan;

(c)	to have completed an HTSB approved teacher preparation program[33] for recommendation as a Literacy Specialist from an accredited university or college, and no less than a specified number of years (as determined by the HTSB) of general classroom or special education teaching experience. Provided however, recognized, certified instructors and others certified in reading remediation or language therapy by a nationally recognized professional organization and demonstrated success for at least two years in teaching Struggling Readers, may be substituted for requirements of the preceding sentence, at the HTSB's discretion; and

(d)	to pass the Advanced Exam described in section 5.11 of this Comprehensive Plan.

**5.6	Federal and Nationally Recognized Guidelines.** The HTSB standards and requirements established in connection with Section 5 of this Comprehensive Plan shall be consistent national standards which address knowledge and practice in the instruction of students with dyslexia or other literacy challenges in oral and written language.

**5.7	 HTSB-Approved Literacy Skills Teacher Training Programs.** The HTSB shall evaluate and approve qualified and appropriate teacher training programs offering content consistent with the requirements of section 4.2(a), section 4.3(a), or section 4.4(a) of this Comprehensive Plan, as applicable, and practicum experience consistent with the requirements of section 4.2(b), section 4.3(b), or section 4.4(b) of this Comprehensive Plan, as applicable, and which have been approved by the Standards and Practices Committee of the International Dyslexia Association (IDA), International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council (IMSLEC), Academy of Orton-Gillingham Practitioners and Educators, or other nationally recognized organizations accrediting literacy specialists, dyslexia specialists, reading specialists, and/or language therapy programs which have been approved by the HTSB. Such literacy skills teacher training programs may be operated by the Department of Education, universities and colleges in Hawaii (not necessarily as part of a teacher preparation program), private entities, and/or recognized, certified instructors. Such literacy skills teacher training programs shall be available to in-service teachers to prepare for the Basic Exam or Advanced Exam, or to prepare and qualify for a Teacher of Reading License Field or Teacher of Reading License, or a Literacy Specialist License or Literacy Specialist License Field.

**5.8	Services Provided by Recognized, Certified Instructors.** Recognized, certified instructors, and other individuals who are certified in reading remediation or language therapy by a nationally recognized professional organization, who have demonstrated success for at least

---

[33]	The HTSB presently contemplates that such approved programs for Literacy Specialist shall include post-baccalaureate preparation.

two years in teaching reading to Struggling Readers and have passed the Advanced Exam may, subject to approval of the HTSB, be hired by the Department of Education or other schools in the State of Hawaii as Literacy Specialists, or to provide professional development and/or training in literacy instruction to educators, or to work individually with Struggling Readers.

5.9   Provisional Licenses.

(a)   The HTSB may, in its discretion, grant a provisional Teacher of Reading License Fields or Teacher of Reading Licenses for up to a one-year term after failure and before retaking the Basic Exam, provided the teacher is actively participating in an HTSB-approved literacy skills teacher training program in preparation for retaking the Basic Exam. However, no individual shall be accepted into or continue in a program that involves teaching grades K through 6 without first passing the Basic Exam.

(b)   The HTSB may, in its discretion, grant a provisional Literacy Specialist License or Literacy Specialist License Field for up to one year after failure and before retaking the Advanced Exam, provided such teacher has passed the Basic Exam and is actively participating in an HTSB-approved literacy skills teacher training program in preparation for retaking the Advanced Exam.

(c)   The HTSB may, in its discretion, renew the one year provisional license of a teacher who has not successfully completed the Basic Exam or Advanced Exam, whichever is applicable, for additional one year periods (but not to exceed two additional one year periods), contingent upon such teacher:

(i)   providing evidence of active participation in an HTSB-approved literacy skills teacher training program that includes a formal diagnostic component in the specific areas in which the licensee did not obtain qualifying scores; and

(ii)   re-taking the Basic Exam or Advanced Exam, whichever is applicable, during the one year extension period.

5.10   Basic Reading Instruction Competence Examination (Basic Exam). The Basic Exam shall cover basic knowledge of the foundations of reading development, development of reading comprehension, reading instruction and assessment, and integration of knowledge and understanding, consistent with the curriculum requirements for Teachers of Reading as set forth in Section 4.2(a) and Section 4.3(a) of this Comprehensive Plan.

(a)   The Basic Exam shall be identified and adopted by the HTSB and shall meet national standards and have evidence of validity appropriate for assessing the knowledge and skills of those to be licensed as Teachers of Reading. For example:

(i)   the foundations of reading portion of the Basic Exam may include questions covering the understanding of phonological and phonemic awareness, the understanding of concepts of print and the alphabetic principle, the role of phonics in promoting

reading development, and the understanding of word analysis skills and strategies;

(ii)   the development of the reading comprehension portion of the Basic Exam may include questions covering the understanding of vocabulary development, the understanding of how to apply reading comprehension skills and strategies to imaginative or literary texts, and the understanding of how to apply reading comprehension skills and strategies to informational or expository texts;

(iii)   the reading assessment and instruction portion of the of the Basic Exam may include questions covering the understanding of formal and informal methods for assessing reading development, and the understanding of multiple approaches to reading instruction; and

(vi)   the integration of knowledge and understanding portion of the Basic Exam may include open response questions requiring organized, developed analyses on topics related to foundations of reading development, development of reading comprehension, and reading assessment and instruction.

(b)   The HTSB, in consultation with a panel of individuals who have demonstrated mastery of the knowledge foundations of reading development, development of reading comprehension, reading instruction and assessment, and integration of knowledge and understanding of reading literacy, shall select the Basic Exam and shall, as appropriate, make a practice exam available to the University of Hawaii and other universities and colleges in Hawaii which offer teacher preparation programs, the Department of Education, schools in Hawaii, teachers, teaching candidates, and other interested persons.

5.11   Advanced Reading Instruction Competence Examination (Advanced Exam). The Advanced Exam shall cover reading processes and development, reading assessment, reading instruction, reading support systems, and advanced knowledge and understanding of the teaching of reading, consistent with the curriculum requirements for Literacy Specialists as set forth in Section 4.4(a) of this Comprehensive Plan.

(a)   The Advanced Exam shall be identified and adopted by the HTSB and shall meet national standards and have evidence of validity appropriate for assessing the knowledge and skills of those to be licensed as Literacy Specialists. For example:

(i)   the reading processes and development portion of the Advanced Exam may include questions covering in depth the understanding of the connections among listening, speaking, reading, and writing; phonological and phonemic awareness; concepts of print and the alphabetic principle; the role of phonics knowledge in reading development; other word analysis skills and strategies; the development of vocabulary knowledge and skills; skills and strategies for comprehending literary or imaginative texts; and skills and strategies for comprehending expository and content area texts;

(ii)   the reading assessment portion of the Advanced Exam may include questions covering the understanding of test construction and the interpretation of test results;

characteristics and uses of formal and informal reading and writing assessments; the role of assessment in promoting reading and writing development; and the screening and diagnosis of reading difficulties and disabilities;

    (iii) the reading instruction portion of the Advanced Exam may include questions covering the understanding of research-validated instructional strategies, programs, and methodologies for promoting early reading and writing development; research-validated instructional strategies, programs, and methodologies for consolidating and expanding reading, writing, and spelling skills; the differentiation of reading instruction to meet the needs of individual students; and characteristics and uses of reading resources, materials, and technologies;

    (iv) the professional knowledge and roles of Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, Teachers of Reading, and Literacy Specialists (as appropriate to the candidate) portion of the Advanced Exam may include questions covering the understanding of the interpretation, evaluation, and application of reading research; the multiple roles of the candidate's prospective position in planning and implementing reading instruction in collaboration with other members of the school community; and the understanding of the role of professional development in promoting the effectiveness of the candidate's prospective position and other educators; and

    (v) the integration of knowledge and understanding portion of the Advanced Exam may include open response questions requiring organized, developed analyses on topics related to reading processes and development, reading assessment, reading instruction, and the professional knowledge and roles of Elementary Teachers, Teachers of Special Subjects, Teachers of Reading, and Literacy Specialists (as appropriate to the candidate).

  (b) The HTSB, in consultation with a panel of individuals who have demonstrated mastery of the knowledge foundations of reading development, development of reading comprehension, reading instruction and assessment, and integration of knowledge and understanding of reading literacy, shall select the Advanced Exam.

<div align="center">

SECTION 6
LITERACY INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS:
Teaching Literacy Skills

</div>

  This Comprehensive Plan contemplates that all students, including Struggling Readers, meet or exceed grade level reading proficiency in all content subjects. This requires development of foundational reading skills, reading literacy skills, writing literacy skills, and speaking, listening, and language skills (collectively, literacy skills). It also contemplates that the literacy challenges experienced by Struggling Readers be addressed, to the greatest extent possible, in general education classrooms. Not all Struggling Readers should, can, or must be referred to special education.

In order to effectively teach literacy skills to all students, and to address literacy challenges experienced by Struggling Readers, the Department of Education must institute systems, procedures, and processes which require all teachers to utilize best practices for literacy instruction, strategy, and intervention. The best practices must include direct, explicit, structured, and systematic instruction in oral and written language with (i) early screening and assessment for identification of students with literacy challenges, including those displaying risk factors for dyslexia, (ii) a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) including multisensory structured language education (MSL) and other research-validated interventions, within the response to intervention (RTI) model with varying levels of intensity and duration which connects general, compensatory, exceptional, gifted and talented, and special education programs, implemented and matched to individual student strengths and needs, and (iii) evidence-based progress monitoring that provides students, parents, and educators with data on student performance and improvements, and that uses this data in evaluations and decisions for instructional changes.

This Section 6 provides guidelines for teaching foundational reading skills, reading literacy skills, writing literacy skills, and speaking, listening, and language skills to all students, including Struggling Readers.

6.1   Literacy Instruction and Standards.

(a)   Literacy skills instruction shall be integrated and aligned with the Common Core State Standards adopted by the Department of Education and the IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards.

6.2   Foundational Reading Skills Instruction in Grades K through 6.[34] Foundational reading skills instruction programs shall consist of specific program content and a defined delivery system. The programs shall be taught by Elementary Teachers holding a Teacher of Reading Licenses or Teacher of Reading License Field.

(a)   The following are the content requirements for foundational reading skills instruction programs:

(i)   Language-Based - provides instruction that integrates all aspects of language: receptive (listening and reading); expressive (oral expression to include word finding and sequencing); written expression (spelling, mechanics, coherence); and, handwriting;

(ii)   Phonological Awareness - explicitly supports that words are made up of individual speech sounds and that those sounds can be manipulated: rhyming; recognition of initial, final, and medial sounds; recognition of vowel sounds; recognition and identification of the number of syllables in a word; sound blending of phonemes (sounds) in words and detached

---

[34] For elementary schools which end with grade 5, the references to "grade 6" throughout this section 6.2 may be replaced with "grade 5."

syllables; phoneme segmentation of real words and detached syllables; and, phoneme manipulation;

      (iii)   Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondence Knowledge - provides instruction on the system by which symbols represent sounds in a writing system: accurately pronouncing each phoneme represented by a given grapheme (symbol to sound); writing the graphemes that represent each given phoneme (sound to symbol); and, blending rules;

      (iv)   Syllable Instruction - provides instruction in syllables and their application to reading both as a word or part of a word that contains one sounded vowel;

      (v)   Linguistics - provides the science of language that includes phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics; the study of the structure of a language and its relationship to other languages;

      (vi)   Meaning-Based Instruction - provides instruction, through words and sentences, on how to best extract meaning in addition to teaching isolated letter-sound correspondence; instruction in morphology which includes identification of morphemes and their functional use in written and spoken words; instruction of syntax to include sentence construction, combining, and expansion in both narrative and expository text; instruction of semantics to include vocabulary acquisition, idioms, and figurative language; and, instruction in comprehension of narrative and expository text;

      (vii)   Reading Fluency Instruction - provides instruction on the imperative of reading fluency to include: accuracy; appropriate use of pitch, juncture, and stress; text phrasing; and the rate at which one reads. Instruction shall provide for substantial practice and continual application of decoding and word recognition to work toward automaticity; and also opportunities for reading large amounts of text to achieve independent reading at grade level with ninety-five percent accuracy and specific practices in skills being learned; and

      (viii)   Phonics - provides instructional practices that emphasize how spellings are related to speech sounds in systematic ways.

    (b)   All Elementary Teachers shall be prepared to utilize the following foundational reading skills instruction techniques and strategies with a diverse student population in the classrooms. Foundational reading skills instruction with student-teacher interaction shall include:

      (i)   direct, explicit, structured, systematic, sequential, and cumulative instruction that is organized and presented in a way that follows a logical sequential plan, fits the nature of language (alphabetic principle) with no assumption of prior skills or language knowledge, and maximizes student engagement. This instruction proceeds at a rate commensurate with students' needs, ability levels, and demonstration of progress;

      (ii)   individualized instruction that meets the specific learning needs of each

Struggling Reader in a small group setting to include a reading curriculum that matches each student's individual ability level;

(iii)   intensive, highly concentrated instruction that maximizes student engagement, uses specialized methods and materials, and produces results;

(iv)   meaning-based instruction that is directed toward purposeful reading and writing, with an emphasis on comprehension and composition, and independent thinking;

(v)   instruction that incorporates the simultaneous use of two or more sensory pathways (auditory, visual, kinesthetic, tactile) during teacher presentations and student practice;

(vi)   instructional delivery that uses a simultaneous combination of internal learning pathways, visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile to achieve proficiency in language processing;

(vii)   synthetic to analytic phonics delivery that teaches students the sounds of the letters first and then combines or blends these sounds to create words. Analytic phonics uses prior knowledge of letters and their corresponding sounds to decode and form new words; should be present in any model

(viii)   synthetic phonics methodology that teaches students the sounds of the letters first and then combines or blends these sounds to create words. It is delivered to students as follows:

A.   Systematically. The material is organized and taught in a way that is logical and fits the nature of our language. This characteristic of the methodology refers to the way a system of rules governs how sounds combine to form words and words combine to form sentences to represent knowledge.

B.   Sequentially. The learner moves step by step, in order, from simple, well-learned material to that which is more complex, as he or she masters the necessary body of language skills.

C.   Cumulatively. Each step is incremental and based on those skills already learned.

D.   Individualized. Teaching is planned to meet the differing needs of learners who are similar to each other, but not identical; and

(ix)   automaticity of student reading performance that requires a fluent processing of printed material. The goal is for the process to require little effort or attention, as in sight word recognition. Adequate student practice with decodable text is to be provided for mastery of automaticity skills and applications of concepts.

(c)   Implementation of the foundational reading skills instruction program is to be routinely provided to students within the regular school day for a minimum of 90 to 120 minutes per day. The instruction shall be scheduled in two segments for students as follows: regular class instruction, out-of-class instruction, individual or small group instruction, a combination of these options, or any additional arrangements to be developed by the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons).

6.3   Speaking, Listening, and Language Skills Instruction in Grades K through 6.[35]
Speaking, listening, and language skills of increasing difficulty by grade-level shall be taught to students in grades K through 5 by Elementary Teachers holding a Teacher of Reading License or Teacher of Reading License Field for academic and lifelong expression, comprehension, cooperation, and collaboration, using research-validated instruction and interventions aligned with Common Core State Standards.

(a)   Comprehension and collaboration in discussion with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

(i)   engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher led) with diverse partners on grade level topics and texts, building on others' ideas, and expressing their own ideas clearly;

(ii)   come to discussions prepared, having read or studied required material; explicitly draw on that preparation and other information known about the topic to explore ideas under discussion:

A.   follow agreed-upon rules for discussions and carry out assigned roles;

B.   pose and respond to specific questions by making comments that contribute to the discussion and elaborate on the remarks of others; and

C.   review the key ideas expressed and draw conclusions in light of information and knowledge gained from the discussions;

(iii)   summarize a written text read aloud or information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally; and

(iv)   summarize the points a speaker makes and explain how each claim is supported by reasons and evidence.

(b)   Expression and presentation of knowledge and ideas in discussion with increased

---

[35]   For elementary schools which end with grade 5, the references to "grade 6" throughout this section 6.3 may be replaced with "grade 5."

difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

   (i) report on a topic or text or present an opinion; sequence ideas logically and use appropriate facts and relevant, descriptive details to support main ideas or themes; and speak clearly at an understandable pace;

   (ii) include multimedia components (e.g., graphics, sound) and visual displays in presentations when appropriate to enhance the development of main ideas or themes; and

   (iii) adapt speech to a variety of contexts and tasks, using formal English when appropriate to task and situation.

  (c) Conventions of Standard English in speaking and writing with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall:

   (i) learn and demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking;

   (ii) learn and explain the function of conjunctions, prepositions, and interjections in general and their function in particular sentences;

   (iii) learn to use the perfect verb tenses (e.g., I had walked; I have walked; I shall have walked);

   (iv) learn to use verb tense to convey various times, sequences, states, and conditions; and

   (v) learn to recognize and correct inappropriate shifts in verb tense (e.g., either/or, neither/nor).

  (d) Command of the conventions of standard English - capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

   (i) use punctuation to separate items in a series;

   (ii) use a comma to separate an introductory element from the rest of the sentence;

   (iii) use a comma to set off the words yes and no (e.g., Yes, thank you), to set off a tag question from the rest of the sentence (e.g., It's true, isn't it?), and to indicate direct address (e.g., Is that you, Steve?);

   (iv) use underlining, quotation marks, or italics to indicate titles of works; and

(v) spell grade-appropriate words correctly, consulting references as needed.

(e) Knowledge of language with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

(i) use knowledge of language and its conventions when writing, speaking, reading, or listening;

(ii) expand, combine, and reduce sentences for meaning, reader and listener interest, and style; and

(iii) compare and contrast the varieties of English (e.g., dialects, registers) used in stories, dramas, and poems.

(f) Vocabulary acquisition and use with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

(i) determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases based on grade-level reading and content, choosing flexibly from a range of strategies;

(ii) use context (e.g., cause/effect relationships and comparisons in text) as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase;

(iii) use common, grade-appropriate Greek and Latin affixes and roots as clues to the meaning of a word (e.g., photograph, photosynthesis);

(iv) consult reference materials (e.g., dictionaries, glossaries, thesauruses), both print and digital, to find the pronunciation and determine or clarify the precise meaning of key words and phrases;

(v) demonstrate understanding of figurative language, word relationships, and nuances in word meaning;

(vi) interpret figurative language, including similes and metaphors, in context;

(vii) recognize and explain the meaning of common idioms, adages, and proverbs;

(viii) use the relationship between particular words (e.g., synonyms, antonyms, homographs) to better understand each of the words; and

(ix) acquire and use accurately grade-appropriate general academic and domain-specific words and phrases, including those that signal contrast, addition, and other logical relationships (e.g., however, although, nevertheless, similarly, moreover, in addition).

6.4   Reading Literacy Skills Instruction in the Content Areas in All Grades.[36] Grade–level appropriate reading literacy skills shall be taught to all students in all grade-levels in, in English language arts and all content areas, as determined by the Common Core State Standards to define college and career readiness expectations.

    (a)   Key ideas and details in content area reading literacy with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

        (i)   read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text;

        (ii)   determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas; and

        (iii)   analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text;

    (b)   Craft and structure content area reading literacy with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

        (i)   interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone;

        (ii)   analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole; and

        (iii)   assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.

    (c)   Integration of knowledge and ideas in content area reading literacy with increased difficulty by grade-level. For example, students shall learn to:

        (i)   integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse formats and media, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words;

        (ii)   delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence; and

        (iii)   analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics to build

---

[36] Note that the reading literacy skills described in this section 6.4 apply to the instruction in content areas for all grade-levels; which means they may be taught by Elementary Teachers, Content Area Teachers, and Teachers of Special Subjects, as applicable.

knowledge or to compare author approaches; and

(d)   Range of reading and level of text complexity for reading literacy with increased difficulty by grade-level. Analyze and structure instruction with complex textual literature that requires increased comprehension proficiency and encourages independent analysis.

6.5   Writing Literacy Skills Instruction in Grades 4 through 8.[37] Writing literacy skills shall be taught to all students in grades 4 through 8 in English language arts and all content areas, as determined by the Common Core State Standards to define college and career readiness expectations.

(a)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and master the skill of writing opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons and information that increase in complexity. For example, students shall learn to:

(i)   introduce a topic or text clearly, state an opinion, and create an organizational structure in which related ideas are grouped to support the writer's purpose;

(ii)   provide reasons that are supported by facts and details;

(iii)   link opinion and reasons using words and phrases; and

(iv).   provide a concluding statement or section related to the opinion presented.

(b)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and master the skill of writing arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. For example, students shall learn to:

(i)   introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence;

(ii)   develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases;

(iii)   use words, phrases, and clauses as well as varied syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims;

(iv)   establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to

---

[37] Note that the writing literacy skills described in this section 6.5 apply to the instruction in content areas for grades 4 through 8; which means they may be taught by Elementary Teachers, Content Area Teachers, and Teachers of Special Subjects, as applicable.

the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing; and

(v)   provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.

(c)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and shall master the skill of writing narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event sequences. For example, students shall learn to:

(i)   orient the reader by establishing a situation and introducing a narrator and/or characters; organize an event sequence that unfolds naturally;

(ii)   use dialogue and description to develop experiences and events or show the responses of characters to situations;

(iii)   use a variety of transitional words and phrases to manage the sequence of events;

(iv)   use concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely; and

(v)   provide a conclusion that follows from the narrated experiences or events.

(d)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and shall master the skill of the production and distribution of writing. For example, students shall learn to:

(i)   produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience;

(ii)   with guidance and support from peers and teachers, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing; and

(iii)   with some guidance and support from teachers, use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing as well as to interact and collaborate with others; demonstrate sufficient command of keyboarding skills.

(e)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and master the writing skill of using Research to Build and Present Knowledge. For example, students shall learn to:

(i)   conduct short research projects that build knowledge through investigation of different aspects of a topic;

(ii) recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; take notes and categorize information; and provide a list of sources; and

(iii) draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

6.6 Writing Literacy Skills Instruction in Grades 9 through 12.[38] Writing literacy skills shall be taught to students in grades 9 through 12 in English language arts and all content areas, as determined by the Common Core State Standards to define college and career readiness expectations.

A. Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and shall master the skill of writing informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content. For example, students shall learn to:

(i) introduce a topic; organize complex ideas, concepts, and information so that each new element builds on that which precedes it to create a unified whole; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia to aid comprehension;

(ii) develop the topic thoroughly by selecting the most significant and relevant facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic;

(iii) use appropriate and varied transitions and syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among complex ideas and concepts;

(iv) use precise language, domain-specific vocabulary, and techniques such as metaphor, simile, and analogy to manage the complexity of the topic;

(v) establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing; and

(vi) provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the information or explanation presented (e.g., articulating implications or the significance of the topic).

(b) Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and master the skill of writing narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well chosen details, and well structured event sequences. For example,

---

[38] Note that the writing literacy skills described in this section 6.6 apply to the instruction in content areas for grades 9 through 12; which means they may be taught by Content Area Teachers and Teachers of Special Subjects, as applicable.

students shall learn to:

> (i)   engage and orient the reader by setting out a problem, situation, or observation and its significance, establishing one or multiple point(s) of view, and introducing a narrator and/or characters; create a smooth progression of experiences or events;

> (ii)   use narrative techniques, such as dialogue, pacing, description, reflection, and multiple plot lines, to develop experiences, events, and characters;

> (iii)   use a variety of techniques to sequence events so that they build on one another to create a coherent whole and build toward a particular tone and outcome (e.g., a sense of mystery, suspense, growth, or resolution);

> (iv)   use precise words and phrases, telling details, and sensory language to convey a vivid picture of the experiences, events, setting, and characters; and

> (v)   provide a conclusion that follows from and reflects on what is experienced, observed, or resolved over the course of the narrative.

(c)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and master the skill of production and distribution of writing. For example, students shall learn to:

> (i)   produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience;

> (ii)   develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience; and

> (iii)   use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products in response to ongoing feedback, including new arguments or information.

(d)   Students shall, with increased difficulty by grade-level, be instructed on and master the writing skill of using research to build and present knowledge. For example, students shall learn to:

> (i)   conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating an understanding of the subject under investigation;

> (ii)   gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the strengths and limitations of each source in terms of the task, purpose, and audience; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, while avoiding plagiarism and overreliance on any one source and

following a standard format for citation; and

              (iii)   draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

6.7   **Instruction in Preschool.** Pre-reading, speaking, listening and language preparation skills instruction in preschools shall address similar criteria as set forth in section 6.2 and section 6.3 of this Comprehensive Plan, adjusted for age appropriateness.

SECTION 7
LITERACY INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS:
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (RTI)

On December 3, 2004, Congress reauthorized the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004). The language that Congress uses in IDEA 2004 and No Child Left Behind (NCLB 2001) stresses the use of professionally sound interventions and instruction based on defensible research, as well as the delivery of effective academic and behavior programs to improve student performance. Congress believes that as a result, fewer children shall require special education services. Provisions of IDEA 2004 allow schools to use scientific, research-based interventions as an alternative method for identifying students with specific learning disabilities (SLD). This process is generally referred to as Response to Intervention (RTI).

The RTI framework utilizes a problem-solving multi-tiered approach to address academic and behavioral difficulties for all students using scientific, researched-based instruction. It relies on school-wide collaborative efforts and practices of: (a) universal screening and identification of at-risk learners, (b) data-driven decision making, (c) providing timely intensive research-based instruction/intervention by qualified professionals that are matched to specific student needs to close achievement gaps, (d) using a fluid multi-tiered model of service delivery, (e) ongoing progress monitoring and, (d) evaluating the effectiveness of instruction and intervention. RTI is intended to reduce the incidence of "instructional or curriculum casualties" by means of providing high quality instruction with fidelity and identify students at-risk for literacy failure including, but not limited to those due to a specific learning disability such as dyslexia.

It is important to note that RTI is not a placement model; it is a flexible service delivery model that should be applied in general education, supplemental and special education.

This Section 7 provides guidelines for the application and implementation of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) and response to intervention (RTI) model in teaching literacy skills to all students, including Struggling Readers.[39]

---

[39]   Portions of Section 7 are taken from the Alliance for Excellent Education Issue Brief June 2007
    Federal Support for Adolescent Literacy: A Solid Investment at
    http://www.all4ed.org/files/FedAdLit.pdf

7.1   Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (RTI) Standards for Struggling Readers in Grades K through 6.[40]

(a)   The needs of Struggling Readers and all students struggling with literacy challenges shall be addressed by implementing MTSS/RTI for students most at-risk for literacy failure. All Struggling Readers shall have the opportunity to benefit from an MTSS/RTI program and process that helps them through instruction, intervention, and if necessary, referral to special education in accordance with this Comprehensive Plan.

(b)   Principles of MTSS/RTI are:

(i)   assumption and belief that all students can learn;

(ii)   universal screening of all students and early intervention for students who demonstrate risk for literacy failure;

(iii)   use of a multi-tier model of service delivery (to achieve high rates of student success, instruction may be differentiated in both nature and intensity);

(iv)   use of a problem-solving or standard-protocol method to make decisions within a multitier model;

(v)   use of research-validated interventions and instruction to the extent available;

(vi)   monitoring of student progress to inform instruction;

(vii)   use of data to make decisions; and

(viii)   intervention and screening must be delivered by a qualified instructor with fidelity.

(c)   Essentials elements of a successful reading intervention MTSS/RTI program are:

(i)   universal screening and early identification - early screening, assessment, and identification of students at-risk for literacy failure in grades K through 6 should only be administered and scored by teachers and staff who have received ongoing professional development. To ensure fidelity of administration and reliability of scores, directions for administering screening tools and/or assessments, including curriculum based measurements (CBMs) must be explicitly followed. CBMs are primarily used as a method for determining if students are on benchmark or for purposes of progress monitoring;

---

[40]   For elementary schools which end with grade 5, the references to "grade 6" throughout this section 7.1 may be replaced with "grade 5."

(ii)   early identification - early screening, assessment, and identification of Struggling Readers in grades K through 6;

(iii)   intense instruction - optimally, a student who is struggling to read shall be assessed and provided instruction in a group of three and no more than five students, and the student shall receive this specialized reading instruction at least four, and preferably five, days a week;

(iv)   qualified teachers - intense instruction and intervention shall be delivered by Elementary Teachers in accordance with this Comprehensive Plan; and

(v)   sufficient duration - one of the most common errors in teaching Struggling Readers to read is to withdraw prematurely the instruction that seems to be working. A student who is reading accurately at or above grade-level but not fluently at their independent reading level still requires intensive reading instruction.

(d)   The process described below is the three-tiered MTSS/RTI for students who struggle in the area of reading. However, it is important to note that this process should be used with students struggling in any area of literacy such as: phonemic awareness, phonics decoding/encoding, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral or written language.

(i)   Tier I – Core Foundational Reading Instruction should involve (a) the use of a research-validated instructional program for all students, (b) ongoing assessment of progress and monitoring of reading achievement gains, and (c) Elementary Teachers using flexible grouping to target specific skills and differentiate instruction for all students, and (d) Elementary Teachers submit to the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) concerns for students who lack responsiveness after five consecutive weeks of intervention with progress monitoring. The decision to advance to Tier II should be based upon an analysis of all data submitted and the determination of a lack of responsiveness at Tier I by the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons).

A.   At a minimum, students shall be universally screened at the beginning, middle, and end of the academic school year to obtain baseline data.

B.   Students shall be provided a minimum of 90 – 120 minutes of instruction in flexible groups.

C.   Intervention instruction shall be in addition to the core curriculum and instruction.

D.   Parents shall be notified of Tier I interventions and progress.

(ii)   Tier II – Strategic MTSS Intervention is designed to meet the needs of Struggling Readers who do not respond quickly to foundational reading instruction. MTSS/RTI shall be provided in the general classroom setting. These students shall receive intensive small

group reading instruction in general education. The Elementary Teachers shall provide intervention, emphasizing all essential components of early literacy. Progress monitoring on the student reading development shall occur at least every two weeks on targeted skills to ensure adequate advancement and learning. A set of goals for each student shall be identified and established. Progress monitoring data shall be analyzed, interpreted, and documented. Students who meet set criteria on targeted skills as a result of Tier II Interventions are reintegrated into the general classroom setting (Tier I).

   A. Students shall be provided 9 to12 weeks (or as prescribed by the applicable instructional program) of 20 to 40 minute instructional sessions 3 to 4 times per week in flexible groups that are limited to 1 adult to 5 students maximum.

   B. Students shall continue in school-wide universal screening and assessments.

   C. Progress monitoring of targeted skills shall be completed at least every two weeks or weekly and used to adjust interventions based on student progress or lack thereof..

   D. The school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) shall be notified if progress monitoring data reflects below goal line performance over four consecutive periods of data collection; and frequency should be increased or new strategic interventions added.

   E. Intervention instruction shall be in addition to the core curriculum and instruction.

   F. Parents shall be notified of Tier I and Tier II interventions and progress.

  (iii) If at any time during the student's Tier II Strategic MTSS Intervention or after receiving Tier II Strategic MTSS Intervention (maximum of 9 to 18 weeks), the student's progress in the essential targeted components of reading shows little or no advancement and/or the student demonstrates characteristics associated with learning disorders such as dyslexia or specific learning disability, the Elementary Teachers shall recommend a formal diagnostic assessment for the student to the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons). If a student is not proficient in target skills after Tier II, the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) must determine that the Tier II strategic interventions have been implemented with fidelity, before consideration for intensive intervention at Tier III.

  (iv) Tier III – MTSS Intensive Instruction involves a small percentage of students who have received Tier II Strategic MTSS Intervention usually in general education and continue to show marked difficulty in acquiring necessary reading development to reach grade-level attainment. These students necessitate intensive instruction that is more explicit and

specifically designed to meet their individual needs. These students shall receive progress monitoring at least every two weeks weekly on targeted skills to ensure adequate progress and learning. The approximate time for Tier III MTSS Intensive Instruction is daily for 8 to 10 weeks, a minimum of 60 minute sessions in homogeneous groups led by 1 adult to a small group of 3 to 5 students. After this intensity of instruction the student can return to Tier II Strategic MTSS Intervention support before reintegration into the general classroom setting (Tier I).

           A.   Intensive intervention instruction may be extended to provide students with intensive and targeted intervention for 9 to18 weeks, daily for 60 minute instructional sessions in homogeneous groups that are led by 1 adult with up to 5 students maximum.

           B.   Students shall continue in school-wide universal screening and assessments.

           C.   Progress monitoring of targeted skills shall be completed at least every week and used to adjust interventions based on student progress or lack thereof.

           D.   Schools data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) shall be notified if progress monitoring data reflects below goal line performance over four consecutive periods of data collection; and frequency should be increased or new strategic interventions added.

           E.   Intervention instruction shall be in addition to the core curriculum and instruction.

           F.   Parents shall be notified of Tier II and Tier III interventions and progress.

           (v)   If at any time during the student's Tier III Intensive Instruction, or after receiving Tier III intervention, the student's progress in the essential components of reading development shows no advancement, continues to show marked difficulty in acquiring necessary reading development to reach grade-level attainment, and/or the student demonstrates characteristics associated with a learning disorder such as dyslexia or specific learning disability, the Elementary Teacher shall immediately recommended a formal diagnostic assessment for the student to the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) and notify the student's parent(s).

7.2   Interventions for Preschool Students. Utilize MTSS/RTI with research-validated instruction and interventions using similar criteria as described in section 7.1 of this Comprehensive Plan, adjusted for age-appropriateness, for interventions for preschool students.

7.3 **Reading Interventions and Strategies for Students in Grades 7 through 12.**[41]

     (a)   According to the Alliance for Excellent Education, researchers share a powerful consensus on what policymakers should do to support student struggling with literacy challenges in middle and high school. They should:

     (i)   encourage schools to articulate clear, comprehensive, and actionable plans for improving adolescent literacy instruction;

     (ii)   invest in assessment tools that schools can use to identify struggling readers in grades 7 through 12, assign them to appropriate classes, keep track of their progress, deliver and adjust instruction to meet their needs by literacy specialists;

     (iii)   invest in targeted interventions that shall enable students who read far below grade-level to make rapid progress in reading, helping them to achieve grade-level reading as quickly as possible;

     (iv)   invest in ongoing professional development programs designed to help all grade 7 through 12 teachers provide effective literacy instruction; and

     (v)   support and invest in ongoing research on and evaluation of strategies to improve adolescent literacy.[42]

     (b)   In 2004, the Alliance for Excellent Education brought together reading experts who developed the document *Reading Next*[43] which described fifteen teaching strategies and school-wide reforms that rigorous scientific research has shown to have positive effect on adolescent literacy achievement. The 15 key elements in programs designed to improve adolescent literacy achievement are:

Instructional Improvements:

     (i)   direct, explicit, structured, multi-sensory comprehension instruction;

---

[41] For middle and intermediate schools which begin with grade 6, the references to "grade 7" throughout this section 7.3 may be replaced with "grade 6." This section 7.3 would also apply to students in grades 4 through 6 if, for some reason, the interventions and strategies described in section 7.1 are not available to them, or if the Department of Education determines that the interventions and strategies described in section 7.3 are appropriate for grades 4 through 6 (the "late elementary grades").

[42] Federal Support for Adolescent Literacy: A Solid Investment, Alliance for Excellent Education Issue Brief, June 2007; and Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006), *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy*, which is a report to Carnegie Corporation of New York (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved April 28, 2012 from http://www.all4ed.org/files/ReadingNext.pdf)

[43] See footnote 42.

(ii)   effective instruction principles embedded in content;

(iii)   motivation and self-directed learning;

(iv)   text-based collaborative learning;

(v)   strategic tutoring;

(vi)   diverse texts;

(vii)   intensive writing;

(viii)   a technology component;

(ix)   ongoing formative assessments of students;

Infrastructure Improvements:

(x)   extended time for literacy;

(xi)   professional development;

(xii)   ongoing summative assessments of students and programs;

(xiii)   teacher teams;

(xiv)   leadership; and

(xiv)   a comprehensive and coordinated literacy program.[44]

(c)   It is important to establish a school culture that recognizes that all teachers, including Content Area Teachers, provide instruction supports in reading and writing literacy in their respective content areas so that all students attain grade-level proficiency, and that all teachers, including Content Area Teachers, shall provide every opportunity for students to read, practice their reading strategies and literacy skills in every subject, every day, to enhance their development of reading skills. Therefore, reading strategies shall be implemented as a school wide program involving all teachers, including Content Area Teachers, in connection with a school culture and vision that works toward high levels of student achievement in reading literacy. Specific interventions and strategies shall be provided to support Struggling Readers who have struggled to learn to read and are performing below grade-level in reading.

(d)   A consensus of the evidence suggests that for older students, adjustments should be made to the five essential components in the National Reading Panel Report to include these five areas for struggling older readers in late elementary, middle and high school: (i) word study;

---

[44]   See footnote 42.

(ii) fluency; (iii) vocabulary; (iv) comprehension; and (v) motivation. Furthermore, it is important to note that these components must be used when developing a MTSS/RTI framework to address older struggling students.

(e)   Although the basic elements of MTSS/RTI (high quality core curriculum and instruction, universal screening, progress monitoring, tier interventions, and data-based decision making) should be present in any model, there are fundamental differences between how an MTSS/RTI framework is applied at a late elementary, middle, or secondary school as compared with an early elementary school. Key differences include: course/credit and schedule driven curriculum models, consensus building models, staff capacity, student motivation and commitment, school resources, and fidelity. Furthermore, additional consideration of these factors are required for successful implementation of MTSS/RTI at the late elementary, middle, or high school level because of differences between the late elementary, middle, or high schools and elementary schools with respect to the academic and school environment and teacher preparation and training; for example: (i) leadership (stakeholders, administration, content area leads, and additional support staff), (ii) intervention or Literacy Specialist, (iii) professional development/coaching, and (iv) evaluation of intervention outcome and instruction effectiveness.

(f)   Each school shall provide intensive reading interventions to Struggling Readers in grades 7 through 12 with reading problems. While the expectation is that students shall learn to read with understanding before attaining middle and high school status, many students reach these schools unable to read grade-level text effectively and with understanding. Struggling Readers with demonstrated reading difficulties shall be provided supplemental reading interventions that directly addresses their word study, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, motivation, speaking, or writing challenges so they are able to perform significantly better in reading subject material text and can achieve grade-level reading literacy.

(i)   Through universal screening and other data collected, schools shall identify grades 7 through 12 students who are one to two grade-levels behind in reading, and shall provide daily reading intervention with a Teacher of Reading or Literacy Specialist, for 60 minutes in addition to core curriculum and instruction (Tier 2). Schools shall provide grades 7 and 8 students who are more than two grade-levels behind in reading with a dedicated period each day (approximately 90 to 120 minutes per day) of reading intervention with a Literacy Specialist, focused specifically on their instructional needs (Tier 3). This 90 to 120 minute dedicated period may supplant core curriculum and instruction. Schools shall provide grades 9 through 12 students who are more than two grade-levels behind in reading with a dedicated period each day (approximately 60 minutes per day) of reading instruction with a Literacy Specialist, focused specifically on their instructional needs (Tier 3). This 60 minute dedicated period shall be in addition to core curriculum and instruction.

(ii)   Schools shall provide students specific interventions that are focused on their learning needs requires identifying whether a student's reading comprehension difficulties are a function of (a) word reading problems (e.g., decoding unknown words); (b) word meaning problems (e.g., vocabulary); (c) adequate knowledge to understand text (e.g., background knowledge); (d) unusually slow text reading (e.g., fluency); or (e) inadequate use of reading

comprehension strategies to promote reading comprehension. Through diagnostic assessment, teachers can determine which of the above are contributing to the reading difficulties and target their instruction.

(iii)   Schools shall target instruction for each student by providing systems of support in three tiers with an outline of assessments of skill accomplishments and a time line for stages of support.

(iv)   Continuous progress monitoring (every 2 to 3 weeks for Tier 1; every 2 weeks for Tier 2; and weekly for Tier 3) must be used to guide intervention instruction and data-driven decision.

(v)   During Tier I Intervention for grades 7 through 12 students who need intervention in word study, a Teacher of Reading or Literacy Specialist provides students with daily lessons composed of word study to teach advanced decoding of multi-syllabic words. Students' mastery of sounds and word reading determines their progress through the lessons. Students receive daily instruction and practice with individual letter sounds, letter combinations, syllables, and affixes. In addition, students receive instruction and practice in applying a strategy to decode multi-syllabic words by breaking them into known parts. Students also practice breaking words into parts to spell. Word reading strategies are applied to reading in context in the form of sentences and passage reading daily. Instruction on word analysis focuses on morphology, or analysis of the meaningful word parts and orthography, the letter patterns and structural features associate with predictable speech and spelling patterns.   During Tier I Intervention, high levels of support and scaffolding from a Teacher of Reading or Literacy Specialist is provided to students in applying the multi-syllabic word reading strategy to reading words and connected text, and spelling words. Fluency instruction is promoted by using oral reading fluency data; for example by pairing higher and homogeneously grouping lower readers for partner reading led by an adult. Students engage in repeated reading daily with their partner(s) with the goal of increased fluency (accuracy and rate). Partners take turns reading orally while their partner reads along and marks errors. The higher reader always reads first. After reading, partners are given time to go over errors and ask questions about unknown words. Partners read the passage three times each and graph the number of words read correctly. The Teacher of Reading or Literacy Specialist is actively involved in modeling and providing feedback to students. Vocabulary is taught daily; for example by teaching the meaning of the high utility or high usage words through basic definitions and providing examples and non-examples of how to use the word. New vocabulary words are reviewed daily with students matching words to appropriate definitions or examples of word usage. Direct, explicit teaching of reading comprehension strategies must be is taught during and after reading by asking students to address relevant comprehension questions of varying levels of difficulty (literal and inferential) to all students with ample opportunity for modeling, guided practice and scaffolded release to independent practice. Teachers of Reading License and Literacy Specialists assist students in locating information in text and rereading to identify answers. The following comprehension strategies are findings by the National Reading Panel Report and *generally* supported by research: activating prior knowledge, graphic and semantic organizers, comprehension-monitoring strategies, cooperative learning, answering and generating questions,

text structure, and summarizing.

(vi)   During Tier II Intervention for grades 7 through 12 students the core curriculum and instruction emphasis is on vocabulary and comprehension with additional instruction and practice provided by a Teacher of Reading or Literacy Specialist for applying word study and fluency skills strategies. Tier II Intervention examples: Word study and vocabulary are taught through daily review by applying the sounds and strategy to reading new words. Focus on word meaning is also part of word reading practice. Students are also taught word relatives and parts of speech (e.g., politics, politician, politically). Finally, students review application of word study to spelling words. Vocabulary words for instruction are chosen from content areas and academic word lists. Fluency and comprehension are taught with an emphasis on reading and understanding text through discourse or writing. Students spend three days a week reading and comprehending expository subject matter text. One and two days a week reading and comprehending narrative text in novels. Content and vocabulary are needed to understand the text and are taught prior to reading. Students then read the text at least twice with an emphasis on reading for understanding. During and after the second reading, comprehension questions of varying levels of complexity and abstraction are discussed with students. Students also receive explicit instruction in generating questions of varying levels of complexity and abstraction while reading (e.g., literal questions, questions requiring students to synthesize information from text, and questions requiring students to apply background knowledge to information in text), identifying the main idea, summarizing, and employing strategies for multiple choice, short answer, and essay questions.

(vii)   During Tier III Intervention for grades 7 through 12 students continues the instructional emphasis on identified targeted areas identified by a Literacy Specialist including word study, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and motivation,, which shall include daily, direct instruction (in fluid, homogenous groups of 1 to 6 students) by a Literacy Specialist for 60 minutes in those targeted areas.

(g)   Each teacher, including each Content Area Teacher, shall identify key content subject words for each student to learn and teach at least two new words every day and review one from the previous day. This practice can be readily implemented across all content area instruction and provides students with opportunities to expand their academic vocabulary, increase their background knowledge, and better understand the key ideas that they are reading and learning about. For example, a Content Area Teacher can do this by selecting words in a unit that are high-frequency and high-utility words. The following are examples of ways these words can be taught:

(i)   teachers can use vocabulary maps that use the key word, pictures of the word, words that relate to the key word, a student friendly definition, and how the word can be used in a historical context;

(ii)   teachers can illustrate, show a picture that represents the word, or read one or two sentences that include the word describing it in ways that allow students to make informed decisions about word meaning. Then the students and the teacher can use this

information to co-construct the meaning of the word; and

   (iii) key words can be taught within the context of a debate or structured discussion in which students use those key words in their written and oral arguments.

  (h) Each teacher, including each Content Area Teacher, shall ask students to ask questions while they read and after they listen to the teacher read while they are following the text so that they shall monitor comprehension and learning. Students who are actively engaged while listening and reading are more likely to understand and remember what they read or hear. Teachers can promote that practice by instructing students to ask questions while they are reading. After students complete their reading they can also be asked to develop one question to ask the class. Students benefit from having question stems to help them develop these questions.

  (i) Each teacher, including each Content Area Teacher, shall teach word meaning strategies within content area classes. Concept words are the center of learning the big ideas of content as well as the necessary academic vocabulary for success. Content areas (e.g., mathematics, science, social studies, and English language arts) each have unique vocabulary used to communicate concepts and explain processes. Students need to learn what these words mean and how to use them within the multiple contexts of reading, writing, and speaking. Adolescents shall encounter approximately 10,000 new words per year, the majority of which are the complex terms of the content areas. Research supports the following two practices for helping students learn academic vocabulary:

   (i) teachers can provide explicit instruction of academic or concept words that students need to learn to master the key ideas they are teaching. These words need to be introduced to the student by showing them the words, showing them a picture, video, or other demonstration to make the words vivid. Teachers then need to work with students to discuss what the word means and doesn't mean. A critical step is to return to these words regularly throughout the lesson and throughout the instructional unit to assure that students can use them with understanding in their speaking and writing tasks. Teachers should teach students the meaning of words within the context of learning and also the multiple meanings of words; and

   (ii) teachers need to provide instruction in word learning strategies. Although explicit instruction is important, the sheer number of words students need to learn requires that they develop strategies for independently determining the meanings of unfamiliar vocabulary. One means of equipping students to understand the content area terms they encounter is to teach the component morphemes (prefixes, roots, and suffixes) and how they contribute to the meaning of words. Students taught this process of analyzing words by morphemes were able to infer the meanings of untaught terms in subject-matter text. Other research indicates the practice is particularly effective with Struggling Readers when done systematically and coupled with multiple opportunities to practice. This can be facilitated by applying learned morphemes to words used in different content areas. Another word learning strategy involves teaching word meanings directly through the use of a mnemonic word association and a picture that ties together the word clue and the definition.

(j)   Each teacher, including each Content Area Teacher, shall instruct students how to activate and build appropriate background knowledge for understanding text content. Researchers report that background knowledge is second only to vocabulary in enhancing reading comprehension outcomes with secondary readers. A lack of prior knowledge can make understanding informational text particularly challenging. Research supports the following strategy for building background knowledge:

(i)   teach students to use text to support answers and consider whether they can locate text-based support for positions; and

(ii)   teach students to elaborate on why statements that they select could or could not be supported based on the text.

According to researchers, this technique requires students to identify related background knowledge in their memories to link to the statements and to provide adequate justification for their responses. When used in connection with text reading, it encourages students to return to important information to obtain further elaboration for their responses. Students would be asked to determine whether they could or could not adequately support the statement and use prior learning and text to support their views.

(k)   Each teacher, including Content Area Teacher, shall teach students to use reading comprehension strategies while reading complex text. Students benefit from using reading comprehension strategies while reading complex text. Too often, adolescents proceed through text with little understanding of what they are reading or awareness of when their comprehension has broken down. They need to be taught to recognize when they do not adequately understand text and how to build comprehension. Research supports the following strategies for reading comprehension:

(i)   teach students to generate questions while reading to build comprehension skills. Learning to generate questions while reading is one way of getting students to stop at regular intervals to think about what is being communicated and how the information relates across paragraphs. Studies have shown that the practice can increase comprehension of content area text for students of different ability levels. The first level of questions is the most literal in that they are based on a fact that can be identified in one place in the text. The second level of questions combines information that is located in two different parts of the text. The third level of questions relates information in the text to something the reader has experienced or learned previously; and

(ii)   another means of encouraging students to be active readers and to monitor their own comprehension is to teach them how to generate main idea statements for single or multiple paragraphs. Adolescents and teens that learn to identify the explicitly or implicitly stated main ideas of a text have shown increased understanding and recall of important information. Referred to as either "paragraph shrinking" or "get the gist," students at a range of ability levels and language backgrounds have been successfully taught to use the following three steps in generating a main idea statement:

A.   identify who or what is the focus of the paragraph or section;

B.   determine the most important information about what the key person place/thing has, is, or does; and

C.   succinctly state the who or what and most important information about him/her/it in a sentence.

(l)   Each teacher, including each Content Area Teacher, shall guide and engage students in activities that are text-related. Through both classroom discussion and written assignments, students shall learn to apply critical analysis, inference, interpretation, and summation of printed material. The goal is to guide the student to understand text and respond through productive discussion and written answers. Research supports the following strategies for encouraging reading for understanding:

(i)   foster discussion in small groups. Give students the opportunities to return to texts a number of times to explore, discuss, and revise their developing understanding of the ideas and concepts. This practice can be fostered through the use of reciprocal teaching, a multi-component strategy intended to support student comprehension. In reciprocal teaching, the teacher leads the dialogue about the text until students learn to assume different roles independently: summarizer, questioner, clarifier, or predictor. After reading a short section of text (generally a few paragraphs, at first, but increasing to several pages with practice), the summarizer highlights the key points for the group. Then, the questioner helps the group consider and talk about what was read by posing questions about anything that was unclear, puzzling, or related to other information that was learned. In this portion of reciprocal teaching, students can apply question generation skills that shall support asking about more than surface-level information. The clarifier in the group of students is responsible for seeking out portions of text that shall help answer the questions just posed. However, all members of the group participate in discussing the information and connecting ideas. In doing so, students shall return to the current selection and, possibly, other readings to look for text evidence in support of their responses. Finally, the predictor offers suggestions about what the group can expect to read in the next section of text. These predictions are focused on activating relevant background knowledge, setting a purpose for reading, and relating new information to that just discussed by the group; and

(ii)   instruct students in how to summarize text. Students that are explicitly taught how to summarize text are better able to discern the relationships among main ideas and significant details. When students work collaboratively on summaries of expository text, such as in reciprocal teaching, they reach higher levels of comprehension and retain more content information. Teachers shall thoroughly explain and model each step multiple times with different types of text before students shall be able to complete them in collaborative groups or, eventually, on their own.

(m)   Each teacher, including each Content Area Teacher, shall maximize all opportunities for students to read printed material. Content Area Teachers have a range of

readers in their classrooms, providing challenges for assignments that require text reading. For this reason, and others, many classroom teachers require students to read very little both inside and outside of their class time. Teachers also report that they increasingly rely on reading text aloud or using other media (e.g., videos) as a means for providing students with content knowledge perceiving text reading as inaccessible. Reading and understanding text requires practice, and students need opportunities to read a range of text types (e.g., textbooks, letters, descriptions, original documents, poetry). Research supports the following strategies to enhance opportunities for students to read and respond to text:

(i) prepare students to read text by providing key ideas and key words. Providing the big idea and connecting principles prior to having students read the text shall facilitate comprehension. This goal can also be accomplished by soliciting the big idea and principle from the students. Present the key words orally, on the board, or on a handout, including all proper nouns, prior to text reading;

(ii) provide daily opportunities for students to read for a specific amount of time, then, provide a prompt for student response (e.g., 2 to 3 minutes for reading and 1 to 2 minutes for responding). Students can be asked to respond to predetermined prompts such as, "What is this section mostly about?" "How does the author describe _____?" "What did you learn about _____?" Students can respond in writing using learning logs or they can respond orally by turning and talking with a partner for 1 minute; and

(iii) have students participate in partner reading (typically a better reader and a less able reader) and then ask them to take turns reading the same passage with the better reader reading the passage first and then the less able reader rereading the passage. Students can partner-read for a specified amount of time (e.g., 3 minutes) and can use 1–2 minutes to write responses by determining the main idea, writing and answering a question, or summarizing.

(n) Each teacher, including Content Area Teacher, should organize students into collaborative groups for reading tasks. Student involvement and learning can be well enhanced through well-structured collaborative groups, designed to promote both individual and group accountability. These collaborative groups can be used within content area classes and are associated with improved reading comprehension for students when implemented two or more times per week. Research supports the following strategies for collaborative groups:

(i) have students utilize Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). CSR has two important phases: the first phase is learning the four reading comprehension strategies that include (1) previewing text (preview); (2) monitoring comprehension while reading by identifying key words and concepts that are challenging (click and clunk); (3) thinking about the main idea while reading and putting it into your own words (get the gist); and (4) summarizing text understanding after you read (wrap up). The second phase is teaching students to use collaborative groups effectively as a means of applying the strategies. The focus of the practice described in this section is on implementing collaborative groups. Once students have developed proficiency using the four strategies with teacher guidance, they are ready to use these same strategies in peer-led collaborative groups. Some teachers ask students to first work in pairs and

then move into a collaborative group, while other teachers find it better to start with collaborative groups;

(ii)   form CSR collaborative groups. All students do not function equally well in a group and groups are more effective when the teacher selects students with the intent of designing a well-functioning team. Teachers assign approximately 4 students to each collaborative group, considering that each group shall need a student with reading proficiency and a leader, thus providing a group that represents varying abilities. Teachers assign students to roles in the group and teach them to perform their role. Roles rotate on a regular basis (e.g., every couple of weeks) so that students can experience a variety of roles. Student roles are an important aspect of effective implementation of cooperative learning so that all group members are assigned a meaningful task and participate in the group's success; and

(iii)   ensure the students have been taught their role and know how to implement their responsibility in CSR collaborative groups. Forming successful and productive groups is an important accomplishment because it allows the teacher to circulate among the groups, listen to students' participation, read students' learning logs, and most importantly, provide clear and specific feedback to improve the use and application of the strategies. Teachers can help by actively listening to students' conversations and clarifying difficult words, modeling strategy usage, encouraging students to participate, and modeling strategy application. It is expected that students shall need assistance learning to work in cooperative groups, implementing the strategies, and mastering academic content.

SECTION 8
LITERACY INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS:
Screening, Formal Assessment, Gathering Data, and Referral to Special Education

This Section 8 provides for the application of a data use plan under which students, grades PK through 12, enrolled or enrolling in Department of Education schools in Hawaii, are screened and assessed for literacy failure or grade-level reading literacy attainment as may be necessary, and are provided appropriate supports dependent on multiple factors and at multiple times until proficient grade-level reading skills are secured. It also addresses referral of certain students for evaluation for special education in the context of literacy skills.

8.1   General Screening Procedures. The Department of Education shall establish written procedures for screening, assessing, and recommending students at-risk for literacy failure within general education. While they shall follow federal and state guidelines, they shall also develop internal procedures that address the needs of their student populations.

(a)   All entering kindergarten students shall be screened for potential characteristics of Struggling Readers that could inhibit reading development. Kindergarten screening shall happen at the beginning and end of the first semester of the year and once towards the end of the second semester (minimum 3 to 4 times per year).

(b)   Every student in grades 1, 2, and 3 shall be systematically assessed every two to

three weeks during reading development stages of instruction to ensure they are making appropriate gains to achieve grade-level reading. Every student in grades 4 through 12 shall be systematically assessed at the beginning, middle, and end of each school year to ensure they are making appropriate gains to achieve grade-level reading.

        (c)   Upon the request of a parent/ guardian, student, school nurse, classroom teacher, or other school personnel who have data to support that a student has a need for diagnostic testing in any grade, such testing shall be conducted within 30 days.

8.2   **Screening Procedures.** With the use of screening, a Teacher of Reading or Literacy Specialist can quickly assess if a student shall experience reading difficulties and can provide early stage, targeted instruction by isolating the skills that need to be strengthened.

        (a)   All entering kindergarten students shall be universally screened during the first, early weeks of reading instruction, again before the winter break, and also in the spring to evaluate reading progress. If a student is falling behind his or her peers, common characteristics shall be identifiable early in these screening assessments. Elementary Teacher shall provide MTSS/RTI to ameliorate the areas of weakness.

        (b)   If a student in grades K through 12 is found to be at serious risk for literacy failure, a systematic assessment shall be provided, and the school shall notify the students' parents/guardians. The school shall also implement an MTSS/RTI reading program (accelerated and/or intensive) that appropriately addresses students' reading difficulties and enables them to "catch up" with their typically-performing peers.

        (c)   Any student entering public school from outside of the State of Hawaii or from an independent school should be screened upon entry.

        (d)   When a student is identified and provided with systems of support, yet grade-level attainment is not accomplished within 90 days, then more intensive intervention is mandated.

8.3   **Assessments for Reading Literacy Procedures.**

        (a)   Every student who has been flagged for intervention shall be assessed for grade-level reading attainment. Every student in grades 1, 2, and 3 who has been flagged for intervention shall be systematically assessed, every two to three weeks during the year for grade-level reading skill attainment to ensure a successful skill progression. Any student in grades 4 through 12 who has been flagged for intervention and continues to struggle with one or more components of reading and/or experiences literacy failure, shall be further assessed and monitored until grade-level attainment is reached for a semester.

        (b)   In doing such assessments, students receiving below grade-level scores shall be a top priority and the student shall be provided support within a week. When a student is identified and provided with systems of support, yet grade-level attainment is not accomplished within 30 days, then more intensive intervention is mandated.

(c)   Assessments shall have one or more of the following results:

(i)   no indication of need for services;

(ii)   indication of need for MTSS/RTI (Tier II) supports in general education reading services to ameliorate literacy failure;

(iii)   indication of need for assistance to improve the effect of general education reading instruction through intense intervention services (MTSS/RTI-Tier III); or

(iv)   referral for further formal diagnostic assessment for the existence of Struggling Readers factors and eligibility for the receipt of special education services.

(d)   If the student has not made adequate progress, the student shall receive a diagnostic assessment for all other issues of learning disorders such as seeking identification of dyslexia and/or specific learning disability, and/or social, cultural, and environmental factors that put a student at-risk for literacy failure.

(e)   Students in need of services and/or assistance shall have it provided to them. Services shall be provided in accordance with Federal and State law requirements.

(f)   New students enrolling in public schools shall be screened and assessed, if needed, for at-risk reading attainment at appropriate times in accordance with content area subject teacher request, request of parents or guardians, or poor school progress.

(g)   The Department of Education shall provide support for any Struggling Reader determination or determination of learning disorder and shall adopt rules and standards necessary to administer this section 8 of the Comprehensive Plan.

(h)   The screenings and assessments shall be done only by screening/assessment specialists (including Literacy Specialists, Teachers of Reading, guidance counselors, pupil appraisal personnel, or other professional employees of the school system who have been appropriately trained). Screening/assessment specialists shall have expertise in the following areas:

(i)   identification and knowledge of the following:

A.   Struggling Readers;

B.   characteristics of attention deficit disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder;

C.   characteristics of social, cultural, and emotional at-risk literacy failure factors; and

D. characteristics of gifted Struggling Readers (sometimes referred to as twice exceptional).

(ii) use of appropriate screening instruments:

A. kindergarten screening instrument(s) to determine developmental strengths and needs;

B. checklist;

C. social/emotional factors at-risk checklist;

D. informal reading/language inventories;

E. rapid automatic naming tests and phonological processing (awareness and memory);

F. written language samples;

G. informal mathematical assessment; and

H. norm-referenced tests.

(iii) administration and interpretation of selected screening instruments:

A. training of personnel to administer instruments; and

B. interpret screening results;

(iv) operation and procedures of school building level committee:

A. membership;

B. referral process;

C. interventions in the classroom;

D. documentation; and

E. decision-making process;

(v) selection of appropriate classroom strategies, accommodations, and modifications; and

(vi) child advocacy.

(i)   A private assessment by a qualified professional can be obtained by the parents/guardian of the student. The school shall take into account the assessment, administer additional assessments, or provide intervention based on the private assessment.

(j)   The International Dyslexia Association indicates that there may be unexpected difficulties that students with dyslexia demonstrate in the area of reading, writing, and mathematics despite the provision of effective foundational reading instruction and, thus, screening and assessment shall identify and accelerate the systems of support under MTSS/RTI. Furthermore, students with dyslexia and learning disabilities may be gifted and their difficulties more difficult to appreciate because of their intellect. The Department of Education acknowledges formal assessment and diagnostics are necessary to understand these difficulties and the relationship to the student's cognitive abilities, reading fluency, writing skills, and mathematics skills.

8.4   Literacy Failure Diagnosis.

(a)   The Department of Education, following Federal and State of Hawaii laws and guidelines, shall adopt a list of approved grade-appropriate research-validated universal screening tools, assessment/reading instruments for use in all schools concerning reading skills development and reading comprehension, and which provide for diagnosing the reading development, fluency, and comprehension of students participating in a program, provide ongoing professional development for administering and scoring measures to ensure fidelity, and propose data collection schedules.

(b)   The Department of Education, following Federal and State of Hawaii guidelines, shall implement procedures consistent with the following:

(i)   schools shall administer approved assessment/reading instruments to diagnose student reading development, fluency, and comprehension;

(ii)   specific educators shall be trained to become screening/assessment specialists who shall administer the approved assessment/reading instruments;

(iii)   schools shall apply the results of the approved assessment/reading instruments to the instructional program;

(iv)   schools shall administer, at the kindergarten level and in grades 1 through 12, an assessment/reading instrument which is on the list of the approved assessment/reading instruments;

(v)   schools shall report the results of the assessment/reading instruments for each student to the Department of Education and to the student's respective parent or guardian;

(vi)   schools shall notify the parent or guardian of each student who is determined, on the basis of assessment/reading instrument results, to be a Struggling Reader; and

(vii)   schools shall make a good faith effort to ensure that the notice required under this section is provided either in person or by regular mail, and that the notice is clear and easy to understand, and is written in English and in the parent or guardian's native language, where possible.

8.5   Data Gathering. At any time (from kindergarten through grade 12) that a student continues to struggle with one or more components of reading and/or experiences literacy failure, schools shall collect additional information about the student. This information shall be analyzed and used to evaluate the student's underachievement and to determine what actions are needed to ensure the student's improved academic performance. Some of the information that the school collects is in the student's cumulative folder; other data is available from teachers and parents/guardians.

(a)   To ensure that underachievement in Struggling Readers is not due to lack of appropriate instruction in reading, other criteria should be considered. This information should include data that demonstrates the student was provided appropriate instruction and data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable intervals (progress monitoring), reflecting formal assessment of student progress during instruction. Additional information to be considered includes the results from some or all of the following:

(i)   vision screening;

(ii)   hearing screening;

(iii)   teacher reports of classroom concerns;

(iv)   basal reading series assessment;

(v)   accommodations provided by classroom teachers;

(vi)   academic progress reports (report cards);

(vii)   samples of school work;

(vii)   parent conferences; and

(ix)   speech and language screening through a referral process.

(b)   One of the actions that the school has available is to recommend that a Struggling Reader be administered a diagnostic assessment if the student demonstrates poor performance in one or more areas of reading and/or the related area of spelling that is unexpected for the student's age, grade, or intellectual development.

(c)   When the school recommends a student be formally assessed, the following procedures for assessment shall be adhered to set forth in this Comprehensive Plan.

8.6   Formal Assessment. A student's formal assessment diagnostic is dependent upon multiple factors including the student's reading performance, reading difficulties, poor response to supplemental scientifically based reading instruction, teachers' input, and input from the parents or guardians. Furthermore, the appropriate time for assessing is early in a student's school career, the earlier the better. While earlier is better, Struggling Readers should be recommended for assessment even if the reading difficulties appear later their school career.

       (a)   These procedures shall be followed:

            (i)   notify parents or guardians of proposal to perform a formal assessment diagnostic on a student;

            (ii)   inform parents or guardians of their rights;

            (iii)   obtain permission from the parent or guardian to assess the student; and

            (iv)   assess student.

       (b)   The notices and consent shall be provided in the native language of the parent or guardian or other mode of communication used by the parent or guardian, unless it is clearly not feasible to do so.

       (c)   Tests, assessments, diagnostics, and other evaluation materials shall:

            (i)   be validated for the specific purpose for which the tests, assessments, and other evaluation materials are used;

            (ii)   include material tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely materials that are designed to provide a single general intelligence quotient;

            (iii)   be selected and administered so as to ensure that when a test is given to a student with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the test results accurately reflect the student's aptitude or achievement level, or whatever other factor the test purports to measure, rather than reflecting the student's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills;

            (iv)   if possible, include multiple measures of a student's reading abilities, such as informal assessment information (e.g., anecdotal records, lists of books the student has read, audio recordings of the student's oral reading); and

            (v)   be administered by trained personnel and in conformance with the instructions provided by the producer of the evaluation materials.

       (d)   The school shall administer measures that are related to the student's educational needs. Depending upon the student's age and stage of reading and intellectual development, the following reading areas should be assessed:

<blockquote>

(i)   reading real and nonsense words in isolation (decoding);

(ii)   phonological processing (awareness and memory);

(iii)   letter knowledge (name and associated sound);

(iv)   rapid naming;

(v)   reading fluency (rate and accuracy);

(vi)   reading comprehension; and

(vii)   written spelling.

</blockquote>

(e)   Based on the student's individual academic difficulties and characteristics, additional areas that can be assessed include vocabulary, written expression, handwriting, and mathematics.

8.7   **English Language Learners and Students with Limited English Proficiency.** Much diversity exists among English language learners and students with limited English proficiency. The identification and service delivery process for English Language Learners and students with limited English proficiency as Struggling Readers shall be in step with the student's linguistic environment and educational background. Involvement of a language proficiency assessment committee is recommended.

(a)   Additional data gathering may be required to include language proficiency documentation that includes the following:

<blockquote>

(i)   home language survey;

(ii)   assessment related to identification for limited English proficiency (oral language proficiency tests and norm-referenced tests);

(iii)   linguistic environment and second language acquisition development;

(iv)   previous schooling in and outside of the United States; and

(v)   comprehensive oral language proficiency testing in English and the student's native language whenever possible.

</blockquote>

(b)   These data gathering procedures are important to determine:

<blockquote>

(i)   whether the student's current classroom setting is appropriate given his or her language abilities;

</blockquote>

(ii)   the appropriate languages for assessing the student's academic achievement and cognitive processing;

(iii)   the degree to which language proficiency in both the first and second language influences or explains the student's test performance on the academic achievement and cognitive processing measures; and

(iv)   whether the student's difficulties in reading are the result of a disability or a reflection of the normal process of second language acquisition.

(c)   Furthermore, personnel involved in the evaluation process of English language learners and students with limited English proficiency as Struggling Readers need to be trained in bilingual assessment and interpretation procedures. It is strongly recommended that personnel involved in the assessment and interpretation of assessment results have the following knowledge:

(i)   understanding of first and second language acquisition stages;

(ii)   understanding of potential impact of culture on student performance;

(iii)   knowledge regarding bilingual education and English as a second language programming and MTSS/RTI teaching methods;

(iv)   knowledge in how to interpret results of student's oral language proficiency in relation to the results of the test measuring academic achievement and cognitive processes; and

(v)   understanding of how to interpret results of similar or parallel tests given in more than one language.

(d)   To appropriately understand test results, the examiner(s) and the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) shall interpret test results in light of the student's language development (in both English and the student's native language), educational history, linguistic background, socio-economic issues, and any other pertinent factors that affect learning.

8.8   Struggling Reader Determination.

(a)   A school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) determines whether the student is a Struggling Reader, after reviewing all accumulated data, including the following areas:

(i)   observations of the teacher, school staff, and/or parent/guardian;

(ii)   data gathered from the classroom (including student work and the results

of classroom measures) and information found in the student's cumulative folder (including the developmental and academic history of the student);

(iii)   data-based documentation of student progress during instruction/intervention;

(iv)   results of administered assessments; and

(v)   all other accumulated data regarding the development of the student's learning and his or her educational needs.

(b)   Difficulties in the area of reading for Struggling Readers shall be reflected in unexpectedly low performance for the student's age and educational level in the following areas:

(i)   reading real words in isolation;

(ii)   decoding nonsense words;

(iii)   reading fluency (both rate and accuracy); and

(iv)   written spelling.

(c)   Unexpectedly low reading performance, including reading fluency, shall be the result of a deficit in phonological processing, including the following:

(i)   phonological awareness;

(ii)   rapid naming; and

(iii)   phonological memory.

(d)   Many Struggling Readers shall have difficulty with the secondary characteristics of literacy, including reading comprehension, written composition, spelling, grammar, and rote mathematics skills.

(e)   The school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) shall also incorporate the following guidelines into the determination that a student is a Struggling Reader:

(i)   the student has received MTSS/RTI instruction;

(ii)   the student has an unexpected lack of appropriate academic progress (in the areas of reading and spelling) relative to their age/ grade/intellectual development;

(iii)   the student has adequate intelligence (an average ability to learn in the

absence of print or in other academic areas);

        (iv)   the student exhibits characteristics associated with Struggling Readers; and

        (v)   the student's lack of progress is not due to socio-cultural factors such as language differences, irregular attendance, or lack of experiential background.

     (f)   Based on the above information and guidelines, the school's data or leadership team (or committee of knowledgeable persons) determines and identifies Struggling Readers and also determines whether the student has a disability under the IDEA, the Rehabilitation Act, and/or the ADA.

8.9   Referral to Special Education.

     (a)   At any time during the assessment for reading failure identification process or instruction, students may be referred for evaluation for special education. At times, students shall display additional factors or areas complicating their instruction and requiring more support than what is available through general education MTSS/RTI. At other times, students with severe at-risk characteristics or related disorders shall be unable to make appropriate academic progress within any of the programs described in the procedures related to Struggling Readers. In such cases, a referral to special education for evaluation and possible identification as a student with a disability within the meaning of IDEA, the Rehabilitation Act, and/or the ADA should be made as needed.

     (b)   If a Struggling Reader is found eligible for special education in the area of reading, the school shall include appropriate reading instruction on the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP).

<div align="center">

SECTION 9
LITERACY INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS:
<u>Role of Literacy Specialists</u>

</div>

     This Section 9 describes the role of Literacy Specialists in teaching literacy skills in schools.

9.1   Literacy Specialist in Every School.

     (a)   The Department of Education shall require and cause at least one Literacy Specialist licensed or otherwise approved by the HTSB to be employed at each Department of Education school [grades K (and in some instances PK) through 12] to provide specialized literacy instruction and support to teachers of Struggling Readers, including students with dyslexia or other literacy challenges, in both general education and special education classrooms and contexts.

(b)   Literacy Specialists shall, in concert with all other teachers, practice, promote, and facilitate best practices in literacy instruction, strategy, and intervention in their schools, including direct, explicit, structured, and systematic instruction in oral and written language with (i) early screening and assessment for identification of students with literacy challenges, including those displaying risk factors for dyslexia, (ii) a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) including multisensory structured language education (MSL) and other research-validated interventions, within the response to intervention (RTI) model with varying levels of intensity and duration which connects general, compensatory, exceptional, gifted and talented, and special education programs, implemented and matched to individual student strengths and needs, and (iii) evidence-based progress monitoring that provides students, parents, and educators with data on student performance and improvements, and that uses this data in evaluations and decisions for instructional changes.

(c)   Literacy Specialists shall assist Content Area Teachers, Elementary Teachers, and Teachers of Special Subjects in providing foundational reading skills instruction; reading literacy skills instruction, writing literacy instruction, and speaking, listening and language instruction to all students, including Struggling Readers, in both general education and special education classrooms and settings.

(c)   Literacy Specialists shall work directly with Struggling Readers who require more intensive, individualized intervention and instruction.

(d)   Literacy Specialists may provide support in respect of the professional development described in Section 3.1 of this Comprehensive Plan.

SECTION 10
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

10.1   Additional Resources. For additional resources which relate to Section 6, Section 7, and Section 8 of this Comprehensive Plan, see:

(a)   National Center for Response to Intervention
        http://www.rti4success.org/

(b)   State of Washington
        Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction website links:

        Using Response to Intervention (RTI) for Washington's Students (June 2006)
        http://www.k12.wa.us/rti/pubdocs/WashingtonRTIManual.pdf

        http://www.k12.wa.us/ELA/pubdocs/CLP.pdf
        http://www.k12.wa.us/Reading/pubdocs/DyslexiaResourceGuide.pdf
        http://www.k12.wa.us/Reading/Dyslexia.aspx

Scott Douglas Redmond
  Venture Solutionist and Start-up Specialist, Silicon Valley

Elenn Steinberg
  President, Rocky Mountain Branch of the International Dyslexia Association

Cheryl Ward MS, CALP
  Co-founder Literate Nation; and President, Wisconsin Branch of the International Dyslexia Association

APPENDIX A

Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading
International Dyslexia Association

Executive Summary

Reading Difficulties, Including Dyslexia, Are Very Common

Reading difficulties are the most common cause of academic failure and underachievement. Learning to read and write is not natural or easy for many—if not most—students, especially those with dyslexia and related language problems. The National Assessment of Educational Progress consistently finds that about 36% of all fourth graders read at a level described as "below basic." Between 15 and 20% of young students are doomed to academic failure because of reading and language processing weaknesses, unless those weaknesses are recognized early and treated skillfully. Another 20–30% are at risk for inadequate reading and writing development, depending on how—and how well—they are taught. Most of these at-risk students are ineligible for special education services and are dependent on the instruction given in the regular classroom or other supplementary services. However, of those students who are referred to special education services in public schools, approximately 85% are having severe difficulties with language, reading, and writing. Clearly, responsibility for teaching reading and writing must be shared by classroom teachers, reading specialists, and special education personnel.

Effective Instruction Is Key

Although dyslexia and related reading and language problems may originate with neurobiological differences, they are mainly treated with skilled teaching. Informed and effective classroom instruction, especially in the early grades, can prevent or at least effectively address and limit the severity of reading and writing problems. Potential reading failure can be recognized as early as preschool and kindergarten, if not sooner. A large body of research evidence shows that with appropriate, intensive instruction, all but the most severe reading disabilities can be ameliorated in the early grades and students can get on track toward academic success. For those students with persistent dyslexia who need specialized instruction outside of the regular class, competent intervention from a specialist can lessen the impact of the disorder and help the student overcome and manage the most debilitating symptoms.

What is the nature of effective instruction for students at risk? The methods supported by research are those that are explicit, systematic, cumulative, and multisensory, in that they integrate listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The content of effective instruction emphasizes the structure of language, including the speech sound system (phonology), the writing system (orthography), the structure of sentences (syntax), the meaningful parts of words (morphology), meaning relationships among words and their referents (semantics), and the organization of spoken and written discourse. The strategies emphasize planning, organization, attention to task, critical thinking, and self-management. While all such aspects of teaching are essential for students with dyslexia, these strategies also enhance the potential of all students.

Are Teachers Prepared?

Teaching language, reading, and writing effectively, especially to students experiencing difficulty, requires considerable knowledge and skill. Regrettably, the licensing and professional development practices currently endorsed by many states are insufficient for the preparation and support of teachers and specialists. Researchers are finding that those with reading specialist and special education licenses often know no more about research-based, effective practices than those with general education teaching licenses. The majority of practitioners at all levels have not been prepared in sufficient depth to prevent reading problems, to recognize early signs of risk, or to teach students with dyslexia and related learning disabilities successfully. Inquiries into teacher preparation in reading have revealed a pervasive absence of rich content and academic rigor in many courses that lead to certification of teachers and specialists. Analyses of teacher licensing tests show that typically, very few are aligned with current research on effective instruction for students at risk. When tests are aligned with scientific research, far too many teacher candidates are unable to pass them. To address these gaps and promote more rigorous, meaningful, and effective teacher preparation and professional development, IDA has adopted this set of knowledge and practice standards.

Standards for Practice

IDA's *Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading* provide a content framework for courses and course sequences. In addition, they delineate proficiency requirements for practical application of this content (e.g., interpretation of assessments, delivery of differentiated instruction, and successful intervention with a child or adult with a reading disability). The first section specifies what all teachers of reading should know and be able to do, as well as ethical standards for the profession. The second section offers guidelines for the additional practical teaching skills necessary for teaching students with dyslexia and related difficulties. The standards are organized and presented in the following order:

SECTION I: Knowledge and Practice Standards
1. Foundation Concepts about Oral and Written Language Learning
2. Knowledge of the Structure of Language
3. Knowledge of Dyslexia and Other Learning Disorders
4. Interpretation and Administration of Assessments for Planning Instruction
5. Structured Language Teaching:
    1. Phonology
    2. Phonics and Word Study
    3. Fluent, Automatic Reading of Text
    4. Vocabulary
    5. Text Comprehension
    6. Handwriting, Spelling, Written Expression
6. Ethical Standards for the Profession

SECTION II: Guidelines Pertaining to Supervised Practice of Teachers of Students with Documented Reading Disabilities or Dyslexia Who Work in School, Clinical, or Private Practice Settings

    A.   Level I expectations for teachers.

    B.   Level II expectations for specialists.

Guidance and Support for Teachers

In summary, learning to teach reading, language, and writing is a complex undertaking. The competence and expertise of teachers can be nourished with training that emphasizes the study of reading development, language, and individual differences. In addition, teachers need supervised practice opportunities to be successful, especially if they are responsible for students with dyslexia and other reading difficulties. If teachers are better prepared, the impact of reading difficulties, including dyslexia, will be lessened and many more students will receive the instruction and support that they require to reach their potential. We owe them no less.

Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading

International Dyslexia Association,
Professional Standards and Practices Committee
2010

Louisa Moats, Committee Chair
Suzanne Carreker
Rosalie Davis
Phyllis Meisel
Louise Spear-Swerling
Barbara Wilson

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of These Standards

The International Dyslexia Association (IDA) offers these standards to guide the preparation, certification, and professional development of those who teach reading and related literacy skills in classroom, remedial, and clinical settings. The term *teacher* is used throughout this document to refer to any person whose responsibilities include reading instruction. The standards aim to specify what any individual responsible for teaching reading should know and be able to do so that reading difficulties, including dyslexia, may be prevented, alleviated, or remediated. In addition, the standards seek to differentiate classroom teachers from therapists or specialists who are qualified to work with the most challenging students.

Although programs that certify or support teachers, clinicians, or specialists differ in their preparation methodologies, teaching approaches, and organizational purposes, they should ascribe to a common set of professional standards for the benefit of the students they serve. Compliance with these standards should assure the public that individuals who teach in public and private schools, as well as those who teach in clinics, are prepared to implement scientifically based and clinically proven practices.

Background: Why These Standards Are Necessary

Reading difficulties are the most common cause of academic failure and underachievement. The National Assessment of Educational Progress consistently finds that about 36% of all fourth graders read at a level described as "below basic." Between 15 and 20% of young students demonstrate significant weaknesses with language processes, including but not limited to phonological processing, that are the root cause of dyslexia and related learning difficulties. Of those who are referred to special education services in public schools, approximately 85% are referred because of their problems with language, reading, and/or writing. Informed and effective classroom instruction, especially in the early grades, can prevent and relieve the severity of many of these problems. For those students with dyslexia who need specialized instruction outside of the regular class, competent intervention from a specialist can lessen the impact of the disorder and help the student overcome the most debilitating symptoms.

Teaching reading effectively, especially to students experiencing difficulty, requires considerable knowledge and skill. Regrettably, current licensing and professional development practices endorsed by many states are insufficient for the preparation and support of teachers and specialists. Researchers are finding that those with reading specialist and special education licenses often know no more about research-based, effective practices than those with a general education teaching license. The majority of practitioners at all levels have not been prepared in sufficient depth to recognize early signs of risk, to prevent reading problems, or to teach students with dyslexia and related learning disabilities successfully. Inquiries into teacher preparation in reading have a revealed a pervasive absence of substantive content and academic rigor in many courses that lead to certification of teachers and specialists. Analyses of teacher licensing tests show that typically, very few are aligned with current research on effective instruction for students at risk. To address these gaps, IDA has adopted these standards for knowledge, practice, and ethical conduct.

Research-based Assumptions about Dyslexia and Other Reading Difficulties

These standards are broadly constructed to address the knowledge and skill base for teaching reading in preventive, intervention, and remedial settings. Underlying the standards are assumptions about the nature, prevalence, manifestations, and treatments for dyslexia that are supported by research and by accepted diagnostic guidelines. These assumptions characterize dyslexia in relation to other reading problems and learning difficulties, as follows:

- Dyslexia is a language-based disorder of learning to read and write originating from a core or basic problem with phonological processing intrinsic to the individual. Its primary symptoms are inaccurate and/or slow printed word recognition and poor spelling – problems that in turn affect reading fluency and comprehension and written expression. Other types of reading disabilities include specific difficulties with reading comprehension and/or speed of processing (reading fluency). These problems may exist in relative isolation or may overlap extensively in individuals with reading difficulties.
- Dyslexia often exists in individuals with aptitudes, talents, and abilities that enable them to be successful in many domains.
- Dyslexia often coexists with other developmental difficulties and disabilities, including problems with attention, memory, and executive function.
- Dyslexia exists on a continuum. Many students with milder forms of dyslexia are never officially diagnosed and are not eligible for special education services. They deserve appropriate instruction in the regular classroom and through other intervention programs.
- Appropriate recognition and treatment of dyslexia is the responsibility of all educators and support personnel in a school system, not just the reading or special education teacher.
- Although early intervention is the most effective approach, individuals with dyslexia and other reading difficulties can be helped at any age.

How to Use These Standards

The standards outline the 1) content knowledge necessary to teach reading and writing to students with dyslexia or related disorders or who are at risk for reading difficulty; 2) practices of effective instruction; and 3) ethical conduct expected of professional educators and clinicians. Regular classroom teachers should also have the foundational knowledge of language, literacy development, and individual differences because they share responsibility for preventing and ameliorating reading problems.

The standards may be used for several purposes, including but not limited to:
- course design within teacher certification programs;
- practicum requirements within certification programs;
- criteria for membership in IDA's coalition of organizations that provide training and supervision of teachers, tutors, and specialists (note that additional requirements for membership are to be determined);
- criteria for the preparation of those professionals receiving referrals through IDA offices; and
- a content framework for the development of licensing or certification examinations.

How to Read the Standards

The Standards include two major sections. Section I addresses foundation concepts, knowledge of language structure, knowledge of dyslexia and other learning disorders, administration and interpretation of assessments, the principles of structured language teaching, and ethical standards for the profession. Section II addresses skills to be demonstrated in supervised practice. In Section I, Standards A, B, C, and E are presented in two columns. The column on the left refers to content knowledge that can be learned and tested independent of observed teaching competency. The column on the right delineates the practical skills of teaching that depend on or that are driven by content knowledge. The exception to this format is Standard D. It includes a third column on the right that specifies in greater detail what the teacher or specialist should be able to do.

Many of the standards are followed by the designation of (Level1) or (Level 2). These designations indicate whether the standard should be met by novice teachers in training (Level 1) or by specialists with more experience and greater expertise (Level 2). In Section II, the recommended standards for preparation of teachers and specialists are distinguished by these two levels.

References

Bos, C., Mather, N., Dickson, S., Podhajski, B., & Chard, D. (2001). Perceptions and knowledge of preservice and inservice educators about early reading instruction. *Annals of Dyslexia, 51*, 97–120.

Cunningham, A. E., Perry, K. E., Stanovich, K. E., & Stanovich, P. J. (2004). Disciplinary knowledge of K-3 teachers and their knowledge calibration in the domain of early literacy. *Annals of Dyslexia, 54*, 139–167.

Joshi, R. M., Binks, E., Hougen, M., Ocker-Dean, E., Graham, L., & Smith, D. (2009). Teachers' knowledge of basic linguistic skills: Where does it come from? In S. Rosenfield & V. Berninger (Eds.), *Handbook on implementing evidence based academic interventions* (pp. 851–877). New York: Oxford University Press.

McCutchen, D., Harry, D. R., Cunningham, A. E., Cox, S., Sidman, S., & Covill, A. E. (2002). Reading teachers' knowledge of children's literature and English phonology. *Annals of Dyslexia, 52*, 207–228.

Moats, L. C. (1994). The missing foundation in teacher education: Knowledge of the structure of spoken and written language. *Annals of Dyslexia, 44*, 81–102.

Moats, L. C., & Foorman, B. R. (2003). Measuring teachers' content knowledge of language and reading. *Annals of Dyslexia, 53*, 23–45.

Piasta, S. B., Connor, C. M., Fishman, B. J., & Morrison, F. J. (2009). Teachers' knowledge of literacy concepts, classroom practices, and student reading growth. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *13*(3), 224–248.

Smartt, S. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2007). *Barriers to the preparation of highly qualified teachers in reading*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Spear-Swerling, L. (2008). Response to intervention and teacher preparation. In E. Grigorenko (Ed.), *Educating individuals with disabilities: IDEA 2004 and beyond* (pp. 273–293). New York: Springer.

Spear-Swerling, L., Brucker, P., & Alfano, M. (2005). Teachers' literacy-related knowledge and self-perceptions in relation to preparation and experience. *Annals of Dyslexia, 55*, 266–293.

Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D. D. (2006). *What education schools aren't teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning.* Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.

SECTION I: KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE STANDARDS

A. Foundation Concepts about Oral and Written Learning

Content Knowledge	Application
1. Understand and explain the language processing requirements of proficient reading and writing • Phonological (speech sound) processing • Orthographic (print) processing • Semantic (meaning) processing • Syntactic (sentence level) processing • Discourse (connected text level) processing	1. a. Explain the domains of language and their importance to proficient reading and writing (Level 1). b. Explain a scientifically valid model of the language processes underlying reading and writing (Level 2).
2. Understand and explain other aspects of cognition and behavior that affect reading and writing • Attention • Executive function • Memory • Processing speed • Graphomotor control	2. a. Recognize that reading difficulties coexist with other cognitive and behavioral problems (Level 1). b. Explain a scientifically valid model of other cognitive influences on reading and writing, and explain major research findings regarding the contribution of linguistic and cognitive factors to the prediction of literacy outcomes (Level 2).
3. Define and identify environmental, cultural, and social factors that contribute to literacy development (e.g., language spoken at home, language and literacy experiences, cultural values).	3. Identify (Level 1) or explain (Level 2) major research findings regarding the contribution of environmental factors to literacy outcomes.
4. Know and identify phases in the typical developmental progression of • Oral language (semantic, syntactic, pragmatic) • Phonological skill • Printed word recognition • Spelling • Reading fluency • Reading comprehension • Written expression	4. Match examples of student responses and learning behavior to phases in language and literacy development (Level 1).
5. relationships among phonological skill, phonic decoding, spelling, accurate and automatic word recognition, text reading fluency, background knowledge, verbal reasoning skill, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing.	5. Explain how a weakness in each component skill of oral language, reading, and writing may affect other related skills and processes across time (Level 2).

Content Knowledge	Application
6. Understand and explain the known causal Know and explain 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).	6. Identify the most salient instructional needs of students who are at different points of reading and writing development (Level 2).
7. Know reasonable goals and expectations for learners at various stages of reading and writing development.	7. Given case study material, explain why a student is/is not meeting goals and expectations in reading or writing for his or her age/grade (Level 1).

Explanatory Notes

An extensive research base exists on the abilities that are important in learning to read and write, including how these abilities interact with each other, how they are influenced by experience, and how they change across development. Teachers' knowledge of this research base is an essential foundation for the competencies and skills described in subsequent sections of this document.

References

Level 1

Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Learning and thinking about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bickart, T. (1998). *Summary report of preventing reading difficulties in young children* (National Academy of Sciences). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children.* Baltimore: Brookes.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institutes of Health.

Shaywitz, S. (2003). *Overcoming dyslexia: A new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level*. New York: Knopf.

Snow, C., Griffin, P., & Burns, S. (2006). *Knowledge to support the teaching of reading.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spear-Swerling, L., & Sternberg, R. J. (2001). What science offers teachers of reading. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 16*, 51-57.

Level 2

Adams, M. J. (1998). The three-cueing system. In F. Lehr & J. Osborn (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning* (pp. 73–99). New York: Guilford Press.

Crawford, E. C., & Torgesen, J. K. (2006, July). *Teaching all children to read: Practices from Reading First schools with strong intervention outcomes*. Presented at the Florida Principal's Leadership Conference, Orlando. Retrievable from http://www.fcrr.org/science/sciencePresentationscrawford.ht

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability ten years later. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 934–945.

Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). An evaluation of intensive intervention for students with persistent reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39*, 447–466.

Denton, C., Foorman, B., & Mathes, P. (2003). Schools that "Beat the Odds": Implications for reading instruction. *Remedial and Special Education, 24*, 258–261.

Denton, C., Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. (2003). Bringing research-based practice in reading intervention to scale. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 18*, 201–211.

Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2007). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention*. New York: Guilford Press.

Genesee, F., Paradis, J., & Crago, M. (2004). *Dual language development & disorders: A handbook on bilingualism & second language learning.* Baltimore: Brookes.

McCardle, P., & Chhabra, V. (2004). Th*e voice of evidence in reading research.* Baltimore: Brookes.

Rayner, K., & Pollatsek, A. (1989) *The Psychology of Reading* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.Spear-Swerling, L. (2004). A road map for understanding reading disability and other reading problems: Origins, intervention, and prevention. In R. Ruddell & N. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading: Vol. 5*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Stanovich, K. E. (2000). *Progress in understanding reading: Scientific foundations and new frontiers*. New York: Guilford Press.

Stone, A. C., Silliman, E. R., Ehren, B. J., & Apel, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of language and literacy*: *Development and disorders*. New York: Guilford Press.

Vellutino, F. R., Tunmer, W. E., Jaccard, J. J., & Chen, R. (2007). Components of reading ability: Multivariate evidence for a convergent skills model of reading development. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *11*(1), 3–32.

B. Knowledge of the Structure of Language

Content Knowledge	Application
Phonology (The Speech Sound System) 1. Identify, pronounce, classify, and compare the consonant and vowel phonemes of English.	1. a. Identify similar or contrasting features among phonemes (Level 1). b. Reconstruct the consonant and vowel phoneme inventories and identify the feature differences between and among phonemes (Level 2).
Orthography (The Spelling System) 2. Understand the broad outline of historical influences on English spelling patterns, especially Anglo-Saxon, Latin (Romance), and Greek.	2. Recognize typical words from the historical layers of English (Anglo-Saxon, Latin/Romance, Greek) (Level 1).
3. Define *grapheme* as a functional correspondence unit or representation of a phoneme.	3. Accurately map graphemes to phonemes in any English word (Level 1).
4. Recognize and explain common orthographic rules and patterns in English.	4. Sort words by orthographic "choice" pattern; analyze words by suffix ending patterns and apply suffix ending rules.
5. Know the difference between "high frequency" and "irregular" words.	5. Identify printed words that are the exception to regular patterns and spelling principles; sort high frequency words into regular and exception words (Level 1).
6. Identify, explain, and categorize six basic syllable types in English spelling.	6. Sort, pronounce, and combine regular written syllables and apply the most productive syllable division principles (Level 1).
Morphology 7. Identify and categorize 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.	7. a. Recognize the most common prefixes, roots, suffixes, and combining forms in English content words, and analyze words at both the syllable and orpheme levels (Level 1). b. Recognize advanced morphemes (e.g., chameleon prefixes) (Level 2).
Semantics 8. Understand and identify examples of meaningful word relationships or semantic organization.	8. Match or identify examples of word associations, antonyms, synonyms, multiple meanings and uses, semantic overlap, and semantic feature analysis (Level 1).

Syntax	
9. Define and distinguish among phrases, dependent clauses, and independent clauses in sentence structure.	9. Construct and deconstruct simple, complex, and compound sentences (Level 1).
10. Identify the parts of speech and the grammatical role of a word in a sentence.	10. a. Identify the basic parts of speech and classify words by their grammatical role in a sentence (Level 1). b. Identify advanced grammatical concepts (e.g., infinitives, gerunds) (Level 2).
Discourse Organization	
11. Explain the major differences between narrative and expository discourse.	11. Classify text by genre; identify features that are characteristic of each genre, and identify graphic organizers that characterize typical structures (Level 1).
12. Identify and construct expository paragraphs of varying logical structures (e.g., classification, reason, sequence).	12. Identify main idea sentences, connecting words, and topics that fit each type of expository paragraph organization (Level 2).
13. Identify cohesive devices in text and inferential gaps in the surface language of text.	13. Analyze text for the purpose of identifying the inferences that students must make to comprehend (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

Formal knowledge about the structure of language—recognizing, for example, whether words are phonetically regular or irregular; common morphemes in words; and common sentence structures in English—is not an automatic consequence of high levels of adult literacy. However, without this kind of knowledge, teachers may have difficulty interpreting assessments correctly or may provide unintentionally confusing instruction to students. For instance, struggling readers are likely to be confused if they are encouraged to sound out a word that is phonetically irregular (e.g., *some*), or if irregular words, such as *come* and *have*, are used as examples of a syllable type such as "silent e." Similarly, to teach spelling and writing effectively, teachers need a knowledge base about language structure, including sentence and discourse structure. Research suggests that acquiring an understanding of language structure often requires explicit teaching of this information and more than superficial coverage in teacher preparation and professional development.

References

Level 1
Grace, K. (2006). *Phonics and spelling through phoneme-grapheme mapping*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
Moats, L.C. (2009). *Language essentials for teachers of reading and spelling (LETRS)*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Level 2
Brady, S., Gillis, M., Smith, T., Lavalette, M., Liss-Bronstein, L., Lowe, E., et al. (2009). First grade teachers' knowledge of phonological awareness and code concepts: Examining gains from an intensive form of professional development. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 22*, 375–510.
Henry, M. (2003). *Unlocking literacy*. Baltimore: Brookes.
McCutchen, D., Abbott, R. D., & Green, L. B. (2002).Beginning literacy: Links among teacher knowledge, teacher practice, and student learning. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 69–86.

Moats, L. C. (2000). *Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Spear-Swerling, L., & Brucker, P. (2004). Preparing novice teachers to develop basic reading and spelling skills in children. *Annals of Dyslexia, 54*, 332–364.

Spear-Swerling, L., & Brucker, P. (2006). Teacher-education students' reading abilities and their knowledge about word structure. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 29*, 113–123.

C. Knowledge of Dyslexia and Other Learning Disorders

Content Knowledge	Application
1. Understand the most common intrinsic differences between good and poor readers (i.e., cognitive, neurobiological, and linguistic).	1. a. Recognize scientifically accepted characteristics of individuals with poor word recognition (e.g., overdependence on context to aid word recognition; inaccurate nonword reading) (Level 1). b. Identify student learning behaviors and test profiles typical of students with dyslexia and related learning difficulties. (Level 2).
2. Recognize the tenets of the NICHD/IDA definition of dyslexia.	2. Explain the reasoning or evidence behind the main points in the definition (Level 1).
3. Recognize that dyslexia and other reading difficulties exist on a continuum of severity.	3. Recognize levels of instructional intensity, duration, and scope appropriate for mild, moderate, and severe reading disabilities (Level 1).
4. Identify the distinguishing characteristics of dyslexia and related reading and learning disabilities (including developmental language comprehension disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, disorders of written expression or dysgraphia, mathematics learning disorder, nonverbal learning disorders, etc.).	4. Match symptoms of the major subgroups of poor readers as established by research, including those with dyslexia, and identify typical case study profiles of those individuals (Level 2).
5. Identify how symptoms of reading difficulty may change over time in response to development and instruction.	5. Identify predictable ways that symptoms might change as students move through the grades (Level 2).
6. Understand federal and state laws that pertain to learning disabilities, especially reading disabilities and dyslexia.	6. a. Explain the most fundamental provisions of federal and state laws pertaining to the rights of students with disabilities, especially students' rights to a free, appropriate public education, an individualized educational plan, services in the least restrictive environment, and due process (Level 1). b. Appropriately implement federal and state laws in identifying and serving students with learning disabilities, reading disabilities, and dyslexia (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

To identify children with dyslexia and other learning disabilities, teachers must understand and recognize the key symptoms of these disorders, as well as how the disorders differ from each other. In order to plan instruction and detect older students with learning disabilities who may have been overlooked in the early grades, teachers also should understand how students' difficulties may change over time, based on developmental patterns, experience, and instruction, as well as on increases in expectations across grades.

References

Level 1

Aaron, P. G., Joshi, R. M., Gooden, R., & Bentum, K. (2008). Diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities based on the component model of reading: An alternative to the discrepancy model of LD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41*, 67–84.

Hudson, R. R., High, L., & Al Otaiba, S. (2007). Dyslexia and the brain: What does current research tell us? *The Reading Teacher, 60*(6), 506–515.

Lyon, R., Shaywitz, S., & Shaywitz, B. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia, 53*, 1–14.

Moats, L. C., & Dakin, K. (2007). *Basic facts about dyslexia.* Baltimore: The International Dyslexia Association.

Level 2

Catts, H. W., Hogan, T. P., & Adlof, S. M. (2005). Developmental changes in reading and reading disabilities. In H. W. Catts & A. Kamhi (Eds.), *The connections between language and reading disabilities* (pp. 25–40). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Leach, J. M., Scarborough, H. S., & Rescorla, L. (2003). Late-emerging reading disabilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 211–224.

Ehri, L., & Snowling, M. (2004). Developmental variation in word recognition. In A. C. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 443–460). New York: Guilford Press.

Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. (2009) *Developmental disorders of language, learning, and cognition*. Oxford, England:Wiley-Blackwell.

Pennington, B. (2009). *Diagnosing learning disorders* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Olson, R. K. (2004). SSSR, environment, and genes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 8*(2), 111–124.

Rayner, K., Foorman, B. F., Perfetti, C. A., Pesetsky, D., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2002). How should reading be taught? *Scientific American, 286*(3), 84–91.

Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., Peyton, J. A., & Jenkins, J. R. (2002). Timing and intensity of tutoring: A closer look at the conditions for effective early literacy tutoring. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 17*, 227–241.

Wolf, M. (2007). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. New York: Harper Collins.

Wolf, M., & Bowers, P. G. (1999). The double-deficit hypothesis for the developmental dyslexias. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 415–438.

D. Interpretation and Administration of Assessments for Planning Instruction

Content Knowledge	Application	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Understand the differences among screening, diagnostic, outcome, and progress-monitoring assessments.	1. Match each type of assessment and its purpose (Level 1).	1. Administer screenings and progress monitoring assessments (Level 1)
2. Understand basic principles of test construction, including reliability, validity, and norm-referencing, and know the most well-validated screening tests designed to identify students at risk for reading difficulties.	2. Match examples of technically adequate, well-validated screening, diagnostic, outcome, and progress-monitoring assessments (Level 1).	2. Explain why individual students are or are not at risk in reading based on their performance on screening assessments (Level 1).
3. Understand the principles of progress-monitoring and the use of graphs to indicate progress.	3. Using case study data, accurately interpret progress-monitoring graphs to decide whether or not a student is making adequate progress (Level 1).	3. Display progress-monitoring data in graphs that are understandable to students and parents (Level 1).
4. Know the range of skills typically assessed by diagnostic surveys of phonological skills, decoding skills, oral reading skills, spelling, and writing.	4. Using case study data, accurately interpret subtest scores from diagnostic surveys to describe a student's patterns of strengths and weaknesses and instructional needs (Level 2).	4. Administer educational diagnostic assessments using standardized procedures (Level 2).
5. Recognize the content and purposes of the most common diagnostic tests used by psychologists and educational evaluators.	5. Find and interpret appropriate print and electronic resources for evaluating tests (Level 1).	5. Write reports that clearly and accurately summarize a student's current skills in important component areas of reading and reading comprehension (Level 2).
6. Interpret measures of reading comprehension and written expression in relation to an individual child's component profile.	6. Using case study data, accurately interpret a student's performance on reading comprehension or written expression measures and make appropriate instructional recommendations.	6. Write appropriate, specific recommendations for instruction and educational programming based on assessment data (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

Teachers' ability to administer and interpret assessments accurately is essential both to early identification of students' learning problems and to planning effective instruction. Appropriate assessments enable teachers to recognize early signs that a child may be at risk for dyslexia or other learning disabilities, and the assessments permit teachers to target instruction to meet individual student's needs. Teachers should understand that there are different types of assessments for different purposes (e.g., brief but frequent assessments to monitor progress versus more lengthy, comprehensive assessments to provide detailed diagnostic information), as well as recognize which type of assessment is called for in a particular situation. Teachers need to know where to find unbiased information about the adequacy of published tests, and to interpret this information correctly, they require an understanding of basic principles of test construction and concepts such as reliability and validity. They also should understand how an individual student's component profile may influence his or her performance on a particular test, especially on broad measures of reading comprehension and written expression. For example, a child with very slow reading is likely to perform better on an untimed measure of reading comprehension than on a stringently timed measure; a child with writing problems may perform especially poorly on a reading comprehension test that requires lengthy written responses to open-ended questions.

References

Level 1

Hasbrouck, J., & Haager, D. (Eds.). (2007). Monitoring children's progress in academic learning. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy 33*(2)*.*

Lyon, G. R., Shaywitz, S., & Shaywitz, B. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *53*, 1–14.

Torgesen, J. K. (2004). Avoiding the devastating downward spiral: The evidence that early intervention prevents reading failure. *American Educator, 28*(3), 6–9, 12–13, 17–19, 45–47.

Level 2

Cutting, L. E., & Scarborough, H. S. (2006). Prediction of reading comprehension: Relative contributions of word recognition, language proficiency, and other cognitive skills can depend on how comprehension is measured. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 10*, 277–299.

Deno, S. L. (2003). Developments in curriculum-based measurement. *Journal of Special Education, 37*, 184–192.

Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2007). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention*. New York: Guilford Press.

Fuchs, L. (2004). The past, present, and future of curriculum-based measurement research. *School Psychology Review, 33*, 188–192.

Good, R. H., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*, 257–288.

Hogan, T. P., Catts, H. W., & Little, T. D. (2005). The relationship between phonological awareness and reading: Implications for the assessment of phonological awareness. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36*, 285–293.

Jenkins, J. R., Johnson, E., & Hileman, J. (2004). When is reading also writing: Sources of individual differences on the new reading performance assessments. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 8*, 125–152.

Keenan, J. M., Betjemann, R. S., & Olson, R. K. (2008). Reading comprehension tests vary in the skills they assess: Differential dependence on decoding and oral comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 12*, 281–300.

Pennington, B. (2009). *Diagnosing learning disorders* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

E-1. Structured Language Teaching: Phonology

Content Knowledge	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Identify the general and specific goals of phonological skill instruction.	1. Explicitly state the goal of any phonological awareness teaching activity (Level 1).
2. Know the progression of phonological skill development (i.e., rhyme, syllable, onset-rime, phoneme differentiation).	2. a. Select and implement activities that match a student's developmental level of phonological skill (Level 1). b. Design and justify the implementation of activities that match a student's developmental level of phonological skill (Level 2).
3. Identify the differences among various phonological manipulations, including identifying, matching, blending, segmenting, substituting, and deleting sounds.	3. Demonstrate instructional activities that identify, match, blend, segment, substitute, and delete sounds (Level 1).
4. Understand the principles of phonological skill instruction: brief, multisensory, conceptual, and auditory-verbal.	4. a. Successfully produce vowel and consonant phonemes (Level 1). b. Teach articulatory features of phonemes and words; use minimally contrasting pairs of sounds and words in instruction; support instruction with manipulative materials and movement (Level 2).
5. Understand the reciprocal relationships among phonological processing, reading, spelling, and vocabulary.	5. a. Direct students' attention to speech sounds during reading, spelling, and vocabulary instruction using a mirror, discussion of articulatory features, and so on as scripted or prompted (Level 1). b. Direct students' attention to speech sounds during reading, spelling, and vocabulary instruction without scripting or prompting (Level 2).
6. Understand the phonological features of a second language, such as Spanish, and how they interfere with English pronunciation and phonics.	6. Explicitly contrast first and second language phonological systems, as appropriate, to anticipate which sounds may be most challenging for the second language learner (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

Phonological awareness, basic print concepts, and knowledge of letter sounds are foundational areas of literacy. Without early, research-based intervention, children who struggle in these areas are likely to continue to have reading difficulties. Furthermore, poor phonological awareness is a core weakness in dyslexia. Ample research exists to inform teaching of phonological awareness, including research on the phonological skills to emphasize in instruction, appropriate sequencing of instruction, and integrating instruction in phonological awareness with instruction in alphabet knowledge. Teachers who understand how to teach these foundational skills effectively can prevent or ameliorate many children's reading problems, including those of students with dyslexia.

References

Level 1

Adams, M., Foorman, B. R., Lundberg, I., & Beeler, T. (Spring/Summer, 1998). The elusive phoneme: Why phonemic awareness is so important and how to help children develop it. *American Educator, 22*(1 & 2), 18–29.

Level 2

Brady, S. & Shankweiler, D. (Eds.). (1991). *Phonological processes in literacy: A tribute to Isabelle Y. Liberman.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Gillon, G. (2004). *Phonological awareness: From research to practice.* New York: Guilford Press.

Neuman, S. B., & Dickinson, D. K. (2002). *Handbook of early literacy research.* New York: Guilford Press.

Scarborough, H. S. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: Phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In B. K. Shapiro, P. J. Accardo, & A. J. Capute (Eds.), *Specific reading disability: A view of the spectrum* (pp. 75–119). Timonium, MD: York Press.

Scarborough, H. S., & Brady, S. A. (2002). Toward a common terminology for talking about speech and reading: A glossary of the 'phon' words and some related terms. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*, 299–334.

E-2. Structured Language Teaching: Phonics and Word Recognition

Content Knowledge	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Know or recognize how to order phonics concepts from easier to more difficult.	1. Plan lessons with a cumulative progression of word recognition skills that build one on another (Level 1).
2. Understand principles of explicit and direct teaching: model, lead, give guided practice, and review.	2. Explicitly and effectively teach (e.g., information taught is correct, students are attentive, teacher checks for understanding, teacher scaffolds students' learning) concepts of word recognition and phonics; apply concepts to reading single words, phrases, and connected text (Level 1).
3. State the rationale for multisensory and multimodal techniques.	3. Demonstrate the simultaneous use of two or three learning modalities (to include listening, speaking, movement, touch, reading, and/or writing) to increase engagement and enhance memory (Level 1).
4. Know the routines of a complete lesson format, from the introduction of a word recognition concept to fluent application in meaningful reading and writing.	4. Plan and effectively teach all steps in a decoding lesson, including single-word reading and connected text that is read fluently, accurately, and with appropriate intonation and expression (Level 1).
5. Understand research-based adaptations of instruction for students with weaknesses in working memory, attention, executive function, or processing speed.	5. Adapt the pace, format, content, strategy, or emphasis of instruction according to students' pattern of response (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

The development of accurate word decoding skills—that is, the ability to read unfamiliar words by applying phonics knowledge—is an essential foundation for reading comprehension in all students. Decoding skills often are a central weakness for students with learning disabilities in reading, especially those with dyslexia. Teachers' abilities to provide explicit, systematic, appropriately sequenced instruction in phonics is indispensable to meet the needs of this population, as well as to help prevent reading problems in all beginning readers. Teachers should also understand the usefulness of multisensory, multimodal techniques in focusing students' attention on printed words, engaging students, and enhancing memory.

References

Level 1

Birsh, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Multisensory teaching of basic language skills* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Brookes.

Moats, L. C. (1998). Teaching decoding. *American Educator, 22*(1&2), 42–49, 95–96.

Level 2

Blachman, B. A., Schatschneider, C., Fletcher, J. M., Francis, D. J., Clonan, S., Shaywitz, B., et al. (2004). Effects of intensive reading remediation for second and third graders. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*, 444–461.

Calhoon, M. B. (2005). Effects of a peer-mediated phonological skill and reading comprehension program on reading skill acquisition for middle school students with reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(5), 424–433.

Catone, W. V., & Brady, S. (2005). The inadequacy of individual educational program goals for high school students with word-level reading difficulties. *Annals of Dyslexia, 55*(1), 53–78.

Christensen, C. A., & Bowey, J. A. (2005). The efficacy of orthographic rime, grapheme-phoneme correspondence, and implicit phonics approaches to teaching decoding skills. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 9*, 327–349.

Ehri, L. C. (2004). Teaching phonemic awareness and phonics: An explanation of the national reading panel meta-analysis. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 153–186). Baltimore: Brookes.

Joseph, L. M., & Schisler, R. (2009). Should adolescents go back to the basics?: A review of teaching word reading skills to middle and high school students. Remedial and Special Education 30 (3), 131– 147.

Lovett, M. W., Barron, R. W., & Benson, N. J. (2003). Effective remediation of word identification and decoding difficulties in school-age children with reading disabilities. In H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Learning Disabilities* (pp. 273–292). New York: Guilford Press.

Mathes, P. G., Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., Francis, D. J., & Schatschneider, C. (2005). The effects of theoretically different instruction and student characteristics on the skills of struggling readers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*, 148–182.

McCandliss, B., Beck, I. L., Sandak, R., & Perfetti, C. (2003). Focusing attention on decoding for children with poor reading skills: Design and preliminary tests of the word building intervention. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 7*, 75–104.

Torgesen, J. K. (2004). Lessons learned from research on interventions for students who have difficulty learning to read. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 355–381). Baltimore: Brookes.

E-3. Structured Language Teaching: Fluent, Automatic Reading of Text

Content Knowledge	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Understand the role of fluency in word recognition, oral reading, silent reading, comprehension of written discourse, and motivation to read.	1. Assess students' fluency rate and determine reasonable expectations for reading fluency at various stages of reading development, using research-based guidelines and appropriate state and local standards and benchmarks (Level 1).
2. Understand 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.	2. Determine which students need a fluency-oriented approach to instruction, using screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring assessments (Level 2).
3. Define and identify examples of text at a student's frustration, instructional, and independent reading level.	3. Match students with appropriate texts as informed by fluency rate to promote ample independent oral and silent reading (Level 1).
4. Know sources of activities for building fluency in component reading skills.	4. Design lesson plans that incorporate fluency-building activities into instruction at sub-word and word levels (Level 1).
5. Know which instructional activities and approaches are most likely to improve fluency outcomes.	5. Design lesson plans with a variety of techniques to build reading fluency, such as repeated readings of passages, alternate oral reading with a partner, reading with a tape, or rereading the same passage up to three times. (Level 1).
6. Understand techniques to enhance student motivation to read.	6. Identify student interests and needs to motivate independent reading (Level 1).
7. Understand appropriate uses of assistive technology for students with serious limitations in reading fluency.	7. Make appropriate recommendations for use of assistive technology in general education classes for students with different reading profiles (e.g., dyslexia versus language disabilities) (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

Reading fluency is the ability to read text effortlessly and quickly as well as accurately. Fluency develops among typical readers in the primary grades. Because fluency is a useful predictor of overall reading competence, especially in elementary-aged students, a variety of fluency tasks have been developed for use in screening and progress-monitoring measures. Furthermore, poor reading fluency is a very common symptom of dyslexia and other reading disabilities; problems with reading fluency can linger even when students' accuracy in word decoding has been improved through effective phonics intervention. Although fluency difficulties may sometimes be associated with processing weaknesses, considerable research supports the role of practice, wide exposure to printed words, and focused instruction in the development and remediation of fluency. To address students' fluency needs, teachers must have a range of competencies, including the ability to interpret fluency-based measures appropriately, to place students in appropriate types and levels of texts for reading instruction,

to stimulate students' independent reading, and to provide systematic fluency interventions for students who require them. Assistive technology (e.g., text-to-speech software) is often employed to help students with serious fluency difficulties function in general education settings. Therefore, teachers, and particularly specialists, require knowledge about the appropriate uses of this technology.

References

Level 1

Carreker, S. (2005). Teaching reading: Accurate decoding and fluency. In J. Birsh (Ed.), *Multisensory teaching of basic language skills* (2nd ed., pp. 213– 255). Baltimore: Brookes.

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator, 22*(1&2), 8–15.

Hasbrouck, J. E., & Tindal, G. A. (2006). Oral Reading Fluency norms: A valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. *The Reading Teacher,* 59 (7), 636–644.

Hudson, R. F., Lane, H. B., & Pullen, P. C. (2005). Reading fluency assessment and instruction: What, why, and how? *The Reading Teacher, 58*, 702–714.

Kuhn, M. (2004/2005). Helping students become accurate, expressive reading: Fluency instruction for small groups. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(4), 338–345.

Meyer, M. (Winter, 2002) Repeated reading: An old standard is revisited and renovated. *Perspectives* (The International Dyslexia Association Quarterly Newsletter), 15–18.

Meyer, M. S., & Felton, R. H. (1999). Repeated reading to enhance fluency: Old approaches and new directions. *Annals of Dyslexia, 49*, 293–306.

Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 58,* 510–519.

Samuels, S. J. (1997). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher, 50*, 76–81.

Level 2

Chard, D., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. (2002) A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 386–406.

Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., & Katch, L. E. (2004). Beyond the reading wars: Exploring the effect of child-instruction interactions on growth in early reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 8*, 305–336.

Ehri, L. C. (1997). Sight word learning in normal readers and dyslexics. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia* (pp. 163–189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Walz, L., & Germann, G. (1993). Formative evaluation of academic progress: How much growth should we expect? *School Psychology Review, 22*, 27–48.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(3), 239–256.

Good, R. H., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(3), 257–288.

Hamilton, C., & Shinn, M. R. (2003). Characteristics of word callers: An investigation of the accuracy of teachers' judgments of reading comprehension and oral reading skills. *School Psychology Review, 32*(2), 228–240.

Hosp, M. K., Hosp, J. L., & Howell, K.W. (2007). *The ABC's of CBM: A practical guide to curriculum-based measurement*. New York: Guilford Press.

Katzir, T., Kim, Y., Wolf, M., O'Brien, B., Kennedy, B., Lovett, M., et al. (2006). Reading fluency: The whole is more than the parts. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *56*(1), 51–82.

National Center for Education Statistics, 2002. *Fourth grade students reading aloud: NAEP 2002 special study of oral reading.* Washington, DC: National Assessment of Educational Progress, United States Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences.

Samuels, S. J., & Flor, R. F. (1997). The importance of automaticity for developing expertise in reading. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 13*, 107–121.

Speece, D. L., & Ritchey, K. D. (2005). A longitudinal study of the development of oral reading fluency in young children at risk for reading failure. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(5), 387–399.

Stahl, S. A., & Heubach, K. (2005). Fluency-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of literacy research, 37*, 25–60.

Therrien, W. J., Wickstrom, K., & Jones, K. (2006). Effect of a combined repeated reading and question generation intervention on reading achievement. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 21*(2), 89–97.

Torgesen, J., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K., Conway, T., et al. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*, 33–58.

E-4. Structured Language Teaching: Vocabulary

Content Knowledge	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Understand the role of vocabulary development and vocabulary knowledge in comprehension.	1. Teach word meanings directly using contextual examples, structural (morpheme) analysis, antonyms and synonyms, definitions, connotations, multiple meanings, and semantic feature analysis (Levels 1 and 2).
2. Understand the role and characteristics of direct and indirect (contextual) methods of vocabulary instruction.	2. Lesson planning reflects: A. Selection of material for read-alouds and independent reading that will expand students' vocabulary.
3. Know varied techniques for vocabulary instruction before, during, and after reading.	B. Identification of words necessary for direct teaching that should be known before the passage is read.
4. Understand that word knowledge is multifaceted.	C. Repeated encounters with new words and multiple opportunities to use new words orally and in writing.
5. Understand the sources of wide differences in students' vocabularies.	D. Recurring practice and opportunities to use new words in writing and speaking.

Explanatory Notes

Vocabulary, or knowledge of word meanings, plays a key role in reading comprehension. Knowledge of words is multifaceted, ranging from partial recognition of the meaning of a word to deep knowledge and the ability to use the word effectively in speech or writing. Research supports both explicit, systematic teaching of word meanings and indirect methods of instruction such as those involving inferring meanings of words from sentence context or from word parts (e.g., common roots and affixes). Teachers should know how to develop students' vocabulary knowledge through both direct and indirect methods. They also should understand the importance of wide exposure to words, both orally and through reading, in students' vocabulary development. For example, although oral vocabulary knowledge frequently is a strength for students with dyslexia, over time, low volume of reading may tend to reduce these students' exposure to rich vocabulary relative to their typical peers; explicit teaching of word meanings and encouragement of wide independent reading in appropriate texts are two ways to help increase this exposure.

References

Level 1

Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2006). *Vocabulary handbook*. Berkeley, CA: Consortium on Reading Excellence.

Ebbers, S. (2006). *Vocabulary through morphemes*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction.* New York: Guilford Press.

Biemiller, A. (1999). Language and reading success. In J. Chall (Ed.), *From reading research to practice, A series for teachers.* Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Biemiller, A. (2005). Size and sequence in vocabulary development: Implications for choosing words for primary grade instruction. In E. H. Hiebert and M. L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practic*e. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The knowledge deficit: Closing the shocking education gap for American children.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Level 2

Carlisle, J., & Rice, M. S. (2003). *Reading comprehension: Research-based principles and practices.* Baltimore: York Press.

Dickinson, D. K., & Smith, M. W. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low-income children's vocabulary and story comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*, 104–123.

Graves, M. (2006). *The Vocabulary book: Learning and instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Hirsch, E. D. (2001). Overcoming the language gap. *American Educator, 25*(2), 4, 6–7.

Kamil, M. (2004). Vocabulary and comprehension instruction: Summary and implications of the National Reading Panel findings. In P. McCardle and V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 213–234).

Metsala, J. L. (1999) Young children's phonological awareness and nonword repetition as a function of vocabulary development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 3–19.

Paynter, D. E., Bodrova, E., & Doty, J. K. (2005). *For the love of words: Vocabulary instruction that works, Grades K–6*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Simpson, J. A. (Ed.). (1989). *The Oxford English Dicti*onary (2nd Edition, Vol. VII). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stahl, S. A., & Nagy, W. E. (2006) *Teaching word meanings*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tannenbaum, K. R., Torgesen, J. T., & Wagner, R. K. (2006). Relationships between word knowledge and reading comprehension in 3rd grade children. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 10*, 381–398.

E-5. Structured Language Teaching: Text Comprehension

Content Knowledge	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Be familiar with teaching strategies that are appropriate before, during, and after reading and that promote reflective reading.	1. a. State purpose for reading, elicit or provide background knowledge, and explore key vocabulary (Level 1). b. Query during text reading to foster attention to detail, inference-making, and mental model construction (Level 1). c. Use graphic organizers, note-taking strategies, retelling and summarizing, and cross-text comparisons (Level 1).
2. Contrast the characteristics of major text genres, including narration, exposition, and argumentation.	2. Lesson plans reflect a range of genres, with emphasis on narrative and expository texts (Level 1).
3. Understand the similarities and differences between written composition and text comprehension, and the usefulness of writing in building comprehension.	3. Model, practice, and share written responses to text; foster explicit connections between new learning and what was already known (Level 1).
4. Identify in any text the phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and "academic language" that could be a source of miscomprehension.	4. Anticipate confusions and teach comprehension of figurative language, complex sentence forms, cohesive devices, and unfamiliar features of text (Level 2).
5. Understand levels of comprehension including the surface code, text base, and mental model (situation model).	5. Plan lessons to foster comprehension of the surface code (the language), the text base (the underlying ideas), and a mental model (the larger context for the ideas) (Level 2).
6. Understand 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.	6. Adjust the emphasis of lessons to accommodate learners' strengths and weaknesses and pace of learning (Level 2).

Explanatory Notes

Good reading comprehension is the ultimate goal of reading instruction. Reading comprehension depends not only upon the component abilities discussed in previous sections, but also upon other factors, such as background knowledge and knowledge of text structure. In order to plan effective instruction and intervention in reading comprehension, teachers must understand the array of abilities that contribute to reading comprehension and use assessments to help pinpoint students' weaknesses. For instance, a typical student with dyslexia, whose reading comprehension problems are associated mainly with poor decoding and dysfluent reading, will need different emphases in intervention than will a poor comprehender whose problems revolve

around broad weaknesses in vocabulary and oral comprehension. In addition, teachers must be able to model and teach research-based comprehension strategies, such as summarization and the use of graphic organizers, as well as use methods that promote reflective reading and engagement. Oral comprehension and reading comprehension have a reciprocal relationship; good oral comprehension facilitates reading comprehension, but wide reading also contributes to the development of oral comprehension, especially in older students. Teachers should understand the relationships among oral language, reading comprehension, and written expression, and they should be able to use appropriate writing activities to build students' comprehension.

References

Level 1

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2006). *Improving comprehension with questioning the author: A fresh and expanded view of a powerful approach*. New York: Scholastic.

Beck, I., McKeown, M., Hamilton, R., & Kucan, L. (1998). Getting at the meaning. *American Educator, 22*, 66–85.

Caccamise, D., & Snyder, L. (Eds.). (2009). Reading comprehension: Issues and instructional applications*. Perspectives on Language and Literacy*, *35*(2).

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator*, *22*, 8–15.

Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 64*, 479–530.

Willingham, D. T. (2006). How knowledge helps: It speeds and strengthens reading comprehension, learning, and thinking. *American Educator*, *30*(1), 30–37.

Willingham, D. T. (2006-07). The usefulness of brief instruction in reading comprehension strategies. *American Educator*, *30*(4), 39–45.

Level 2

Barnes, M. A., Johnston, A. M., & Dennis, M. (2007). Comprehension in a neurodevelopmental disorder, Spina Bifida Myelomeningocele. In K. Cain & J. V. Oakhill (Eds.), *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 193–217). New York: Guilford Press.

Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. V. (2007). Reading comprehension difficulties: Correlates, causes, and consequences. In K. Cain & J. V. Oakhill (Eds.), *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 81–103) New York: Guilford Press.

Carlisle, J. R., & Rice, M. S. (2002). *Improving reading comprehension: Research-based principles and practices*. Baltimore: York Press.

Catts, H. W., Fey, M. E., Zhang, X., & Tomblin, J. A. (1999). Language basis of reading and language disabilities: Evidence from a longitudinal investigation. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3*, 331–361.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. B., & Simmons, D. C. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*, 174–206.

Gattardo, A., Stanovich, K., & Siegel, L. (1996). The relationships between phonological sensitivity, syntactic processing, and verbal working memory in the reading performance of third-grade children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 63*, 563–582.

Gersten, R., Fuchs, L. S., Williams, J. P., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching reading comprehension strategies to students with learning disabilities: A review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*, 279–320.

Graesser, A. C. (2008). An introduction to strategic reading comprehension. In D. S. McNamara (Ed.), *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, intervention and technologies* (pp. 3–26). New York: Erlbaum.

Hirsch, E. D. (2006). Building knowledge: The case for bringing content into the language arts block and for a knowledge-rich curriculum core for all children. *American Educator*, *30*(1), 8–21, 28–29, 50–51.

Kamil, M. (2004). Vocabulary and comprehension instruction: Summary and implications of the National Reading Panel findings. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 213–234). Baltimore: Brookes.

Kintsch, E. (2005). Comprehension theory as a guide for the design of thoughtful questions. *Topics in language disorders, 25*(1), pp. 51–64.

Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). Reading for understanding: Toward a research and development program in reading comprehension. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. (http://www.rand.org.multi/achievementforall/reading/readreport.html.)

Scarborough, H. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research* (pp. 97–110). New York: Guilford Press.

Scott, C. (2004). Syntactic contributions to literacy development. In C. Stone, E. Stillman, B. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.). *Handbook of Language & Literacy* (pp. 340–362). New York: Guilford Press.

Shankweiler, D., Lundquist, E., Katz, L., Stuebing, K. K., Fletcher, J. M., Brady, S., et al. (1999). Comprehension and decoding: Patterns of association in children with reading difficulties. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 31*, 24–35, 69–94.

Stahl, K.A.D. (2004). Proof, practice, and promise: Comprehension strategy instruction in the primary grades. *The Reading Teacher, 57*, 598–609.

Sweet, A. P., & Snow, C. E. (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford Press.

Vaughn, S., & Klingner, J. K. (1999). Teaching reading comprehension through collaborative strategic reading. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 34*, 284–292.

Westby, C. (2004). A language perspective on executive functioning, metacognition, and self-regulation in reading. In C. A. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 398–427). New York: Guilford Press.

Williams, J. P. (2006). Stories, studies, and suggestions about reading. *Scientific studies of reading, 10*(2), 121–142.

E-6. Structured Language Teaching: Handwriting, Spelling, and Written Expression

Content Knowledge	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
Handwriting 1. Know research-based principles for teaching letter naming and letter formation, both manuscript and cursive. 2. Know techniques for teaching handwriting fluency.	Handwriting 1. Use multisensory techniques to teach letter naming and letter formation in manuscript and cursive forms (Level 1). 2. Implement strategies to build fluency in letter formation, and copying and transcription of written language (Level 1).
Spelling 1. Recognize and explain the relationship between transcription skills and written expression. 2. Identify students' levels of spelling development and orthographic knowledge. 3. Recognize and explain the influences of phonological, orthographic, and morphemic knowledge on spelling.	Spelling 1. Explicitly and effectively teach (e.g., information taught is correct, students are attentive, teacher checks for understanding, teacher scaffolds students' learning) concepts related to spelling (e.g., a rule for adding suffixes to base words) (Level 1). 2. Select materials and/or create lessons that address students' skill levels (Level 1). 3. Analyze a student's spelling errors to determine his or her instructional needs (e.g., development of phonological skills versus learning spelling rules versus application of orthographic or morphemic knowledge in spelling) (Level 2).
Written Expression 1. Understand the major components and processes of written expression and how they interact (e.g., basic writing/ transcription skills versus text generation). 2. Know grade and developmental expectations for students' writing in the following areas: mechanics and conventions of writing, composition, revision, and editing processes.	Written Expression 1. Integrate basic skill instruction with composition in writing lessons. 2. a. Select and design activities to teach important components of writing, including mechanics/ conventions of writing, composition, and revision and editing processes. b. Analyze students' writing to determine specific instructional needs. c. Provide specific, constructive feedback to students targeted to students' most critical needs in writing. d. Teach research-based writing strategies such as those for planning, revising, and editing text.

	e. Teach writing (discourse) knowledge, such as the importance of writing for the intended audience, use of formal versus informal language, and various schemas for writing (e.g., reports versus narratives versus arguments).
3. Understand appropriate uses of assistive technology in written expression.	3. Make appropriate written recommendations for the use of assistive technology in writing.

Explanatory Notes

Just as teachers need to understand the component abilities that contribute to reading comprehension, they also need a componential view of written expression. Important component abilities in writing include basic writing (transcription) skills such as handwriting, keyboarding, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and grammatical sentence structure; text generation (composition) processes that involve translating ideas into language, such as appropriate word choice, writing clear sentences, and developing an idea across multiple sentences and paragraphs; and planning, revision and editing processes. Effective instruction and intervention in written expression depend on pinpointing an individual student's specific weaknesses in these different component areas of writing, as well as on teachers' abilities to provide explicit, systematic teaching in each area. Teachers must also be able to teach research-based strategies in written expression, such as those involving strategies for planning and revising compositions, and they should understand the utility of multisensory methods in both handwriting and spelling instruction. Assistive technology can be especially helpful for students with writing difficulties. Teachers should recognize the appropriate uses of technology in writing (e.g., spell-checkers can be valuable but do not replace spelling instruction and have limited utility for students whose misspellings are not recognizable). Specialists should have even greater levels of knowledge about technology.

References

Level 1

Berninger, V., & Wolf, B. (2009) *Teaching students with dyslexia and dysgraphia*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Graham, S., McArthur, C.A., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Best practices in writing instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.

Joshi, M., Treiman, R., Carreker, S., & Moats, L. C. (2008/2009) How words cast their spell: Spelling is an integral part of learning the language, not a matter of memorization. *American Educator, 32*(4), 6–16, 42–43.

Moats, L. C. (Winter 2005/06). How spelling supports reading: And why it is more regular and predictable than you think. *American Educator, 12–22*, 42–43.

Level 2

Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Jones, J., Gould, L., Anderson-Youngstrom, M., Shimada, S., et al. (2006). Early development of language by hand: Composing, reading, listening, and speaking connections; three letter-writing modes; and fast mapping in spelling. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 29*, 61–92.

Berninger, V. W., & Amtmann, D. (2003). Preventing written expression disabilities through early and continuing assessment and intervention for handwriting and/or spelling problems: Research into practice. In H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Learning Disabilities* (pp. 345–363). New York: Guilford Press.

Cassar, M., Treiman, R., Moats, L., Pollo, T. C., & Kessler, B. (2005). How do the spellings of children with dyslexia compare with those of nondyslexic children? *Reading and Writing, 18*, 27–49.

Edwards, L. (2003). Writing instruction in kindergarten: Examining an emerging area of research for children with writing and reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 36*, 136.

Englert, C. S., Wu, X., & Zhao, Y. (2005). Cognitive tools for writing: Scaffolding the performance of students through technology. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 20*, 184–198.

Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Elementary School Journal, 101*, 251–272.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Troia, G. (Ed.). (2009) *Instruction and assessment for struggling writers: Evidence-based practices.* New York: Guilford Press.

F. Follow Ethical Standards for the Profession

Ethical Principles for Service Providers, Conference Exhibitors, and Advertisers

These principles are to be used by employees, board members, and branch officers of the International Dyslexia Association (IDA) in deciding whether members, conference exhibitors, conference or workshop presenters, and/or advertisers in IDA publications are serving the best interest of the public. These principles are intended to safeguard and promote the well-being of individuals with dyslexia and related learning difficulties, to promote the dissemination of reliable and helpful information, and to ensure that standards of best practice are upheld by the organization and its activities.

Practitioners, publishers, presenters, exhibitors, advertisers, and any others who provide services to individuals with dyslexia and related difficulties:

1. strive to do no harm and to act in the best interests of those individuals;
2. maintain the public trust by providing accurate information about currently accepted and scientifically supported best practices in the field;
3. avoid misrepresentation of the efficacy of educational or other treatments or the proof for or against those treatments;
4. respect objectivity by reporting assessment and treatment results accurately, honestly, and truthfully;
5. avoid making unfounded claims of any kind regarding the training, experience, credentials, affiliations, and degrees of those providing services;
6. respect the training requirements of established credentialing and accreditation organizations supported by IDA;
7. engage in fair competition;
8. avoid conflicts of interest when possible and acknowledge conflicts of interest when they occur;
9. support just treatment of individuals with dyslexia and related learning difficulties;
10. respect confidentiality of students or clients; and
11. respect the intellectual property of others.

SECTION II: GUIDELINES PERTAINING TO SUPERVISED PRACTICE OF TEACHERS OF STUDENTS WITH DOCUMENTED READING DISABILITIES OR DYSLEXIA WHO WORK IN SCHOOL, CLINICAL, OR PRIVATE PRACTICE SETTINGS[1]

Training programs for individuals who are learning to work with challenging students often distinguish levels of expertise by the skills and experience of the individual and the amount of supervised practice required for certification. These levels are labeled differently by various programs and are distinguished here by the designation of "Level I" and "Level II."

C. Level I individuals are practitioners with basic knowledge who:
1. demonstrate proficiency to instruct individuals with a documented reading disability or dyslexia;
2. implement an appropriate program with fidelity; and
3. formulate and implement an appropriate lesson plan.
D. Level II individuals are specialists with advanced knowledge who:
1. may work in private practice settings, clinics, or schools;
2. demonstrate proficiency in assessment and instruction of students with documented reading disabilities or dyslexia;
3. implement and adapt research-based programs to meet the needs of individuals.

To attain Level I status, an individual must:
- pass an approved basic knowledge proficiency exam;
- complete a one-to-one practicum with a student or small group of one to three well-matched students who have a documented reading disability. A recognized, certified instructor* provides consistent oversight and observations of instruction delivered to the same student(s) over time, and the practicum continues until expected proficiency is reached.**
- demonstrate (over time) instructional proficiency in all Level 1 areas outlined on IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, Section I that is responsive to student needs.
- Document significant student progress with formal and informal assessments as a result of the instruction.

To attain Level II status, an individual must:
- Pass an approved advanced knowledge proficiency exam
- Complete a 1:1 practicum with a student or small group of well-matched students (1–3) who have a documented reading disability. A recognized, certified instructor* provides consistent oversight and observations of instruction delivered to the same student(s) over time, and the practicum continues until expected proficiency is reached.**
- Demonstrate (over time) diagnostic instructional proficiency in all Level 1 and 2 areas outlined on IDA Standards document, Section I.
- Provide successful instruction to several individuals with dyslexia who demonstrate varying needs and document significant student progress with formal and informal assessments as a result of the instruction.
- Complete an approved educational assessment of a student with dyslexia and/or language-based reading disability, including student history and comprehensive recommendations.

---

[1] **(Tier 3 in an RTI system; students who may be eligible for special education or intensive intervention; students referred for clinical services because of learning difficulties; or students who qualify for dyslexia intervention services where available.)**

*A recognized or certified instructor is an individual who has met all of the requirements of the level they supervise but who has additional content knowledge and experience in implementing and observing instruction for students with dyslexia and other reading difficulties in varied settings. A recognized instructor has been recommended by or certified by an approved trainer mentorship program that meets these standards. The trainer mentorship program has been reviewed by and approved by the IDA Standards and Practices Committee.

**Documentation of proficiency must be 1) completed by a recognized/certified instructor providing oversight in the specified program; 2) completed during full (not partial) lesson observations; and 3) must occur at various intervals throughout the instructional period with student.