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Standards (MIS)Interpretations

- All Assessments MUST test ONLY the Standards.
- All Curriculum and Instruction must be aligned to the Standards.
- All Students at ALL TIMES must be taught “in the Standards.”
- If it is NOT “The Standards, It is NOT ALLOWED!”

New, longer, and more expensive tests focused solely on accountability

Focus on WHAT students need to learn, versus on HOW to TEACH them

Once size fits all, more students left behind

Another movement based on punitive consequences and compliance versus results
ACCESSING SOME MATERIALS
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**REFERENCES ON COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS**


**REFERENCES ON MTSS/RTI**


REFERENCES ON CURRICULUM-BASED MEASUREMENT IN MTSS/RTI


PRESENTATION WILL BE BROKEN INTO 3 PARTS

Part 1: **Standards.** What They Are-And Aren’t. Probably You Know SOME of This Stuff

Part 2: **Standards and Common (and Good) RtI Assessment Practices.** No Need for Dramatic Change and Full Speed Ahead

Part 3: **Standards and Evidence-Based Interventions.** Moving Forward with Appropriately Tiered and Intensive Intervention

WHAT I’M NOT GOING TO TALK (MUCH) ABOUT

1. Whether the AE/LAMS or CCSS are “Good.”
2. All the Ways in Which the AE/LAMS and CCSS are the Same or Different.
3. Whether the two efforts to assess CCSS, Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) or Smarter Balanced Assessment will be “good tests.”
4. Address ALL WAYS that Simple, Efficient, and Scientific Basic Skills Progress Monitoring and Screening Tests (Curriculum-Based Measurement) is Consistent with and Complementary to AE/LAMS or CCSS.
5. Address ALL WAYS that Evidence-Based Practices can Support Attainment of (ANY) Standards.
1. Increased Attention to New Standards (Alaska English/Language Arts and Mathematics Standards (AE/LAMS), Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are making some schools question their assessment and intervention methods that ensure quality implementation of RtI. Sizable #s of educators see RtI as Antagonistic! EITHER STANDARDS OR RTI!

2. AE/LAMS and CCSS are far more ALIKE than different. They provide end-of-high-school outcomes and end-of-year annual benchmarks to guide WHAT students should learn. Sizable #s of educators see these standards as HOW to teach.

3. The AE/LAMS and CCSS assessment implications are clearly related to summative evaluation and accountability and this emphasis may diminish interest in the assessment practices critical to RtI, Screening and Progress Monitoring.

4. We need to be vigilant in our RtI efforts, whether they are aligned with AE/LAMS and CCSS, our actions need to be S-B and of appropriate intensity to reduce the achievement gap AND achieve the Standards.

LET’S START HERE: ALASKA STANDARDS AND CCSS

Alaska did not choose to adopt the CCSS; it was important to Alaskan educators to have the opportunity to adjust portions of the standards based on the unique context of our state.

Although the sets of standards are equivalent, they are not identical. In general, where differences exist, it is for the following reasons:

1. Alaska educators were focused on making sure that the standards had clarity to ensure that teachers would easily understand the focus and purpose of each standard; and

2. Alaska educators wanted key Alaskan standards retained, especially math standards in measurement in the elementary grades.
THE STATEMENTS ABOUT CCSS APPLY EQUALLY TO AE/LAMS

Are the CCSS perfect?
Of course not. Are they complete?
No.
Do we have ready texts and lesson plans for implementing them?
Not yet.
Is it true that they are not as good as some of the standards of the individual states?
For some states, in some ways, yes, that is true.
However, by raising the bar, the CCSS force us to re-examine expectations and lessons to which we have become accustomed. They force us to ask what else we can and should do to better assist our students.
This is the challenge before us, and it is a very, very important one.


WHY ALASKA ENGLISH/LA AND MATHEMATICS STANDARDS (AE/LAMS) WILL NOT LIKELY BE USEFUL IN MAKING IMPORTANT INDIVIDUAL STUDENT DECISIONS IN RTI

The Alaska State Standards represent the “what” in terms of students’ learning.

According to the authors:

These standards do not tell teachers how to teach, nor do they attempt to override the unique qualities of each student and classroom. They simply establish a strong foundation of knowledge and skills all students need for success after graduation. It is up to schools and teachers to decide how to put the standards into practice and incorporate other state and local standards, including cultural standards.

ECHOED IN CCSS

The CCSS represent the “what” in terms of students’ learning.

According to the authors:

…standards are the foundation upon which almost everything else rests—or should rest. They should guide state assessments and accountability systems; inform teacher preparation, licensure, and professional development; and give shape to curricula, textbooks, software programs, and more.

Choose your metaphor: Standards are targets, or blueprints, or roadmaps. They set the destination:

what we want our students to know and be able to do by the end of their K-12 experience, and the benchmarks they should reach along the way.

From Linda Diamond

Setting rigorous expectations for what students should know and be able to do is an essential step that will bring a degree of consistency to our national education system.

However, the common core standards represent neither salvation nor Armageddon.

Rather, it is time to shift national intensity from the standards to their implementation, with a focus on curriculum and instruction.

SAMPLE AE/LAMS: RELATED TO RTI?

Sample AE/LAMS Language Arts “Foundational Standard”

4. Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension.
   a. Read on-level text with purpose and understanding.
   b. Read on-level text orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings.
   c. Use context to confirm or self-correct word recognition and understanding, rereading as necessary.

Of Course! But Some Students Have Significant Difficulties in Attaining Even This Standard!

IF THEY ARE THE WHAT, BUT NOT HOW...

SAMPLE CCSS: RELATED TO RTI?

Sample Language Arts “Anchor Standard”

10. Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently

Sample Language Arts “Foundational Standard”

4. Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension (Foundational Standard).
   a. Read on-level text with purpose and understanding.
   b. Read on-level prose and poetry orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings.

Of Course! But Some Students Have Significant Difficulties in Attaining This Standard!

THE HOW MATTERS...EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

21 terms; 441 words in the definitions
WHAT ELSE CAN WE CAN AND SHOULD DO TO BETTER ASSIST OUR STUDENTS?

• Improve and expand on our capacity for early intervention by use of proven, evidence-based basic skills screening.

• Use proven, evidence-based programs, across all tiers of services, with an emphasis on quality pedagogy (instructional practices) and behavior support.

• Improve and expand on our capacity for knowing if “things are working” by use of proven, evidence-based basic skills progress monitoring practices.

Part 2: Standards and Common (and Good) RtI Assessment Practices.

No Need for Dramatic Change and Full Speed Ahead

1. The AE/LAMS and CCSS assessment implications are clearly related to summative evaluation and accountability and this emphasis may diminish interest in the assessment practices critical to RtI, Screening and Progress Monitoring.

2. We need to continue to expand use of S-B Screening and Progress Monitoring. The tool(s) of choice, Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM), are consistent with the AE/LAMS and CCSS, especially with the K-5 Reading and Writing Standards. They are content valid.

3. CBM tests are complementary to attaining AE/LAMS and CCSS. They have consequential validity for making screening decisions to facilitate early intervention and critically, for frequent progress monitoring, one of the most powerful tools to increase achievement.

RTI REQUIRES EFFICIENT, ACCURATE, AND S-B SCREENING

EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRESS MONITORING PRACTICES ARE A CORNERSTONE OF ASSESSMENT AND DECISION MAKING IN RTI

After All, It IS RESPONSE to Intervention!
RTI REQUIRES EFFICIENT, ACCURATE, AND SCIENTIFICALLY BASED, SEAMLESS FREQUENT PROGRESS MONITORING

And the Number 1 Most Powerful TEACHING Variable


4 Recognized Major Assessment Decisions

- Screening
- Instructional Planning
- Progress Monitoring
- Program Evaluation and Accountability

SCHOOLS ARE LOOKING FOR SWISS ARMY KNIFE OF TESTS

Tests that Can...

- Do EVERYTHING
- With Little to No Teacher Time
- Little Hassle

CCSS and Other Standards Assessments Emphasis is On Program Evaluation, Accountability, Perhaps Screening, But Quality PM is Not Their Strength!
WHAT ASSESSMENT DECISIONS ARE ESSENTIAL IN RTI/PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Accurately and Efficiently Identify Students to Align with Interventions of Appropriate Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Planning</td>
<td>Plan Instruction for Groups or Individual Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitoring</td>
<td>Figure Out Whether Intervention is Working or Needs Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Is What We Are Doing Working with the Target Audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS:

Guide States’ Assessment and Accountability systems

- Summative Assessments
- Long-Term Outcomes (End-of-Grade 12) and Benchmarks (End-of Grade, Beginning at Grade 3)

The K–12 grade-specific standards define end-of-year expectations and a cumulative progression designed to enable students to meet college and career readiness expectations no later than the end of high school.

USE PROVEN SCREENING AND PROGRESS MONITORING PRACTICES

Politically Challenging, Especially With Persons Who Lack Assessment Training

Politically Challenging, Especially With Persons Who Are Worried About “Compliance Issues”

EDUCATION AND CONFIDENCE BUILDING IS REQUIRED!

WE NEED TO CONTINUE FULL SPEED AHEAD:

IMPLEMENTING PROVEN PRACTICES IN THE BASIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT TO ENSURE ATTAINMENT OF AE/LAMS OR CCSS

That Means Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM)
WHAT IS CURRICULUM-BASED MEASUREMENT?

Time and cost efficient ways to monitor progress frequently and formatively, as well as screen students universally or individually.

Think: Testing “short and small” to make statements about something “big and general!”

Is the student an average reader?

Is the student becoming a better reader?

THE 5 “SS”

See It (Authentic)

Simple to Do and Understand

Sensitive to Improvement

Scientific

SEAMLESS

WHAT IS CURRICULUM-BASED MEASUREMENT?

Short, standardized basic skills measures validated as general outcomes measures (GOM).

General reading skill or ability:
- R-CBM: Oral reading
- Maze: Silent reading

General mathematics skill or ability:
- M-COMP: General mathematics computation skills
- M-CAP: General math concepts and application skills

General writing skill or ability:
- WE-CBM: General written expression skills

Early Literacy:
- Letter Names
- Letter Sounds

Early Numeracy:
- Number Identification
- Missing Number

WHAT CURRICULUM-BASED MEASUREMENT IS NOT

Specific instructional targets or skills

It is not “oral reading fluency”

Tied to any specific curriculum

It does not measure everything

Less important for instructional planning and program evaluation and accountability
CONSISTENT WITH STANDARDS

...a clear relation between what is assessed when schools use CBM and what academic skills are deemed important in the AE/ELMS and CCSS.

This is judged largely by an evaluation of content validity.

Many CBM Tests are
CONSISTENT with Standards.

COMPLEMENTARY

Supports decisions that are related to attainment of the AE/LAMS and CCSS, but that can’t be answered by assessing the Standards Testing Screening

Frequent Progress Monitoring

This is construct validity as indicators of basic skill general outcomes and consequential validity—can we make efficient and accurate screening and frequent progress monitoring decisions?

ALL CBM Tests are COMPLEMENTARY to AE/LAMS and CCSS
Especially in the basic skills—and especially before the end of Grade 3!

A “RICH” TASK:
READING CURRICULUM-BASED MEASUREMENT (R-CBM)

10. Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently (Anchor Standard p. 5)

4. Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension (Foundational Standard).
   a. Read on-level text with purpose and understanding.
   b. Read on-level prose and poetry orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings.

It was a pretty good composition. I felt proud knowing it was the best one at my school. After I’d read it five times, I was impatient to start reading it out loud. I followed the book’s directions again. First I read the composition out loud without trying to sound impressive, just to hear what the words sounded like.

When Students
Read This Out Loud
Under Standard Conditions

CCSS AWARENESS OF
“SINGLE RICH TASKS”

CCSS authors express awareness of the interrelatedness of the standards and the corresponding implications for assessment.

...each standard need not be a separate focus for instruction and assessment. Often, several standards can be addressed by a single rich task.

CBM is CONSISTENT with CCSS in that many of the “tasks” are “RICH.”

R-CBM—Oral Reading
M-COMP—Writing Answers to Computational Problems
M-CAP—Writing Answers to Concepts and Application Problems
WE-CBM—Short Essay Writing
Spelling-CBM—Writing Orally Presented Regular and Irregular Words
RICH TASK FOR WRITTEN EXPRESSION

Writing Anchor Standards

At Grade 4, students are expected to:

3. Write narratives (my emphasis) to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event sequences.
   a. Orient the reader by establishing a situation and introducing a narrator and/or characters; organize an event sequence that unfolds naturally.
   b. Use dialogue and description to develop experiences and events or show the responses of characters to situations.
   c. Use a variety of transitional words and phrases to manage the sequence of events.
   d. Use concrete words and phrases and sensory details to convey experiences and events precisely.
   e. Provide a conclusion that follows from the narrated experiences or events.

It was a hot dry day and I had been walking for an hour...

a man with a creepy smile was walking toward me and went into his big pocket and grabbed at least a pound of food and then came another man came up to me with a water fountain and in my craziness he left by snapping his fingers and I was gone. I couldn't believe my eyes that I just saw that.

STRUCTURE OF CCSS LANGUAGE ARTS

Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects K-5
- Reading: Text Complexity and the Growth of Comprehension;
- Writing: Text Types, Responding to Reading, and Research;
- Speaking and Listening: Flexible Communication and Collaboration; and
- Language: Conventions, Effective Use, and Vocabulary.

Standards for English Language Arts 6-12;
- Reading: Text Complexity and the Growth of Comprehension;
- Writing: Text Types, Responding to Reading, and Research;
- Speaking and Listening: Flexible Communication and Collaboration; and
- Language: Conventions, Effective Use, and Vocabulary

Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects 6-12.
- Reading: Text Complexity and the Growth of Comprehension;
- Writing: Text Types, Responding to Reading, and Research;

CBM CONSISTENCY CCSS LANGUAGE ARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-5</th>
<th>6-12;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and Listening</td>
<td>Speaking and Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R-CBM; WE-CBM; S-CBM; and TEL Highly Consistent with A NUMBER of Anchor and Foundational Standards |
| Less Consistent with CCSS; Basic Skills are Necessary, but Insufficient for CCSS Standards |
| Less Consistent with CCSS; Basic Skills are Necessary, but Insufficient for CCSS Standards |
CBM IS HIGHLY CONSISTENT WITH AE/LAMS K-5 READING FOUNDATIONAL SKILL STANDARDS

K-5 Foundational Skills Standards

The Foundational Skills are focused on developing students’ understanding and working-knowledge of print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency. (p. 2).

4. Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension.
   a. Read on-level text with purpose and understanding.
   b. Read on-level text orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings.
   c. Use context to confirm or self-correct word recognition and understanding, re-reading as necessary.

CBM IS HIGHLY CONSISTENT WITH CCSS K-5 READING FOUNDATIONAL SKILL STANDARDS

CBM ALSO IS HIGHLY CONSISTENT WITH CCSS K-5 READING ANCHOR STANDARDS

Developmental Differences Among Grades

The summative expected outcome for Grade 1 Literature is:

10. With prompting and support, read prose and poetry of appropriate complexity for grade 1.

The summative expected outcome for Grade 5 Literature is:

10. By the end of the year, read and comprehend literature, including stories, dramas, and poetry at the high end of grades 4-5 text complexity band independently and proficiently.

CBM IS HIGHLY CONSISTENT WITH K-5 READING ANCHOR STANDARDS

Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects K-5

K-5 Anchor Standards

The K-5 Reading Standards include 10 identical Anchor Standards across grades, divided into four areas:

(1) Key Ideas and Details
(2) Craft and Structure
(3) Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, and
(4) Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

10. Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently.

The BIG One

But Other CBM Tests Are Consistent

CBM IS HIGHLY CONSISTENT WITH CCSS K-5 READING ANCHOR STANDARDS

K-5 Foundational Skills Standards

The K-5 Reading Standards include also include four Foundational Skills that span literature and informational reading that are:

necessary and important components of an effective comprehensive reading program designed to develop proficient readers” (p. 15):

(1) Print Concepts
(2) Phonological Awareness
(3) Phonics and Word Recognition, and
(4) Fluency

4. Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension.
   a. Read on-level text with purpose and understanding.
   b. Read on-level prose and poetry orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings.

The BIGGEST One
R-CBM PROVIDES EDUCATORS TO ADDRESS QUALITATIVE FEATURES IN CCSS FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS STANDARDS

☐ Reads Accurately?
☐ Reads Efficiently with Automaticity?
☐ Reads with Expression (Prosody)?
☐ Effective Strategy for Unknown Words?
☐ Errors Distort or Preserve Meaning?
☐ Self Corrects Errors (Comprehension Self-Monitoring)?
☐ Adjusts Pace When Text Difficulty Changes?

MOST EDUCATORS WILL JUDGE CBM BASED ON CONSISTENCY WITH CCSS

BUT:

The Real Advantage of CBM is its Ability to Complement CCSS Summative Assessments

4 Recognized Major Assessment Purposes

• Screening
• Instructional Planning
• Progress Monitoring
• Program Evaluation and Accountability

CBM DOES WHAT CCSS CAN’T DO

BUT:

The Real Advantage of CBM is its Ability to Complement CCSS Summative Assessments

4 Recognized Major Assessment Purposes

• Screening
• Instructional Planning
• Progress Monitoring
• Program Evaluation and Accountability

See More Examples and Details of Consistency of CBM tests to:

Standards for English Language Arts K-5;
Standards for English Language Arts 6-12
Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects 6-12

This is What CCMS Assessments will REALLY Be About...Like Our CURRENT High Stakes Testing Systems

This is What CBM Can Do Very Well, if Not Exceptionally Well, Early (as Early as K) Easily Efficiently Authentically
QUESTIONS I CAN ANSWER

At a Single Point in Time:

Is This Student a Good or Poor Reader, gauged normatively or with standards?

SO WHEN YOU SEE THIS...

Frequent Tier 2 or Tier 3 or IEP PM

KNOW That You Are Engaged in Best Practices Efforts to Support ATTAINMENT of CCSS

QUESTIONS I CAN ANSWER

Is This Student Improving in His General Reading Skill?

Over Time—And a Short Period of Time at That!

WHEN I SAY BEST PRACTICE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Screen all students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year. Regularly monitor the progress of students at risk for developing reading difficulties.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide differentiated reading instruction for all students based on assessments of students’ current reading level.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide remedial, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who scored below the benchmark score on initial screening. Typically, these groups meet between three and five times a week, for 30 to 40 minutes.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monitor the progress of your students at least once a month. Use these data to determine whether students still require intervention. For those students still making insufficient progress, schoolwide teams should design and implement phase.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use intensive instruction to meet the needs of students who require additional support.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SO WHEN YOU SEE THIS...

When I say best practices...

1. Increase the quality, consistency, and reach of instruction in every K-3 classroom
2. Universal screening and timely and valid assessments of reading growth for progress monitoring
3. Provide more intensive interventions to “catch up” the struggling readers

SO WHEN YOU SEE THIS THIS...

Special education has other decisions like annual and 3 year evaluations

Not discrepant from peers and reducing the gap

Benefiting from appropriate reading instruction

Know that you are engaged in best practices efforts to support attainment of CCSS

Know that you are engaged in best practices efforts to support IDEA and RtI

Bottom line

If you are using CBM...

Part of your job in attaining the CCSS is done

You can feel very confident that CBM tests are consistent with the language arts CCSS, especially for all students K-5

Most importantly, you can feel very confident that CBM complements important decisions for attaining the CCSS by universal screening to identify students for multi-tiered intervention and enabling frequent basic skills progress monitoring for at risk students in all grades--

Something(s) that standards tests cannot do

Modified from J. Torgerson, www.firr.org
BOTTOM LINE

IF You Are NOT Using Curriculum-Based Measurement...
You WILL Be Faced with the Same Decision Making (and Service Delivery) Challenges that You Faced Before CCSS

The Capacity to Routinely Employ Frequent Basic Skills Progress Monitoring Practices that are Time Efficient and Powerful--One of THE Single Most Important Things We Can Do to Increase Achievement Outcomes

The Capacity to Intervene Early and Consistently Through Universal Screening, Avoid “Wait to Fail, and Inconsistent Teacher Referrals

Part 3: Standards and Evidence-Based Interventions
Moving Forward with Appropriately Tiered and Intensive Intervention

STANDARDS THEMSELVES ARE NOT E-B PRACTICES

Academic standards, including the CCSS-WL, do not usually specify the “how” of instruction but rather the “what.” Nevertheless, standards can and often do signal for educators particular ways in which the standards can be attained via instructional practices and, as mentioned previously, standards do appear to influence not only what is taught but how it is taught.

If this is the case, caution is warranted....

CCSS-WL signal between 13 (36%) and 17 (47%) of the EBPs listed in at least one grade within each of the grade bands noted (i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12).

STANDARDS SHOULD BE TARGETED AT PUBLISHERS TO DEVELOP TOOLS WITH EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

Out of 36 evidence-based writing instruction and assessment practices, the CCSS signal less than half of these in any given grade, suggesting that practitioners will need to consult other resources to acquire knowledge about such practices.

The CCSS establish grade-level “readability bands” that specify the range of text complexity levels required for each grade.

These bands assign text complexity ranges that are somewhat more difficult than the ranges of texts currently assigned to grade levels.

Thus, a text that formerly may have been assigned to fifth graders will now end up in fourth-grade classrooms.

Some Worrisome Interpretation about Standards and RtI

...a teacher about to design a literacy lesson based on the Common Core State Standards in an MTSS framework would begin by selecting a piece of reading for its rich use of language at the appropriate grade level—rather than at students’ reading level.

Have we learned NOTHING?

More Worrisome for Students At Risk or With Severe Achievement Discrepancies

In Tier I instruction, a selected text—in this case, the Gettysburg Address—and supplemental materials could be used to teach any number of standards, but a teacher should focus on a few standards in order to better monitor student progress toward mastery.
More Worrisome

Tier 2 instruction is provided to groups of students who are having difficulty with the standard and accompanying activities. They may need additional instruction to facilitate mastery of the standard(s) (Language Standard 4).

...these students may be able to decode most of the passage, but have difficulty with vocabulary, genre, and comprehension of the material without additional assistance. Some students may simply need preview, review, and/or re-teaching of the core instructional activity.

In the case of English-language learners, students may need instruction that focuses on vocabulary acquisition and the structure of the English language used in the Gettysburg Address or other texts rather than a decoding exercise. Previews might include leveled-readers.

And Especially This...

For many educators, it is uncomfortable watching students struggle, but we also know that true learning emerges from wrestling with material that initially appears dense and difficult to understand.

The tasks laid out by the standards are demanding for both the teacher and student, and can give rise to anxiety.

Teachers need to overcome their own anxieties and focus instead on supporting students as they learn to independently overcome theirs.

Educators often know that student frustrations will only be temporary—a narrow gate through which they must pass if they are to truly grasp what it means to read and understand a difficult text.

From Moats (Key Reading)

The lofty goals of the CCSS and the realities of student learning as we understand them from research may not easily be reconciled.

Students who struggle with reading... comprise at least 30% of the population (Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, 2007).

About 34% of the population as a whole is "below basic" on the National Assessment of Academic Progress in fourth grade.

Often, up to 70-80% of students in high poverty areas enter school at risk for reading failure.

Mixed in as "poor readers" are all those who simply have not been taught how to read or who do not speak English.

This Worried Me MORE

Tier 3

The intervention activities for these students are more intensive and narrower in scope than those designed for students receiving Tier 2 interventions.

...Tier 3 activities would include a more focused concentration on the skills needed by each student to meet the standards being taught using the Gettysburg Address lesson than those used in Tier 1 instruction alone.

Proactive instruction...would involve the remedial teacher's providing more informational context, using texts with a lighter vocabulary load, and re-teaching or modifying instructional delivery in a way that allows students with reading difficulties to reach and master the standards being taught.
From Moats (Key Reading)

These facts imply that raising standards and expectations, without sufficient attention to the known causes and remedies for reading and academic failure, and without a substantial influx of new resources to educate and support teachers, is not likely to benefit students with mild, moderate, or severe learning difficulties.

Rather, the **stage is set for those students to suffer adverse consequences**, such as forced grade repetitions, denial of promotion or diplomas, and irrelevant requirements that do not, in fact, enable students to be more ready for college or career.

I BELIEVE WE KNOW FEATURES OF INTERVENTIONS THAT REDUCE THE GAP

---

**EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM AND INTERVENTION PRACTICES: A PRACTICE GUIDE**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Level of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase student motivation and engagement in literacy learning.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEATURES OF E-B TIER 2

• (More) Time—Typically Supplemental
• (More) Explicit Teacher-Led Instruction
• (More) Language Support, Especially Vocabulary
• (More) Scaffolded Instruction
• (More) Opportunities to Respond with Corrective Feedback
• (More) Intensive Motivational Strategies
• (More) Frequent Progress Monitoring

FEATURES OF E-B TIER 3

• (Most) Time—MAY Be Supplanted
• (Most) Explicit Teacher-Led Instruction
• (Most) Language Support, Especially Vocabulary
• (Most) Scaffolded Instruction
• (Most) Opportunities to Respond with Corrective Feedback
• (Most) Intensive Motivational Strategies
• (Most) Frequent Progress Monitoring

READING INTERVENTION FOR BILLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Teaching Strategy</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Arrangement</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Motivational Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Reading Skills Tied to Phonics, Vocabulary, and Comprehension</td>
<td>Teacher-led instruction using scripted instructions</td>
<td>Corrective Reading C</td>
<td>Small Group 1:5</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>Group Contingencies, Friday Free Time for Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Development</td>
<td>Teacher-led instruction using scripted instructions</td>
<td>Grade 2 &amp; 3 Words from Word Generation</td>
<td>Small Group 1:5</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Teacher Praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Reading Practice</td>
<td>Choral Reading with Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>Student Selected Lexiled Readings from Phyllis C Hunter Library</td>
<td>Small Group 1:5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chart with Reading Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Reading</td>
<td>Individual Student Reading</td>
<td>Student Selected Lexiled Readings from Phyllis C Hunter Library</td>
<td>Independent at School and Home</td>
<td>Outside of Class</td>
<td>Chart with Reading Minutes and Pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THINK...

This is our Dominic, identified with Type 1 Diabetes April 29th, 2009

We do NOT invent, nor manufacture, his insulin.

It is OUR job—Dominic, his Mom, his Dad, his brothers, his teachers, his school nurse, his physician, his TEAM, to DELIVER the intervention he needs.

This job is challenging to do with fidelity and integrity, enough, without the inventing...
Assumptions of Each Composer (When Educators DESIGN CURRICULUM)

- Creates the Ideas into Something that Can Be Performed
- Creates a Piece That Appeals to Most

Performing (When Educators USE E-B Instructional Practices)

- Performs with Passion and Integrity
- Plays the Piece with Adjustments to Meet the Needs of the Audience

Mark’s Take On Common Approaches to Addressing Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking out curricula that are aligned to Standards</td>
<td>Great strategy IF research-based programs are selected with embedded, high quality instructional practices. Alignment is probably not as critical as QUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having teams of educators redesign/re-align existing curriculum to Standards*</td>
<td>Difficult. Time consuming, especially unless teams are knowledgeable about evidence-based instructional practices and instructional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having teams of educators design their OWN curriculum aligned to Standards*</td>
<td>See above, but puts even more pressure on educators to know, do, and create EVERYTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the ROBUST instructional strategies and methods and engaging in considerable staff development and coaching</td>
<td>Essential, even if a High Quality curriculum is used and more so when moving into content area instruction (e.g., science, social studies, English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVOID BIAS AGAINST PROVEN PROGRAMS!

To achieve large scale reform you cannot depend on people’s capacity to bring about substantial change in the short run, so you need to propel the process with...

High quality teaching and training materials (print, video, electronic)

There is still the problem of superficial implementation when new materials are in use, and even new practices in evidence, without the deeper understanding required for substantial and sustained implementation.

But you get farther, faster by producing quality materials and establishing a highly interactive infrastructure of pressure and support.

Finally, the materials do not have to be treated as prescriptive. Many judgments can and should be made during implementation as long as they are based on evidence linking teacher practices with student performance.
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Finally, the materials do not have to be treated as prescriptive. Many judgments can and should be made during implementation as long as they are based on evidence linking teacher practices with student performance.

Solution 1: From Linda Diamond (Key Reading)

- **New math and ELA texts and resources** are essential to implementing the common core successfully.

- If left to schools and districts alone, articulation and coherence may be elusive.


Solution 1: Chingos and Whitehurst (Key Reading)

There is strong evidence that the choice of instructional materials has large effects on student learning—effects that rival in size those that are associated with differences in teacher effectiveness. ... making better choices among available instructional materials should be relatively easy, inexpensive, and quick.


Solution 2: We Need to Know—and Use—What Works

Doing the Right Thing: Early Identification and Tiered Interventions of Increasing Intensity

1. Increase the quality, consistency, and reach of instruction in every K-3 classroom
2. Universal Screening and Timely and Valid Assessments of Reading Growth for Progress Monitoring
3. Provide more intensive interventions to “catch up” the struggling readers