

MEMORANDUM



August 2, 2019

TO: The Kirwan Commission, Legislative Staff, MSDE and Consultants

FROM: Decoding Dyslexia Maryland: Karleen Spitulnik & Laura Schultz, State Leaders

RE: Recommendations to Incorporate High Quality, Multi-Level Reading Frameworks, PK-12

[Decoding Dyslexia Maryland](#) parents, teachers and students from [15 local chapters](#) support the efforts of the Commission on Innovation and Excellence in Education to offer all students a world class education and to invest in educators. High quality reading instruction and interventions begin with determining which students may be at risk for reading difficulty and providing instruction before they fall behind -- this is the first step to implement an early warning system for reading. The second step is to ensure that instruction and interventions are evidence based, systematic, explicit and include the [essential components of reading](#) critical to struggling readers. There are several [pockets of promise](#) in Maryland, but more must be done to connect research to practice in reading and writing.

During the 2018 session, legislation based in part on recommendations made by the [Task Force to Study the Implementation of a Dyslexia Education Program](#), attempted to establish an early warning system to prevent reading difficulties in young children. [House Bill 910](#) was aligned with best practices for reading screening, assessment and instruction to address literacy needs and prevent reading failure. The 2019 legislation will again address reading screening, instruction/intervention frameworks, stakeholder engagement and professional learning for in-service educators. An early warning system to prevent reading failure is aligned with elements in all four working groups and the educational building blocks.

REQUESTED ACTION 1: Screening & Intervention Legislation 2019 (Ready to Read Act)

Decoding Dyslexia Maryland requests that the Ready to Read Act of 2019 be endorsed by the Commission as a legislative priority and that any costs associated with the legislation be included in the funding formula to ensure school districts have the wherewithal to update their current screening, assessment, instruction and intervention practices to support struggling readers and students at risk for reading difficulties like dyslexia.

REQUESTED ACTION 2: Incorporate Recommendations that Support Struggling Readers, Students with Dyslexia and PK-12 Educators

Please accept our apologies for the late feedback and the volume of our response. We respectfully request that each working group closely evaluate the recommendations along with commensurate funding. The recommendations originate from students, parents, educators, research scientists and professionals in the field of screening, assessment, instruction and interventions for struggling readers and students with dyslexia.

Thank you,

Laura Schultz, Karleen Spitulnik & Janice Lepore

Decoding Dyslexia Maryland, State Leaders, DecodingDyslexiaMD@gmail.com

KEY: Yellow = additions and strikethrough = deletions to existing working group elements

| Working Group 1 (WG1): Early Childhood Education | | |
|---|--|---|
| Element | Design Assumptions | Implementation Considerations |
| <p>WG 1: Modify or Eliminate Element 1c</p> <p>Implementation of school reading screening framework readiness assessment for all students in Pre-K and Kindergarten</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This assessment would be given to all kindergarteners by kindergarten teachers as a census. ● The State will continue to provide public Pre-K and kindergarten teachers with training or a refresher course on administering the KRA every year early reading screening frameworks that include multi-level reading instruction and interventions. ● The State will continue to provide professional development funds for jurisdictions that administer the KRA as a reading screening frameworks to all students as a census assessment. ● The assessment tool should screening instruments should provide information for Pre-K and kindergarten teachers to use to plan their lessons and also to enable teachers to identify students who may need additional assistance. ● The tools will not be cumbersome for teachers to administer and teachers will be given dedicated time to administer the screening and assessment tools. ● A protocol high quality, multi-level reading instruction framework will be put in place to enable educators teachers to use and act on the information produced by the assessment tools, such as providing students with reading instruction and/or intervention that meets the students needs and prevents a reading achievement gap. referring students for ease management or in-class or out-of-class supports. ● Schools and districts should be responsible for implementing a reading screening framework that can reliably predict which students need help before they fall behind (prevention). ● Schools and districts should not use assessments like the Kindergarten | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Local boards of education should have flexibility to administer screening protocols, given guidance from the department regarding validity, reliability, and skills to be assessed. the KRA either before students enter kindergarten or during the first two months of the school year. ● The State should implement legislation that requires the KRA screening instruments to be administered to every Pre-K and kindergarten student as a census and not as a random sample to ensure equity and accountability. ● The State should extend the administration window from October 10 to October 30 to reduce the operational impact of conducting the KRA as census assessment. ● A survey of kindergarten teachers should be conducted after Version 2.0 of the KRA is fully implemented in fall 2018 to get feedback on the usefulness and usability of the new version of the KRA. ● The survey should include questions such as the usefulness of the KRA data to inform kindergarten instruction and whether the KRA data enhances a teacher's ability to identify challenges that a student may be experiencing, especially those challenges that indicate that a child may need special education services. ● The oversight body should review the results of the survey and review Version 2.0 for usefulness and usability and make any recommendations for changes, if needed. ● The screening framework assessment should include a standardized process for reporting data about implementation that is managed by the department. a kindergartener's prior care setting. ● The screening framework assessment should be implemented statewide by 2020-2021. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>Readiness Assessment as a stand-alone reading screening tool or diagnostic reading assessment because it cannot predict who may struggle with reading difficulties or dyslexia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administration of the KRA may limit educators' ability (due to time) to administer and implement other valid and reliable reading screeners. | |
| <p>WG 1: New Element 1e Screening</p> <p>“Implementation of an early warning system for Pre-K and Kindergarten reading literacy”</p> <p>And</p> <p>Element 1f: Interventions (next block)</p> <p>*Aligned w/ Working Groups 3 and 4, Elementa 3a and 3c</p> | <p>New Language</p> <p>An aligned screening and assessment system for PK and K that includes¹:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of a reading screening framework that is predictive for risks of reading difficulties, including dyslexia available in all public schools that provide pre-kindergarten (pre-K) and Kindergarten (K). Existing funding can be used to purchase reading screening instruments and informal diagnostic assessments. Current practices for screening in Maryland were surveyed by the Dyslexia Task Force: results summary by DDMD. Formula funding will support screening frameworks that include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Training on screening assessment administration, scoring and interpretation; Data collection and interpretation; Training on informal diagnostic assessment for students who may be at risk including administration, scoring and interpretation of results; The purchase of screening instruments that are developmentally appropriate and predict reading risks for | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The state will require that local districts conduct reading screening for all Pre-K and K (and Grade One) students to determine who may struggle to learn to read and provide effective early instruction and interventions to prevent reading difficulties. Formula funding must include the costs of an early warning system for the youngest and most vulnerable students, beginning with grades PK-1 (see Working groups 3 and 4, element 3c). The state can continue to offer targeted or grant funds to school districts to purchase screening instruments and informal diagnostic assessments. Screening instruments must be brief, economical, accurately and reliably identify at risk readers, developmentally appropriate and use norm referenced or criterion based scores. The screening and intervention framework will require use of the existing online data and electronic platform to house data reporting and to share recommended tools and other materials to support continuous improvement and best practices. |

¹ Working Group 1 addresses Birth to Kindergarten -- the Ready to Read Act (screening legislation), addresses PK-1, which is incorporated into Working Groups 3 and 4, Element 3a and 3c. Screening and intervention is recommended as early as possible to catch children before they fall behind and as long as needed to help them attain grade level reading.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>each grade level screened.</p> <p>5. The purchase of informal diagnostic assessments that help educators determine where to begin reading instruction for each at risk student.</p> | |
| <p>WG 1: New Element 1f, Instruction and Interventions:</p> <p>Implementation of Evidence based Pre-Reading & Reading Instruction</p> <p>(Commonly called RTI, MTSS, ITSS)</p> <p><i>Cross reference with Working Groups 3 and 4: Element 3c</i></p> | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence based instruction that is systematic, explicit and includes a focus on pre-literacy and early literacy constructs must be provided in all public pre-kindergarten (pre-K) and Kindergarten (K) so that students can decode unfamiliar words and comprehend grade level materials by the end of first grade.² 2. Reading instruction should place emphasis on meeting the MCCRS which includes systematic and explicit instruction in early literacy constructs of phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics/spelling and vocabulary as early as possible and for as long as necessary. 3. Schools must know how to provide high quality multi-level reading instruction and interventions with varying levels of intensity, frequency, duration, and other variables proven to prevent reading achievement gaps for struggling readers and students at risk for dyslexia. 4. Foundational reading skills are necessary for students to develop into skilled readers who can comprehend and use grade-level material. 5. The omission of foundational reading skills disproportionately impacts at risk and struggling students who benefit from explicit and systematic foundational reading instruction. 6. Current Pre-K and K reading | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School districts should implement an instructional framework to provide evidence based, foundational reading instruction and interventions to struggling readers and students at risk for dyslexia, using a tiered instructional model. 2. The state will ensure that all local districts provide evidence based, foundational reading skills instruction in phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics/spelling and vocabulary. 3. The state will provide training and continuous professional learning in foundational reading and reading science for grades PK-1 (like PaTTAN in Pennsylvania). 4. The state will provide recommended instructional programs that are evidence based for the student populations and grade levels. 5. The state and districts will ensure that instructional practices and program purchases for PK, K and Grade 1 students are aligned with the CCRS, including MCCRS Appendix A, pp. 19-21 and federal law (ESSA). <p>Formula funding should include the costs of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional learning for in-service Pre-K and K teachers in foundational reading elements and principles including phonological awareness, phonemic awareness/processing, phonics/spelling, vocabulary/morphology, fluency and comprehension. 2. Evaluating existing core and supplemental instruction (tiers 1-3) so that school districts know where they need to supplement instruction and provide additional training. |

² Grade 1 is addressed in Element 3c, Working Groups 3 and 4. Ideally, screening should be continuous throughout a student's career. However, the focus initially is as early as possible - PK-1 to prevent reading difficulties.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>instruction and interventions frequently exclude a systematic and explicit focus on foundational reading skills including phonological and phonemic awareness and phonics.</p> | <p>3. Purchasing evidence based foundational reading and writing curriculum that aligns with the science of reading for Pre-K and K students.</p> |
|--|---|---|

Working Group 2 (WG2): High Quality Teachers and Leaders

| Element | Design Assumptions | Implementation Considerations |
|--|---|--|
| <p>WG2: Element Detail 2a</p> <p>Teacher preparation will be much more rigorous, and induction will be integrated with teacher preparation more systematically</p> | <p>1c) Requiring future teachers to take courses and demonstrate competencies to enable them to identify academic difficulties and other typical problems students have as they work to succeed in academic courses, as well as the instruction and techniques proven to help students with identified difficulties succeed.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> b) Those members of the school faculty serving as Professor Master Teachers on the career ladder will hold appointments as clinical faculty at the university and will teach in both institutions. Professor Master Teachers must be able to pass a reading certification competency assessment like the MTEL (Massachusetts) or the regenerated Reading Praxis, ETS 5207, in order to be eligible. Professor Master Teachers should be drawn from teacher prep programs that are not considered “poor performing” because of low teacher candidate outcomes on reading competency exams. (SEE WG2, Element 2k, suggested, p. 7). |
| <p>WG 2: New Element: 2j</p> <p>In-Service Teachers, Professional Learning in Reading Literacy</p> <p>Initial focus on PK-6, reading, writing and spelling instruction</p> | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In-service professional learning must include a deep understanding of the knowledge and practice needed to teach pre-reading and early reading skills to all students. School districts are the default provider of professional learning in systematic and explicit teaching of foundational reading components including phonological awareness, phonemic awareness/processing, phonics/spelling, vocabulary/morphology, fluency and comprehension. Professional learning on reading instruction must follow federal law where the essential components of reading instruction are delineated. | <p>New Language</p> <p>Formula funding should include the costs of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Preparing teachers in evidence based, foundational reading instruction that follows the science of reading and includes best practices for teaching phonological & phonemic awareness, phonics and spelling, vocabulary/morphology, and comprehension and written expression. Coaching and mentoring for in-service teachers on the skills needed to teach foundational reading and the skills and practices to support implementation for all learners, including students who have difficulty learning to read. In-service teachers who pass a reading competency exam should be considered for higher pay levels and mentoring/coaching work with new teachers. <p>(see Testimony, MD HB 763, 2018; “Are Teachers of Reading Prepared to Teach Reading”; Southern Regional</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | Education Board; Reading is Rocket Science ; Maryland PARCC & NAEP scores over the last 20 years) |
| <p>WG2 Element Detail 2b</p> <p>Raise standards for licensing new teachers in MD to levels comparable to the standards for teachers in the top performing nations</p> | <p>2b(2): Teachers will be required to pass a State-specific exam of teacher content mastery including elementary education (K–6) content knowledge for teaching reading on par with the rigor of the Massachusetts Test of Educator Knowledge (MTEL), Foundations of Reading or the CKT from Praxis, ETS 5207 regenerated, and an adapted MTEL for the middle and high school grade levels.</p> <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers report that they do not have the knowledge and practice needed to teach reading to struggling students and students at risk for dyslexia and related difficulties (HB 793, Del. Stein, 2018 testimony) 2. Maryland must require reading competency for all personnel involved in teaching students to read, write and spell. 3. Maryland requires subject competency exams in social studies, science, math, art, chemistry...but not reading. Maryland's reading scores consistently show that up to 60% of students read below grade level and cannot gain college entry without remediation. 4. There are several rigorous reading competency exams, including the ETS Reading Praxis 5207 and the MTEL Foundations of Reading exam, but they are not required. 5. 16+ states require reading competency exams and the Commission agreed in the interim report to require reading competency exams to raise standards for new teachers in Maryland. | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pre-K-6 educators must understand and be able to teach pre-reading and early literacy elements and principles to all students systematically and explicitly to prevent and close reading gaps. 2. PK-6 educators must pass a foundational reading certification competency exam like Massachusetts & New Hampshire which could include coursework instruction, practice exams, and a practicum to help learn the material. 3. Massachusetts and New Hampshire's pass/fail results for each university's candidates is publicly accessible. Maryland results should be accessible in the aggregate by university and accessible on the Department's website annually. 4. Reading competency results by university can be used by the state to address and improve outcomes for new teachers (see WG2, Element 2k). |
| <p>WG2: New Element 2k</p> | <p>New Language</p> <p>Revised reading standards are expected as the result of the Standards Revision Work Group.</p> | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All pre-service teacher preparation programs in Maryland must provide: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Raise standards for pre-service reading coursework, faculty knowledge of reading science and early literacy instruction</p> | <p>The new standards should be cross referenced with other reading standards to ensure the coursework revisions include the science of reading and systematic and explicit foundational reading essential components. Mississippi undertook a wholesale evaluation and reform of its higher education practices and reports extensive gains in their reading outcomes for students.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Studies conclude that university faculty's knowledge & practice in foundational reading science and practices has direct impact on PK-12 educators and subsequently on PK-12 student outcomes in reading. 2. Teacher preparation faculty at MD Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) must have the requisite knowledge and practice needed to teach reading to teacher candidates. 3. A review of standards, coursework and accreditation processes should be undertaken to ensure reading courses teach the foundational concepts to new teachers. The essential components of reading, included in ESSA are: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. reading coursework that includes foundational reading instruction and supervised practice; b. coaching and mentoring for PK-6 teachers so they are prepared to work with struggling students; c. a one year supervised practicum provided by an experienced master teacher certified in reading and dyslexia. d. opportunity to prepare for the reading certification exam (see WG2 Element 2b revised). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Pre-service faculty teaching reading courses must know and understand the science of reading. One possibility is to require a course on Language Essential for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) or an equivalent to refresh faculty knowledge of the science of reading and the foundational reading and language elements and practices, particularly for struggling readers and students with dyslexia; 3. Reading competency exams, like the MTEL Foundations of Reading exam (WG2, Element 2b) should be used to determine if a university's teacher preparation program is low-performing. Universities considered low performing will be visited by inspection teams assembled and working under the supervision of MSDE and experts in reading science to find and help the university fix the challenges. 4. Teacher candidate results on a rigorous foundations of reading competency exam can be used to determine if a teacher preparation program requires faculty training in reading science and can help determine the scope and content of faculty training. 5. Educator certification and program accreditation by the International Dyslexia Association should be explored as a way to provide teachers with a micro-certification and higher pay, as well as the knowledge and practice to identify students who are at risk for dyslexia and who may need further evaluation for early interventions for dyslexia (5-17% of students); |
|---|---|---|

Working Group 3 (WG3): College and Career Readiness Pathways

| Element | Design Assumption | Implementation Considerations |
|--|---|---|
| <p>WG3: 3a</p> <p>Develop a fully aligned instructional system, including curriculum, instruction and intervention frameworks, course syllabi and assessments, together with clear examples of standard-setting work and formative assessments that includes early screening to ensure that students stay on track</p> <p><i>Aligned with WG 1, 2, 4 recommendations</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schools identified as low-performing by their scores on statewide assessments will be visited by inspection teams assembled and working under the supervision of MSDE and should include educators knowledgeable in foundational reading instruction and dyslexia. ● In the core subjects of English, math, science, and history/social studies, an assessment system designed to assess students' acquisition of the qualities specified in the curriculum standards and frameworks. That system must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading screening frameworks (see HB 910 2018) ○ See screening assumptions and implementation considerations below. <p>New Language: Reading Screening</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All students in PK-1 must be screened for risks of reading difficulties and be provided evidence based instruction that meets the student's specific reading needs. 2. Screening students for signs of reading difficulty before they fall behind is a best practice and is grounded in scientific literature. (see Working Group 1, new elements on screening and instruction for PK and K and the Dyslexia Task Force Report). 3. Screening is a best practice throughout the primary grades and some states screen students through grade 12 (Oregon RTI). Prevention practices focus on screening in PK, K and Grade One and often into grade 2 to prevent reading difficulties. 4. The Ready to Read Act focuses on PK-1, but recognizes that adding grade 2 would benefit students. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The work should start with an inventory of the current instructional system required by the 2019 Ready to Read Act and then build on curriculum review processes already in place at MSDE (notably, the Maryland District Curricular Support Materials Collaborative) to develop curriculum frameworks and lesson "seeds", which are lesson outlines for teachers to expand, although much work will be needed to accomplish this goal 2. Designing this system will be a multi-year effort that will involve the development and piloting of each component by teachers and incorporating their feedback. The Maryland Dyslexia Task Force created a model pilot program for reading and dyslexia instruction and interventions that can be used as a model or starting point. <p>New Language: Screening Implementation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The state will require that local districts conduct reading screening for all PK-1 students to determine who may struggle to learn to read and provide effective early instruction and interventions to prevent reading difficulties. 2. Formula funding must include the costs of an early warning system prioritizing the youngest and most vulnerable students, grades PK-1 (see Working groups 3 and 4, element 3c). All students must be screened to determine who may be at risk for reading difficulties as early as possible. Selective screening for reading difficulties is a current practice and is not effective (see special education data for MD). Waiting to see if a child "catches up" is not research supports, equitable or effective. Research confirms that early intervention is cost effective because it takes less time to remediate early difficulties than later onset reading difficulties; early interventions also prevent emotional and mental health difficulties for students. 3. The State can continue to offer targeted or grant |

New Language: Instruction & Intervention

1. Instruction and interventions should be provided with varying levels of intensity, frequency, duration, and other variables proven to prevent reading achievement gaps for struggling readers and students at risk for dyslexia.
2. Evidence based instructional frameworks should be available in all public schools including [MANSEF contracted schools](#).
3. Foundational reading skills are necessary for students to develop into skilled readers who can comprehend and use grade-level material.
4. The omission of foundational reading skills disproportionately impacts at risk and struggling students who benefit from explicit and systematic foundational reading instruction.
5. Future practices should place emphasis on meeting the MCCRS which includes systematic and explicit instruction in early literacy constructs of phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics/spelling and vocabulary.
6. Current reading instruction and interventions frequently exclude a systematic and explicit focus on early screening and foundational reading skills including phonological and phonemic awareness and phonics.

funds to school districts to purchase screening instruments and informal diagnostic assessments.

4. Screening instruments must be brief, economical, accurately and reliably identify at risk readers, developmentally appropriate and use norm referenced or criterion based scores;
5. The early warning framework will require use of the existing online data and electronic platform to house data reporting and to share recommended tools and other materials to support continuous improvement and best practices.

New Language: Instruction & Intervention Implementation

6. School districts should implement an instructional framework to provide evidence based, foundational reading instruction and interventions to struggling readers and students at risk for dyslexia, using a tiered instructional model.
7. The state will ensure that all local districts provide evidence based, foundational reading skills instruction in phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics/spelling and vocabulary.
8. The state will provide training and continuous professional learning in foundational reading and reading science for grades PK-12 (like [PaTTAN in Pennsylvania](#)).
9. The state will provide recommended instructional programs that are evidence based for the student populations.
10. The state and districts will ensure that instructional practices and program purchases are aligned with the CCRS, including [MCCRS Appendix A](#), pp. 19-21 and federal law (ESSA).
11. Districts should determine if they need to examine their core instruction by evaluating the number of students receiving supplemental (tier II) instruction and through examination of summative data (PARCC). The breakout: tier one core: 80%; Tier II/supplemental intervention: 15% tier III/intensive intervention: 5-7%. If more than 15% of students receive a supplemental

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>intervention (tier II), a school or district must examine its core instruction to find the problem(s).</p> <p>Formula funding should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional learning for in-service Pre-K-12 language arts/reading/literacy teachers in foundational reading elements and principles including phonological awareness, phonemic awareness/processing, phonics/spelling, vocabulary/morphology, fluency and comprehension. 2. Evaluating and auditing existing core and supplemental instruction (tiers 1-3) so that school districts know where they need to supplement instruction and provide additional training. 3. Purchasing evidence based foundational reading and writing curriculum that aligns with the science of reading for Pre-K and K students. |
| <p>WG3: Element 3c: The Commission’s Preliminary Report calls for reorganizing schools so that teachers trained to diagnose identify and address students’ learning needs can work collaboratively to monitor students and intervene when they are struggling. Teachers will meet regularly to compare notes on student progress, decide on any needed interventions —academic or referral to services— and assign a single teacher to take responsibility for</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As it may will take several years to establish a high quality early warning framework with multiple levels of instruction and intervention (Rtl), put this system in place, it will be necessary to develop a transitional program to address the needs of struggling learners and students at risk for dyslexia. This will be a program to provide systematic, explicit, comprehensive structured literacy interventions tutoring in reading for all students who are behind grade level, with a particular emphasis on bringing students up to grade level in reading by the end of first grade but no later than by 3rd grade. (At such time as the State can provide sufficient resources, and if at that time a transitional program is still needed, similar tutoring arrangements should be made for students needing help with math.) Funding will be provided for a lead teacher in each school who will be in charge of the tutoring program and who will have specific expertise in reading literacy, structured literacy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HB 1415 (Chapter 361) of 2018 authorizes funding for evidence-based early literacy intervention in grades K-8 with a priority for K-3rd graders in schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty. The bill mandates \$2.5 million in each of fiscal 2019 through 2022 for the program. 2. HB 1415 funding for these interventions expires after fiscal 2022, with a requirement to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at that time. 3. Because tutors are considered a transitional program, needed until teachers have time and capacity to provide this support themselves, HB 1415 funding will have to continue in order to cover the full 6 to 8 years required to fully implement the new forms of school organization and professional development that will make it possible for regular teachers to take over the tutoring function <p>New Language</p> <p>Provide weighted funding for struggling students:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educator training in foundational reading for |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>following the student until he or she is back on track. (See Working Group 2 elements)</p> <p>OR -- Suggested Element Title:</p> <p>3c) Transitional Reading Tutoring Instruction and Intervention within a Response to Intervention (RtI)/ tiered or multi-level reading instruction framework</p> <p><i>Aligned with recommendations for working groups 1 and 3.</i></p> | <p>competencies and dyslexia. The school will be required to use the rest of this special grant money for tutoring but the design of the program will be up to the school district in conference with stakeholder groups, to enable it to determine how best to address the unique needs of its pupils and to take advantage of local resources. MSDE will be responsible for developing a statewide professional development program for the lead teachers in tutoring in consultation with stakeholder groups in reading and dyslexia. Over time, fewer students will need tutoring as teachers are better trained to provide individualized instruction to students that is aligned with CCR standards and State curriculum frameworks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There will always be some students who fall behind but increasingly they will receive effective, evidence based reading instruction in their regular classroom and supplemental instruction as needed by their regular teachers as those teachers' time is freed up for such work and as they are trained in how to identify struggling readers and provide effective, evidence based reading instruction to address diagnosing and addressing learning difficulties like dyslexia. 3. As a new system is implemented, school leaders and teachers should be trained in new approaches to supporting students. This will involve three strands of training: for school leaders on the system of supports; for veteran teachers in schools; and for new teachers in preparatory programs on the pedagogy as well as the new system. 4. The special-education system will remain in place for students with disabilities, but as more students are supported early, fewer students will be | <p>PK-6 personnel who will work with struggling students to provide transitional "tutoring" instruction and interventions (see WG1, 2).;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Educator training in the administration of screening and informal diagnostic assessments to determine who may be at risk for reading difficulties and to inform instruction and intervention (see WG1, 2); 3. Evaluation and auditing of existing core and supplemental instruction (tiers 1-3) so that school districts have information that guides professional learning in reading; 4. Administrator purchasing workshops and data evaluation clinics to help determine the evidence base that supports curriculum, reading and writing program purchases and instructional materials that align with the MCCRS and the science of reading. 5. Use a research organization to evaluate efficacy of the transitional tutoring using various design assumptions and best practices in data collection, monitoring and sharing. 6. Funding for tutoring intervention program should diminish as the need for tutoring diminishes. 7. The state can offer targeted or grant funds to purchase screening instruments and informal diagnostic assessments. |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>referred for special-education services.</p> <p>New Language:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Current instructional reading practices often do not adequately include foundational reading skills of phonological and phonemic awareness and phonics needed for grade level reading, fluency and comprehension. 6. This omission disproportionately impacts at risk and struggling students who benefit from explicit and systematic foundational reading instruction (Sections 3 and 5 of USC 20 (ESSA) describes the skills children must learn in order to read). | |
|--|--|--|

Working Group 4 (WG4): More Resources for At-risk Students

| Element | Design Assumptions | Implementation Considerations |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Element 3c: Transitional Tutoring Instruction and Intervention, within a Response to Intervention (RtI)/ tiered or multi-level reading instruction framework</p> <p><i>Cross reference with recommendations for working groups 1 and 3.</i></p> | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current instructional reading practices often do not adequately include foundational reading skills of phonological and phonemic awareness and phonics that student’s need to build their emergent and early literacy skills to meet grade level reading, fluency and comprehension requirements. 2. This omission disproportionately impacts at risk and struggling students who benefit from explicit and systematic foundational reading instruction (Sections 3 and 5 of USC 20 (ESSA) describes the skills children must learn in order to read). 3. The state will require that local districts conduct reading screening for all Pre-K and K (and first grade) students to determine which children may struggle to learn to read and provide effective early instruction and interventions. | <p>New Language</p> <p>The base funding formula should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educator training in foundational reading for PK-6 personnel who will work with struggling students to provide transitional “tutoring” instruction and interventions (see WG1, 2, 3).; 2. Educator training in the administration of screening and informal diagnostic assessments to determine who may be at risk for reading difficulties and to inform instruction and intervention (see WG1, 2, 3); 3. Evaluation and auditing of existing core and supplemental instruction (tiers 1-3) so that school districts have information that guides professional learning in reading; 4. Administrator purchasing workshops and data evaluation clinics to help determine the evidence base that supports curriculum, reading and writing program purchases and instructional materials that align with the MCCRS and the science of reading. 5. Use a research organization to evaluate efficacy |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Screening instruments must be brief, economical, accurately and reliably identify at risk readers, developmentally appropriate and use norm referenced or criterion based scores | <p>of the transitional tutoring using various design assumptions and best practices through data collection, monitoring and publication;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Funding for tutoring intervention program should diminish as the need for tutoring diminishes. The state can offer targeted or grant funds to purchase screening instruments and informal diagnostic assessments. |
| <p>WG4: Element 4c:</p> <p>Adequate funding for special education</p> | <p>New Language</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Federal law (Child Find) requires school systems to identify, locate, and evaluate all students who have or are suspected of having disabilities and are in need of special education and related services. 30,000+ students were identified with a specific learning disability in Maryland (2016). The majority of students in the Specific Learning Disability Category (SLD) in MD have difficulty with reading -- these students typically have average to above average intelligence but are not receiving reading instruction that meets their needs. PARCC and NAEP data show an increasing gap in reading achievement for special education students. The longer a student is in special education, the wider the achievement gap becomes. Most students in a special education program are below grade level in reading and have reading goals included in their Individualized Education Program (IEP). Educators must be able to determine if a child is struggling to read and be able to offer proven interventions to bring the student to grade level in reading. Special Education teachers must be experts in reading and dyslexia interventions on day one in the classroom in order to address students with basic reading and written | <p>New Language</p> <p>Weighted funding to support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> More special education teachers, school psychologists, speech language pathologists and other personnel should be assigned in each school district and funding should be provided to do so. Schools are short staffed and many special educators spend hours doing paperwork to comply with procedural laws. Parent engagement must be a priority for the State and engagement must begin before the first day of school. General and special education personnel must work together to ensure that parents understand early literacy and are part of the delivery process. Pennsylvania has an excellent parent engagement model embedded in its reading and dyslexia education pilot program, now in year 4 and expanding due to excellent student outcomes. The National Center on Improving Literacy also has excellent resources. In-service educator professional development on dyslexia-specific instruction and interventions for PK-12 and accommodations (see WG2, Suggested Element 2j). Pre-service teacher preparation should include a specific focus on indicators of dyslexia, dysgraphia and dyscalculia; the science of reading and the brain, and a focus on screening, assessment and interventions known to work for students with dyslexia (see WG2, suggested element 2k). Pre-service special education coursework and training must include instruction on how to work |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>language difficulties. Because students are often identified for special education in grades 3-10, students must learn grade level materials with below grade level reading and writing skills. Educators must have the knowledge and practice needed to teach grade level material AND provide specialized instruction for reading and dyslexia so the student makes enough gain to close the achievement gaps. Most special educators are not provided this level of knowledge in their undergraduate university coursework (see WG2).</p> | <p>with students with learning disabilities and should include the science of reading, evidence based reading interventions for dyslexia, a supervised practicum in a public school setting with a student with a reading disability.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Disability awareness training for all educators to encourage collaboration, equity, understanding, motivation, learning and improved outcomes. 7. Some districts in Maryland are hiring and training teachers with experience remediating dyslexia. All districts should explore a special education certification in dyslexia and reading through International Dyslexia Association (IDA), the Center for Effective Reading Instruction and/or explore the coursework offered by Notre Dame of Maryland Graduate Certificate in Dyslexia. |
|--|---|---|