

Comprehensive Decoding Rubric Manual

Laura A. Moylan, Evelyn S. Johnson, Angela R. Crawford, and Yuzhu Zheng

Boise State University 2018

This research was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, award number

R324A150152 to Boise State University.

Table of Contents

Overview:	3
Preparation for the Observations	4
Understanding the Structure	4
Assigning Rating on CDR	4
Description of CDR	6
Component 1: Systematic instruction	6
Component 2: Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondence	6
Component 3: Word Reading	7
Component 4: Encoding	7
Component 5: Word Meaning	8
Component 6: Reading Decodable Text	8
Component 7: Monitoring and Feedback Throughout Instruction	9
Psychometric properties	9
KEY Terms on CDR	9
References	36

Comprehensive Decoding Rubric

Overview:

Reading is a complex process that relies upon the reader's ability to integrate, coordinate, and execute multiple skills and processes in order to extract meaning from text (Cain, Oakhill, & Bryant, 2004; Cain, 2009; Kendeou, van den Broek, Helder, & Karlsson, 2014; Perfetti, Landi, & Oakhill, 2005). While the ability to accurately and efficiently read and understand words does not ensure that comprehension will occur, proficiency with word reading is a necessary component within this complex process (Cain et al., 2004; Denton & Al Otaiba, 2011; Ehri, Nunes, Stahl, Willows, 2001; Perfetti & Hogaboam, 1975). Significant evidence supports explicit systematic instruction in word reading that emphasizes phonological (sound) and orthographic (written) connections for students with reading disabilities (Denton, Tolar, Fletcher, Barth, Vaughn & Francis, 2013; Blachman et al., 2004; Ehri et al., 2001; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000); Lovett et al., 2000; Lovett, Steinbach, & Frijters, 2000; Torgesen, Alexander, Wagner, Rashotte, Voeller & Conway 2001; Lovett, Borden, DeLuca, Lacerenza., Benson, & Brackstone, 1994).

The Comprehensive Decoding Rubric (CDR) evaluates the teacher's implementation of a comprehensive decoding lesson taught using explicit systematic instruction. In a comprehensive decoding lesson, the focus is on the instruction and practice of accurate sound-symbol correspondence, word reading, encoding and reading connected text.

Instruction may reflect differences in methods, routines and forms of scaffolding. However, what should be common to all instruction is a planned set of phonics skills that follow a logical progression. These skills are taught using explicit and systematic instruction that includes application of this knowledge to reading and understanding written language. Learning is facilitated when instruction is unambiguous, instructional procedures are efficient and curriculum is sequenced logically and sequentially (Stockard, Wood, Coughlin, & Khoury, 2018).

Two approaches to systematic phonics instruction proven to be effective for students with deficits in word reading include synthetic phonics instruction (mapping phonemes to graphemes and blending to decode words) and analytic phonics instruction (recognizing larger word parts and patterns such as onset, rimes, syllables) or a combination of both methods (Ehri et al., 2001; Lovett et al., 2000; Denton & Al Otaiba, 2011; Torgesen et al., 2001; NICHD, 2000). What appears to

be critical is that instruction is explicit, systematic and at the subword level (Steady, Elleman, Lovett, & Compton, 2016).

More time is not a sufficient approach for reading intervention. What students and teachers are actually doing during reading instruction and intervention is critical to the result (Denton, Nimon, Mathes, Swanson, Kethley, Kurz, & Shih, 2010; Vaughn, & Wanzek, 2014). The CDR focuses on what the teacher is doing to fully engage students in effective systematic code-based instruction and practice.

For each item, there are five levels of implementation. Observing either live or from video, the observer assigns a rating based on a scale that ranges from **Implemented to Not Implemented**. The rater selects one score from among the following choices:

3 Implemented--meaning the teacher's performance aligns with the descriptor,
2+

2 Partially Implemented--meaning the teacher's instruction reflects this item, but there are flaws or missing components in the way in which it is implemented
2-

1 Not Implemented--meaning the item is either implemented poorly or should have been observed but was not.

Preparation for the Observations

There are several materials you will need in order to use the CDR to conduct the observations. First, you should ensure you have everything you need to conduct the observation including a copy of CDR (either paper or electronic). As you are observing, you will make notes to help you support the ratings you assign and the feedback you will provide to the teacher. The rubric provides space for notes; you may also want to take notes on a separate document that provides more writing space.

Understanding the Structure

There are 18 items in this rubric. Each item is listed in a table below with an explanation and description of the intention of the item to help clarify its meaning. Each item has five levels of implementation. Descriptors are given for high, middle, and low levels of implementation. Examples are included to help you interpret the meaning of the different implementation levels. You should consider these descriptions and examples as you determine the implementation level for each item.

Assigning Rating on CDR

The RMR rating scale includes the scores of **3 Implemented, 2 Partially Implemented, and 1 Not Implemented**. The Partially Implemented category is further divided to allow for assigning a **2+, 2, or 2-** to indicate the degree to which the item is partially implemented. A **2-** indicates a very low level of partial implementation, whereas a **2+** can be used in cases where the item is almost fully implemented.

Observing either live or from video, you assign a rating on the basis of the observations. Assign a rating that comes closest to describing the observation even if not an exact match.

Because the duration of a class may be 40 minutes or more, it is helpful to note whatever is observed and select a score even at a low level. Then if a higher level item implementation is observed making the score inaccurate, the previous choice can simply be changed. This is especially useful when some items need to be observed throughout the whole lesson. For example, after observing the teacher “clearly model or cues the application of decoding strategies AND elicit the correct response from the student,” the observer should select ‘Partially Implemented’. If the teacher continues to consistently model or cue the application of decoding strategies AND elicit the correct response from the student correctly until the end of the lesson, ‘Partially Implemented’ should be crossed out and a higher level of item implementation should be selected.

Description of CDR

Component 1: Systematic Instruction

Systematic phonics instruction is characterized by a planned set of elements or concepts that are taught and practiced sequentially and build logically upon one another (Ehri et al., 2001) providing students with the prerequisite skills necessary to learn new concepts and advance systematically in their ability to decode and read words in isolation and in context. Concepts are presented as part of a coherent system, and instruction includes regular step-by-step procedures or routines (Moats & Hall, 2010). Systematic instruction is regular, thorough, and methodical in both procedure and planning. While you will find elements of systematic instruction throughout the CDR, this component provides a focus on several key features of systematic instruction.

Elements of Component 1 are:

Item 1 - Skills are taught systematically within the lesson in a logical, clearly defined, graduated sequence.

Item 2 - The teacher provides a focused review of word reading skills.

Item 3 - The teacher uses effective step-by step procedures or routines with appropriate pacing.

Component 2: Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondence

This component focuses on the instruction and attention to phoneme-grapheme correspondence defined as the accurate and explicit connections between letters or letter groups and the sounds they represent. This component may involve the initial introduction of a letter and the corresponding sound and any review, practice, or correction that involves letters and the sounds they make either in isolation or within the context of word reading. Clear and accurate articulation of letter sounds is a critical component of modeling in effective instruction.

Elements of Component 2 are:

Item 4 - The teacher makes explicit connections between sounds and letters or letter groups.

Item 5 - The teacher clearly and accurately models articulation.

Item 6 - The teacher engages all students in the pronunciation of the target sound or sounds with a sufficient emphasis on accurate articulation.

Component 3: Word Reading

The items in this component are aligned with word reading instruction and practice. Findings indicate that both synthetic (phoneme-grapheme mapping) and analytic (larger subparts, onset, rimes, syllables) are effective approaches for teaching and improving word reading skills for students with disabilities. Explicit systematic instruction in word reading paired with frequent opportunities to practice new and previously taught skills with quality feedback are the critical elements in this component.

Elements of Component 3 are:

Item 7 - Blending strategies focused on accurate orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections are used clearly and consistently throughout the lesson.

Item 8 - When a word is segmented, the teacher consistently ensures the word is also read as a whole word at the normal rate.

Item 9 - The teacher provides students with adequate practice designed to reinforce orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections aligned to the target skill.

Item 10 - The teacher guides students to compare and contrast learned patterns.

Component 4: Encoding

Encoding instruction focuses attention at the phoneme level as students map sounds to letters while writing words according to their phoneme-grapheme correspondences, building words using manipulatives (tiles, letters, cards), and manipulating phonemes to create new words. Students demonstrate greater levels of improvement in reading and spelling when they engage in explicit decoding instruction paired with encoding instruction focused on phoneme-grapheme mapping (Blachman et al., 2004; Denton, Fletcher, Anthony, & Francis, 2006; Weiser & Mathes, 2011). Providing students with timely feedback aligned to letter-sound correspondence is emphasised in this item.

The Element of Component 4 is:

Item 11 -The teacher explicitly reinforces precise letter-sound correspondence through encoding exercises aligned to the target skill(s).

- Writing (letters, words or sentences) AND/OR
- Using manipulatives to build words (tiles, cards)

Component 5: Word Meaning

This component focuses on the development of word knowledge within the context of a decoding lesson. While this lesson is primarily focused on learning to read words, the ultimate goal is to understand what we read. Vocabulary knowledge is an important factor in reading comprehension (NICHD, 2000; Perfetti & Stafura, 2014). Word knowledge is a link between the systems of word identification (decoding and retrieval) and comprehension. Word knowledge includes understanding the meaning of words and word form which includes how words are used, spelled and pronounced (Perfetti & Stafura, 2014, Perfetti, 2007).

The Element of Component 5 is:

Item 12 - The teacher effectively integrates word meaning into the lesson.

Component 6: Reading Decodable Text

Reading aloud text containing words with the target pattern(s) and previously taught patterns provides students with the opportunity to apply decoding and word reading skills in context and receive immediate corrective feedback. Performance improves when students are provided with explicit and systematic instruction in decoding paired with the opportunity to successfully apply skills in text reading (Blachman et al., 2004; Jenkins, Peyton, Sanders, & Vadasy, 2004; Mathes et al., 2005; Rashotte, MacPhee, & Torgesen, 2001; Abbott & Berninger, 1999; Denton, Nimon, Mathes, Swanson, Kethle., Kurz, & Shih, 2010). Students with disabilities spend limited amounts of time engaged in reading text (Vaughn & Wanzek, 2014). However, high effect sizes are documented when interventions include both phonics instruction and text level reading (Wanzek & Vaughn, 2007). Decodable text contains both previously taught words and words that are being taught and practiced in this lesson.

Elements of Component 6 are:

Item 13- The teacher scaffolds the transfer of new word reading skills to text reading as needed for students to experience success.

Item 14 -The teacher provides sufficient opportunities for all students to engage in reading decodable text.

Item 15 - The teacher effectively engages background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading.

Item 16 - The teacher effectively scaffolds meaning and understanding through questioning and/or discussion appropriate to the text.

Component 7: Monitoring and Feedback Throughout Instruction

This component focuses on the teacher's use of monitoring and feedback to facilitate learning. Affirmative or corrective feedback that is immediate reinforces accuracy, prevents misconceptions, and ensures accurate practice, all of which are especially critical in the context of decoding instruction. Both affirmative and corrective feedback should be provided to reinforce the application of word reading skills and strategies.

Elements of Component 7 are:

Item 17 - Throughout the lesson the teacher provides affirmative and corrective feedback consistently focused on reinforcing the application of word reading skills and strategies..

Item 18 - When errors are detected the teacher consistently elicits the correct response from the student throughout the lesson.

Psychometric properties -

The CDR has been developed through a rigorous process to ensure that it is a valid and reliable instrument. Each item included within the rubric comes from an analysis of the existing research establishing these instructional practices as effective for students with high incidence disabilities. Additionally, the rubric has been reviewed by content experts in the field to support content validity.

Further psychometric review is ongoing.

KEY Terms:

“**Accurate**” means correct, precise, or exact.

“**Adequate**” means as much or as good as is necessary to accomplish a purpose or produce intended or expected results.

“**Clearly**” means distinctly, obviously, or precisely.

“**Consistently**” means every time the opportunity arises, the teacher responds in the same or an appropriately similar way. It is different from continuously.

“**Deliberately**” means consciously, intentionally, and with full awareness.

“**Effectively**” means adequate to accomplish a purpose or produce intended or expected results.

“Explicit” means fully revealed or expressed, without vagueness or ambiguity, leaving not room for doubt or confusion.

“**Frequently**” means regularly or often.

“**Guides**” means to lead, structure, direct, or support regulation. It may also include intentional modeling or think aloud provided by the teacher or prompting, cueing or questioning.

“**Intentional**” means with intention, done with full awareness or on purpose, deliberately, not done randomly or incidentally.

“**Precise**” means exact, accurate, specific, explicit.

“**Purposeful**” means directed at a goal or purpose, done with intention, not done randomly or incidentally.

“**Sufficient**” means adequate or enough to meet the needs of a situation, proposed end, or specific purpose.

KEY READING TERMS

Term definitions taken from the Florida Center for Reading Research Comprehensive Glossary (www.fcrr.org/documents/glossaryOfReading.pdf)

Connected Text: Words that are linked (as opposed to words in a list) as in sentences, phrases, and paragraphs.

Consonant Blend: Two or more consecutive consonants which retain their individual sounds (e.g., /bl/ in block; /str/ in string).

Consonant Digraph: Two consecutive consonants that represent one phoneme, or sound (e.g., /ch/, /sh/).

Context Clue: Using words or sentences around an unfamiliar word to help clarify its meaning.

Decoding: The ability to translate a word from print to speech, usually by employing knowledge of sound symbol correspondences; also the act of deciphering a new word by sounding it out.

Decodable Text: Text in which a high proportion of words (80%-90%) comprise sound-symbol relationships that have already been taught. It is used for the purpose of providing practice with specific decoding skills and is a bridge between learning phonics and the application of phonics in independent reading.

Digraphs: A group of two consecutive letters whose phonetic value is a single sound (e.g., /ea/ in bread; /ch/ in chat; /ng/ in sing).

Grapheme: A letter or letter combination that spells a phoneme; can be one, two, three, or four letters in English (e.g., e, ei, igh, eigh).

Letter-Sound Correspondence: The matching of an oral sound to its corresponding letter or group of letters.

Morpheme: The smallest meaningful unit of language.

Onset and Rime: In a syllable, the onset is the initial consonant or consonants, and the rime is the vowel and any consonants that follow it (e.g., the word sat, the onset is “s” and the rime is “at”. In the word flip, the onset is “fl” and the rime is “ip”).

Phoneme: The smallest unit of sound within our language system. A phoneme combines with other phonemes to make words.

Phoneme Manipulation: Adding, deleting, and substituting sounds in words (e.g., add /b/ to oat to make boat; delete /p/ in pat to make at; substitute /o/ for /a/ in pat to make pot).

Phonemic Awareness: The ability to notice, think about, or manipulate the individual phonemes (sounds) in words. It is the ability to understand that sounds in spoken language work together to make words. This term is used to refer to the highest level of phonological awareness: awareness of individual phonemes in words.

Item 1: Skills are taught systematically within the lesson in a logical, clearly defined, graduated sequence.

This item assesses the design and sequencing of instruction. Systematic instruction is planned and methodically delivered with concepts connecting and building upon one another in a logical, pre-planned manner. Concepts move from simple to complex in a graduated sequence providing students with the prerequisite skills necessary to be successful (e.g., consistent examples before exceptions, similar skills taught separately before combined, high frequency before less frequent, gradual increase in complexity, avoid too many new skills).

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>Skills are taught systematically within the lesson in a logical, clearly defined, graduated sequence.</p>	<p>Skills are taught somewhat systematically within the lesson in a logical, clearly defined, graduated sequence.</p>	<p>Skills are not taught systematically within the lesson in a logical, clearly defined, graduated sequence; instruction is incidental.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher continues with VCe patterns adding long i as a new skill. The lesson moves progressively through multiple opportunities to engage with the skill (e.g., review letter tiles, manipulate tiles to create words, write words, decode in text). •The teacher guides the student through progressively manipulating single letters in words (bat, mat, man, tan). •The teacher reviews long o patterns, guides students through decoding words by group (ow, oa, o_e) and then as a mixed set of words. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is a logical sequence from word reading practice to decodable text, but the words appear to be driven by the text rather than selected to systematically support the development of specific decoding skills or patterns. Words are a mix of unrelated patterns. •The teacher asks students to spell short vowel words using letter tiles, but there is not a purposeful progression from one word to the next. •Word reading practice is mostly aligned but includes a pattern that has not been taught (“We haven’t done tw - what does it say?”). 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Instruction is incidental; skills are only addressed as students encounter unknown words while reading. •The teacher jumps from one activity to the next without an apparent connection. The word sort does not appear to be a deliberate practice connected to prior learning or as a method to compare and contrast specifically targeted patterns. •The teacher introduces the concept of onset/rime with words that do not follow a systematic pattern or progression.

<p>Item 2: The teacher provides a focused review of word reading skills.</p> <p>This item examines how effectively the teacher provides a focused and intentional review of prior skills relevant to the learning goal(s) and/or engages background knowledge (e.g., phonics skill(s) previously taught, related phonological awareness activity, recall of letter sounds). A “focused” review is clearly delivered, understandable for students and aligned to specific skills.</p>		
3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher provides a focused review of word reading skills.</p>	<p>The teacher provides a review, but the review is limited or lacking in focus.</p>	<p>The teacher does not provide a review.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reviewing ang/ing the teacher shows an example in words and guides students to decode additional words with the endings. •The teacher prompts the student to recall the sounds made by an intentionally selected set of letter tiles prior to using the tiles to spell words. •The teacher begins with an example of closed syllable words from the prior day, reviews the concept, and has students read a short list of review words before adding new words with a new vowel. •The teacher begins the lesson with a sequence of phoneme manipulations (e.g. “Say man, replace the /m/ with a /t/, what’s the word?”) 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher asks students to name words with ang/ing. Students do not produce appropriate examples and would have benefited from clear examples provided by the teacher. •The teacher reminds the student of the sounds made by letter tiles but does not asks the student to produce the sounds prior to using the tiles to spell words. •The teacher asks students to explain closed syllable words. Students provide vague explanations. The review needs to be more focused. •The teacher provides a list of review words containing er and ar. The teacher reads each word and students repeat the word. It appears that some of the students are simply echoing the teacher. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher begins the lesson by having students do a word sort without providing a review of sounds or making connections to prior learning. •Students are asked to identify and produce rhymes without appropriate review. Students guess randomly. •The teacher begins with a “review” of letter names and sounds using a large stack of cards that the student has not mastered. (too many skills and not a review) •The teacher states that they will be reading words made up of sounds they have already learned but does not provide a review of those sounds prior to reading words.

Item 3: The teacher uses effective step-by-step procedures or routines with appropriate pacing.

This item focuses on the systematic use of procedures and/or routines that are designed to facilitate learning. Well established and implemented routines and procedures lead to a more fluid, efficient, and focused lesson where students know what is expected and have clear opportunities to respond (Moats & Hall, 2010). Step-by-step procedures or routines progress gradually and steadily from one stage to the next and little time is spent on things that are not directly related to learning. To be effective, systematic procedures and routines should be appropriately aligned to the target skill(s) and implemented at a pace that is conducive to learning (not too fast and not too slow). Routines or procedures may include signals, cues or prompts, demonstration and practice routines, or a familiar order to the lesson and activities.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher uses effective step-by-step procedures or routines with appropriate pacing.</p>	<p>The teacher uses step-by-step procedures or routines that are somewhat effective AND/OR not always paced appropriately.</p>	<p>The teacher does not use effective step-by-step procedures or routines throughout instruction, OR pacing negatively impacts learning.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Throughout a exercise, the teacher uses clear and consistent prompts and signals for decoding strategies. •The lesson flows smoothly through all components due to a clearly established routines that are imbedded and appropriate in each section. •The teacher provides consistent cues when students misread a word providing support for strategy application. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Throughout a blending exercise, the teacher is inconsistent with prompts and signals causing some confusion and lack of fluidity throughout the lesson. •The lesson follows an appropriate routine order but in places the pacing is slower than needed. •Prompts and cues for correcting errors vary somewhat from one word to the next, the inconsistency inhibits strategy application. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is not a routine for prompting, cueing or signaling strategies. •The teacher uses a routine that is complex and cumbersome detracting from the goal of effective and efficient word reading. •While the lesson follows a familiar order and there are some routines for identifying vowel sounds, the pace is consistently slow and laborious. The pace negatively impacts learning. •The teacher moves too quickly with unfamiliar routines.

Item 4: The teacher makes explicit connections between sounds and letters or letter groups.

This item focuses on how clearly and precisely the teacher makes connections between sounds and letters or letter groups. Connections are made explicit through examples, demonstrations and exercises that solidly reinforce the linkage between letters or letter groups and the sounds they make. Connections are also reinforced through phonological awareness exercises designed to support the attention to individual sounds throughout words (e.g., counting or tapping sounds, using sound spelling boxes).

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher makes explicit connections between sounds and letters or letter groups.</p>	<p>The teacher makes connections between sounds and letters or letter groups but not always explicitly.</p>	<p>The teacher does not make explicit connections between sounds and letters or letter groups, OR connections are inaccurate.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher provides a clear model by writing the vowel on the board and saying the sound. She then has students say the sound and write the letter while making the associated sound. •The teacher underlines and emphasizes tch while decoding a list of predetermined tch words. •During segmenting and blending the teacher consistently emphasizes the vowel sounds in each word. •The teacher has the student tap, count and say the individual sounds in each word before blending them together. •The teacher ensures students hear and say individual sounds in each word when using Elkonin boxes. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher asks what letter says /r/, shows a rabbit picture and students say bunny, the teacher eventually makes the correlation between the correct letter and sound. •The teacher asks students to think of words with the letters tch. The teacher writes words on the board but does not explicitly connect the letters in the word with the sound. •The teacher orally segments words on a computer screen. She does not clearly point to the word or letters to ensure students are seeing and hearing the correspondence. •The teacher asks the student to give the sound in the middle of each word, but the student needs a more explicit approach (e.g., underlined, sound boxes, markers for sounds). 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher only focuses on reading whole words as sight words and at no point makes letter to sound connections. •The teacher introduces using onset/rime to identify words. Students say the onset and rime based on a picture of the word (baby/chick) and then find the matching onset and rime cards. The teacher does not explicitly connect letter sound correspondence and onset is not always clearly identified. •The teacher provides inaccurate connections when referring to nk as two letters that make one sound.

Item 5: The teacher clearly and accurately models articulation.

This item examines the teacher’s articulation throughout the lesson. The focus is on both clarity and accuracy. The teacher provides the model for how sounds and words are spoken and must model carefully avoiding the distortion of sounds as they are isolated or inaccurately representing sound patterns within a word.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
The teacher clearly and accurately models articulation.	The teacher models articulation but not always clearly .	The teacher does not model articulation OR models inaccurately .
Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•When modeling the sound for /b/, the teacher focuses students on her mouth position and is careful to enunciate clearly.•The teacher consistently articulates sounds clearly and accurately when segmenting and then blending words throughout the lesson.	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The teacher accurately models the sound for /b/, but more emphasis on mouth position and articulation are needed to avoid confusion with /d/.•When segmenting and blending words the teacher is not always <u>clear</u> in her enunciation of individual sounds.•When students confuse /ch/ and /sh/ the teacher models, but not with sufficient emphasis to make the differences clear.	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•While working with the /ch/ sound the teacher consistently produces the sound /ch-u/. The student is clearly hearing two sounds and is confused when she explains that this digraph makes one sound.•When segmenting words into sounds the teacher consistently distorts sounds (e.g., pronounces /bu/ for /b/ and /pu/ for /p/ and /lu/ for /l/ and /twu/ for /tw/).

Item 6: The teacher engages all students in the pronunciation of the target sound or sounds with a sufficient emphasis on accurate articulation.

This item assesses both how well the teacher engages all students in saying the target sound or sounds and how focused the teacher is on ensuring that students precisely and accurately articulate. While item 6 focuses on the teacher providing an accurate model; this item focuses on what the teacher does to ensure that all students have the opportunity to articulate and that their articulation is precise and accurate. Depending upon the response or needs of the students, this may involve focusing the student on mouth shape, lip position, and/or tongue position to fully emphasise accuracy. Emphasis means to make accurate articulation important.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher engages all students in the pronunciation of the target sound or sounds with a sufficient emphasis on accurate articulation.</p>	<p>The teacher engages some, but not all, students in the pronunciation of the target sound or sounds OR does not sufficiently emphasize accurate articulation.</p>	<p>The teacher does not engage students in the pronunciation of the target sound or sounds with an emphasis on accurate articulation OR allows for inaccurate articulation.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •When teaching a new letter sound connection, the teacher emphasizes articulation by having students attend to the shape of their mouth first using a mirror and then by feel. •As the student produces the new sound, the teacher provides feedback reinforcing accurate articulation and asks for the student to reproduce the sound accurately several times. •The teacher ensures that each student is articulating each sound and accurately blending them together, frequently checking with individual students for reinforcement as needed. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •As the student produces the new sound, the teacher does not emphasize clarity and allows hands to be around and over the mouth during parts of instruction. •Students produce the sound as a group. Not all students clearly articulate but provide a muffled response. The teacher does not stress the importance of clear and accurate articulation. •When students segment and blend words orally the teacher does not consistently ensure that all students are engaging in pronunciation and accurate articulation, some students are echoing others or not producing all sounds and/or words. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher introduces the sound for ck and provides several examples without asking the student to produce the sound. •The teacher does not provide correction or feedback when the student inaccurately articulates.

Item 7: Blending strategies focused on accurate orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections are used clearly and consistently throughout the lesson.

This item focuses on the application of strategies designed to develop accurate and efficient word reading. Both synthetic and/or analytic blending strategies have been proven to be effective for SWD when used explicitly and systematically. Synthetic blending means that students are decoding words by putting individual phonemes together to make a whole word (phoneme-grapheme mapping). Analytic blending means that students segment and blend together larger subparts of a word such as the onset and rime, individual syllables or base words and morphemes.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>Blending strategies focused on accurate orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections are used clearly and consistently throughout the lesson.</p>	<p>Blending strategies focused on accurate orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections are used but not always clearly and/or consistently throughout the lesson.</p>	<p>Blending strategies focused on accurate orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections are not used throughout the lesson.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher clearly models both orally and visually (says and writes) while segmenting and blending the sounds in each word followed by students segmenting and blending the same word. •The teacher has students tap the sounds with their fingers (m-a-p) as they segment each word before building it with letter tiles and then blending into a whole word. •The teacher consistently uses prompts that support attention to sounds within the word, (e.g., “When you say ‘fry,’ what do you hear after the /f/?” Students are told to “stretch out the sounds” and listen for all the sounds in order.) 	<p>Examples: .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Student struggles with word pink. The teacher prompts that it is the color of her shirt instead of a decoding strategy. On other words the teacher cues the student appropriately using phoneme-grapheme mapping. (inconsistent) •While there is strategy for blending, at times the teacher allows the student to guess or have other students provide the word rather than use the decoding strategy. • In parts of the lesson the teacher decodes the word for the student without having the student apply the decoding strategy to reinforce letter to sound mapping. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students are prompted to “sound it out” or “try again” without a clear strategy or consistent approach. •When unable to read a word students are prompted to use context to figure it out. •Working on short vowel words, the teacher gives the student clues such as “it goes on your head” (hat) or uses letter sounds but without a clear strategy or consistent method for decoding. •The teacher introduces new words using a word wall. At no point does the teacher model or prompt blending, sounding out, or the use of

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher leads students as they read a list of short vowel words systematically saying the first sound /b/ and the ending sounds as a group /at/ and then reading the whole word as bat. •When decoding simple two syllable words the teacher models segmenting the word into syllables, cues students to decode each syllable and then to read as a whole word - first providing an example and then leading the students to apply the strategy with the same word and subsequent words. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •When decoding two syllable words, students attempt phoneme-grapheme mapping, but the teacher does not provide students with a clear and consistent method for segmenting the word into manageable chunks. 	<p>word analysis to teach the new words.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The focus is on whole word reading, students do not practice new words or new sounds within words using a decoding strategy.
--	--	--

Item 8: When a word is segmented, the teacher consistently ensures the word is also read as a whole word at the normal rate.

This item is focused on the teacher’s attention to both segmenting and blending sounds into whole understandable words. Students decode words by segmenting them into parts such as phonemes, onset-rimes or syllables which leads to blending the parts together to create a whole word. This item focuses on the goal of saying the word as a whole word at the normal rate and with the correct pronunciation, avoiding only saying and hearing the word in parts.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>When a word is segmented, the teacher consistently ensures the word is also read as a whole word at the normal rate.</p>	<p>When a word is segmented, the teacher inconsistently ensures the word is also read as a whole word at the normal rate.</p>	<p>When a word is segmented, the teacher does not ensure the word is also read as a whole word at the normal rate OR words are not segmented.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher and students follow a well-established routine that involves segmenting and then reading the word as a whole word at a normal rate. •When reading text the student stops to decode a word, the teacher prompts the student to then reread the word before continuing on. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher is inconsistent. On some words she ensures that students read the whole word after segmenting and on others she does not. •When reading text the student stops to decode a word, the teacher inconsistently prompts the students to reread the word before continuing. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher and students follow a well-established routine that involves segmenting words, but the teacher does not have students then blend the sounds together and read the word as a whole word at the normal rate. •When reading text when the students stop to decode words the teacher does not ensure they reread the word once it has been segmented. •The lesson consists of only whole word reading. Students are not prompted to segment and blend orally during instruction, practice or correction.

Item 9: The teacher provides students with adequate practice designed to reinforce orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections aligned to the target skill.

This item evaluates how well the teacher designs and implements practice to reinforce orthographic and phonological connections aligned to the target skill. “Adequate” practice is defined as enough or sufficient for the particular skill, student and/or situation, and includes both quality and quantity. Practice takes on multiple forms (e.g., decoding sets of words using a systematic routine, word building or chaining either written or with manipulatives, using sound spelling boxes or Elkonin boxes to build and decode words).

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher provides students with adequate practice designed to reinforce orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections aligned to the target skill.</p>	<p>The teacher provides students with somewhat adequate practice designed to reinforce orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections aligned to the target skill.</p>	<p>The teacher provides students with inadequate practice designed to reinforce orthographic (written) and phonological (sound) connections aligned to the target skill.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students apply the blending strategy to read a set of words written on the board. All students decode orally as a whole group with cueing from the teacher. The teacher then selects individual students to reread the words followed by all students writing the words on whiteboards. •The teacher uses letter tiles to build a series of CVC words changing one letter at a time. The student reads the words as the teacher manipulates the tiles. The practice appears to be sufficient for the lesson. •The teacher provides multiple opportunities to decode a small set of words using ea (tap sounds, manipulate tiles, read in sentences, write on board). 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students apply the blending strategy to read a set of words with some cueing from the teacher. The students decode orally, but not all students are consistently or productively practicing. •The teacher uses letter tiles to build a small set of CVC words changing one letter at a time. The student reads the words as the teacher manipulates the tiles. The student would have benefited from additional opportunities to practice using a variety of methods. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students read some words on the board, but practice is not designed to reinforce a target skill or specific word reading strategy. •The teacher models blending the words but does not engage students in practice. •The teacher did not maximize time during the lesson, causing students to have less than adequate opportunities to practice words before encountering them in decodable text.

Item 10: The teacher guides students to compare and contrast learned patterns.

This item evaluates the opportunities that students are given to compare and contrast learned patterns and the guidance that is provided to scaffold learning. Through discrimination tasks students are taught to analyze word parts, recognize and attend to patterns and see similarities and differences that impact word recognition. Guidance by the teacher may include prompting, cueing, modeling, think aloud or questioning.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher guides students to compare and contrast learned patterns.</p>	<p>The teacher provides students with the opportunity to compare and contrast learned patterns but without appropriate guidance.</p>	<p>The teacher does not provide students with the opportunity to compare and contrast learned patterns.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students sort words containing review vowel sounds. The teacher prompts the student to underline and say the vowel sound, read the word and then place it in the correct column. •During an open word sort the teacher encourages the student to share thinking (e.g., What makes this word different from that word? What do all of these have in common?). •As students segment and blend long o words the teacher guides students to color code spelling patterns. <p>The teacher asks the student to discriminate between /b/, /g/, /j/ through a series of questions (e.g., Which letter is at the beginning of go?).</p>	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students sort three previously learned VCe patterns by vowel sound. The teacher does not remain in proximity and provides little prompting or feedback. •The student reads word pairs containing previously taught vowel combinations (ea, ee, ai,). A more focused approach would include the teacher prompting him to attend to the vowel pattern. •The teacher reviews the sounds /g/, /j/,/b/ but does not guide the students through appropriate discrimination to make the exercise most effective. •Opportunities are present for implicit comparisons, but the teacher does not make them explicitly clear to students. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher only provides practice focused on a single pattern and at no time provides opportunities for students to discriminate between learned patterns. •Students are asked to compare and contrast three VCe patterns by sorting the words based upon vowel sound. The students have not reached an appropriate level of proficiency with VCe words to make this a productive exercise. (not a learned pattern)

Item 11: The teacher explicitly reinforces precise letter-sound correspondence through encoding exercises aligned to the target skill(s).

- **Writing (letters, words or sentences) AND/OR**
- **Using manipulatives to build words (tiles, cards)**

This item evaluates how well the teacher implements encoding exercises that are aligned to target skills and designed to reinforce phoneme to grapheme correspondence. The goal of encoding is to make letter-sound relationships and patterns within words concrete for students through instruction that includes writing words or using manipulatives (e.g., tiles, plastic letters) to build words according to phoneme-grapheme correspondences or learning to manipulate phoneme-grapheme relationships (e.g., stop to top) to make new words (Weiser and Mathes, 2011). Effective encoding instruction paired with decoding instruction is direct and explicit (Weiser and Mathes, 2011) and should be scaffolded with immediate corrective feedback that reinforces precise letter-sound correspondence (Williams, Walker, Vaughn & Wanzek, 2017).

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher explicitly reinforces precise letter-sound correspondence through encoding exercises aligned to the target skill(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing (letters, words or sentences) AND/OR • Using manipulatives to build words (tiles, cards) 	<p>The teacher engages students in encoding exercises that are not aligned to the target skills, OR the teacher does not explicitly reinforce precise letter-sound correspondence.</p>	<p>The teacher does not engage students in encoding exercises.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students write words dictated by the teacher, immediately following each word the teacher reinforces letter sound correspondence and cues corrections as needed. (e.g., yes, this is hop, points to each letter as she says the sound) •Students use a self-correct method closely supervised by the teacher. After writing each word the student uses a key to self-correct before moving to the next word. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students write words dictated by the teacher. At the end of the entire word list, the teacher writes the words on the board and says, “Do you want me to show you which ones you got right?” She then marks the correct words with a star. •Students use a self-correct method. After writing a set of words, the student uses a key to self-correct the whole set at once. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students spell words orally, but do not write words or build words with manipulatives.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students use letter tiles to build words dictated by the teacher. The teacher remains in close proximity and provides both corrective and affirmative feedback. •The students use sound spelling boxes to write each letter or letter group that corresponds to the sound within words dictated by the teacher. The teacher models each word and checks for accuracy. •Encoding includes having students tap the sounds in a word and write a line for each sound before writing the letter/letters on each line that spell the word. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students use letter tiles to build words dictated by the teacher. The teacher does not always remain in close proximity and provide feedback as needed to reinforce the skill. •The students attempt to write letters or letter groups for the sounds within words dictated by the teacher, but they would benefit from the use of sound spelling boxes and teacher modeling to help them explicitly connect sounds to letters. •The teacher provides words for students to write, but the words are not aligned to the target skills. 	
--	---	--

Item 12: The teacher effectively integrates word meaning into the lesson.

This item examines the teacher’s attention to building word knowledge within the context of a decoding lesson. Word knowledge is a link between the systems of word identification (decoding and retrieval) and comprehension. It involves understanding the meaning of words and word form which includes how the word is used, written and pronounced (Perfetti & Stafura, 2014; Perfetti, 2007). Important opportunities may include high utility words, words that will affect the meaning of a passage or words that present an opportunity to build a deeper understanding of the structures of language. It is not expected that all words used for decoding practice also be addressed as vocabulary words.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
The teacher effectively integrates word meaning into the lesson.	The teacher integrates word meaning into the lesson, but important opportunities are missed.	The teacher does not effectively integrate word meaning into the lesson.
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•During portions of the lesson the teacher is appropriately focused on only decoding strategies, but attends to meaning during one section of the lesson by giving the word in a sentence and reinforcing with a student friendly definition.•As students blend words the teacher provides a brief but clear student friendly explanation or sentence.•As students read words that are related, the teacher explains the base word and how the meaning is connected (clothes, cloth).•The teacher ensures that students understand the difference between fare and fair, pale and pail by clearly explaining the meaning and attending to the spellings.	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The teacher explains the meaning of words students ask about but does not intentionally provide meaning for words that will appear in the decodable text and may impact meaning.•The teacher effectively addresses word meaning in parts of the lesson but misses the important opportunity to teach the difference between the meanings of fare and fair, pale and pail.	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The teacher stops too often to address meaning with long explanations and examples (negatively impacts automaticity and strategy application) and explanations are ineffective for developing word knowledge.•The teacher addresses meaning with each word, but explanations or examples lack clarity or precision.•The teacher asks students to circle a picture to match a word, but does not follow up to reinforce or check understanding.

Item 13: The teacher scaffolds the transfer of new word reading skills to text reading as needed for students to experience success.

This item focuses on how the teacher bridges reading words in isolation to the more complex task of reading words in connected in text. The teacher can scaffold the transfer of new skills to text reading by purposefully identifying target words within the context of connected text prior to reading (e.g., teacher highlights target words in the passage, student practices reading them in isolation and then as connected text). In some cases students may be provided with sufficient practice prior to reading and further scaffolding may not be needed for the student to experience success. The emphasis is on scaffolding new skills as needed.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher scaffolds the transfer of new word reading skills to text reading as needed for students to experience success.</p>	<p>The teacher provides some scaffolding for the transfer of new word reading skills to text reading, but more is needed.</p>	<p>The teacher does not scaffold the transfer of new word reading skills to text reading.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher guides student to highlight the new target words in the text prior to reading, practice reading the words as they highlight and then read the complete text with the highlighted words. •The teacher provides students with a passage containing highlighted words from the prior day, reviews the words in the passage, and then provides a copy of the passage that is not highlighted for the students to read. (gradual release) •The teacher provides sufficient practice with word reading skills prior to reading and students read the text successfully. (more scaffolding was not needed for students to be successful) 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher points out new target words in the text prior to reading. An additional scaffold of reading the words in the sentence prior to reading the entire text would have been beneficial. (more scaffolding is needed) •The teacher provides limited practice with word reading skills prior to reading the text. Students would have benefited from additional word reading practice before encountering the new patterns in connected text. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher does not provide opportunities to practice new decoding skills aligned to the text prior to reading and/or does not identify new skills within the text prior to reading.

Item 14: The teacher provides sufficient opportunities for all students to engage in reading decodable text.

This item evaluates the opportunity provided by the teacher for students to apply skills in context by reading text (e.g., passages, sentences). Decodable text contains previously taught words and words aligned to current instruction. “Sufficient” means adequate or enough to meet the needs or purpose of the situation. The purpose is to provide students with the opportunity to successfully read words in the context of connected text and receive feedback, therefore reading must be done orally for this item. The amount of time spent reading depends upon the age and reading level of the particular student.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher provides sufficient opportunities for all students to engage in reading decodable text.</p>	<p>The teacher provides limited opportunities for students to engage in reading decodable text, AND/OR not all students are engaged.</p>	<p>The teacher does not provide opportunities for students to engage in reading decodable text, OR the text is not decodable for most of the students.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students choral read the passage. The teacher closely monitors to ensure that each student is reading the words and repeats as needed to verify. •The teacher provides students with a set of sentences containing words aligned to instruction. The teacher ensures that each student successfully reads each sentence. •The teacher and student take turns reading paragraphs in a story that is aligned to instruction. Due to the length of the story, the student has multiple opportunities to read providing sufficient practice for this particular student. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Students choral read the passage. Some students are not reading the words but are only repeating what is said by the other students. •The teacher provides students with a set of sentences containing words aligned to instruction. Students take turns reading, and each student reads one sentence providing limited opportunity for each student. •The teacher and student take turns reading paragraphs in a story aligned to instruction. The student has limited opportunities to read using this format because the story is short. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher attempts to choral read the text along with the students; students consistently repeat after the teacher without looking at the text. Students are not reading the connected text. •The teacher has selected text that is too difficult for the student(s) and does not provide the opportunity to apply skills successfully. •The teacher reads. Students do not have the opportunity to apply decoding skills in context. •The teacher prompts students to only read silently.

Item 15: The teacher effectively engages background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading.

This item evaluates how well the teacher prepares students to understand what they are reading. Effectively engaging background knowledge and/or schema focuses the reading and influences understanding. It affects the ability to make inferences, monitor understanding and remember what is read. To be effective, the teacher must maintain focus on relevant information and control for distractions or perseveration.

Background knowledge: the experiences, ideas, facts, and knowledge we have about a topic.

Schema: the mental model or web that connects facts and ideas about a particular topic.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher effectively engages background knowledge and/or activates schema relevant to the text prior to reading.</p>	<p>The teacher attempts to engage background knowledge and/or activate schema relevant to the text prior to reading but not effectively.</p>	<p>The teacher does not engage background knowledge and/or activate schema relevant to the text prior to reading.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prior to reading about a con man, the teacher shares a short example of being tricked into believing something not true and asks the students for examples. Then the teacher connects to the story about a con man, focusing on how it feels to be tricked. ● Connected text is a series of short sentences about a silly dog. The teacher provides a brief introduction stating that all of these sentences are about a dog that likes to play and points students to the picture of the dog with a ball. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The teacher prompts the students to share what they know about playing tricks on people. The prompt is too broad and allows for multiple digressions. ● The decodable text is a series of short sentences about a silly dog. The teacher provides each student extended time to talk about their experiences with a dog inviting digressions and focus on unrelated information (not focused or efficient). 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The teacher asks what they did yesterday when she was absent. Students tell her they read part one of the story about a con man. The teacher does not attempt to clarify understanding, summarize important concepts or connect to the reading for the day. ● Text is read without engaging background or activating schema. Some words are discussed prior to reading, but they are not connected to the meaning as it applies in the specific text.

Item 16: The teacher effectively scaffolds meaning and understanding through questioning and/or discussion appropriate to the text.

This item evaluates the teacher’s use of questioning or discussion to support meaning when reading connected text. While practice and application of decoding skills is one purpose for reading connected text, the fundamental purpose for reading is to extract meaning from the text. The level and amount of questioning and discussion will be influenced by the content and complexity of the specific text.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>The teacher effectively scaffolds meaning and understanding through questioning and/or discussion appropriate to the text.</p>	<p>The teacher somewhat scaffolds meaning and understanding through questioning and/or discussion appropriate to the text.</p>	<p>The teacher does not scaffold meaning and understanding through questioning and/or discussion appropriate to the text.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The teacher asks a variety of questions, both factual and inferential, that are designed to promote understanding appropriate to this text. ● The teacher does not ask higher level questions, but this is appropriate for the text that is being read. ● After reading a sentence the students tell one another what the sentence was about and circle the picture that goes with the sentence. The teacher then asks one student to explain why the picture matches the sentence. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The teacher is attempting to use questioning, but questions are superficial and do not directly impact overall understanding appropriate to this text. ● The teacher does not consistently encourage student responses to questions and at times provides answers herself. ● After reading a sentence the students circle the picture that goes with the sentence. The teacher says, “Yes, that is the one with the dog.” 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The teacher does not ask questions or prompt discussion in order to support meaning and understanding. ● After reading a sentence the students circle the picture that goes with the sentence. The teacher does not provide feedback or further discussion.

Item 17: Throughout the lesson the teacher provides affirmative and corrective feedback consistently focused on reinforcing the application of word reading skills and strategies.

This item evaluates how effectively the teacher provides students with timely high quality corrective and affirmative feedback throughout the lesson. Corrective feedback is most effective when it is specific and provides concrete information aligned to the desired outcome. It may be provided in the form of prompting or cueing the application of strategies. Affirmative feedback is essential to reinforcing the application of skills and strategies and should also be present throughout the lesson.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>Throughout the lesson the teacher provides affirmative and corrective feedback consistently focused on reinforcing the application of word reading skills and strategies.</p>	<p>Throughout the lesson the teacher provides some affirmative and/or corrective feedback reinforcing the application of word reading skills and strategies but more is needed.</p>	<p>Throughout the lesson the teacher does not provide feedback OR feedback is not focused on reinforcing the application of word reading skills and/or strategies.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •When the teacher detects inaccurate decoding she consistently provides corrective feedback by drawing attention to the location of the error and prompting the decoding strategy. •The teacher provides quality affirmative feedback frequently and throughout the lesson (e.g., you got the first, middle and ending sound in all those words, fantastic job hearing how many sounds are in the word, you are doing a really good job identifying the vowel and making sure you get the final sound, you used your strategy to figure out that word, nice job correcting that middle sound). 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •When the teacher detects inaccurate decoding she stops and asks students reread the word but does not consistently cue students to the middle of the word where errors are taking place or prompt the application of a strategy. •The teacher provides some quality affirmative and/or corrective feedback throughout the lesson but more is needed to reinforce skills and strategies. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher encourages guessing by giving word meaning clues rather than providing feedback that reinforces decoding strategies (e.g., remember it goes on your head, no no hair, yes hat). •The teacher asks the student to continue trying without feedback aligned to skills and strategies (e.g., “not rat, you are close, not ran, keep trying”). •The teacher consistently provides generic feedback such as good job. •The student repeats similar errors, the teacher does not provide feedback designed to develop awareness and application of skills.

Item 18: When errors are detected, the teacher consistently elicits the correct response from the student throughout the lesson.

This item evaluates the teacher’s deliberate focus on ensuring that students are practicing and applying skills accurately throughout the lesson. The methods used to provide corrective feedback are addressed in Item 17. This item focuses on the teacher’s efforts to monitor for accuracy and ensure the student produces the correct response. The correct response may include responses such as the production of a sound, appropriate application of a blending strategy, the production of a whole word, or rereading a sentence correctly. This item is marked 3 if there are no errors made by any student at any point throughout the lesson.

3 Implemented	2 Partially Implemented	1 Not Implemented
<p>When errors are detected, the teacher consistently elicits the correct response from the student throughout the lesson. OR No errors are made by the student(s) throughout the lesson.</p>	<p>When errors are detected, the teacher inconsistently elicits the correct response from the student throughout the lesson.</p>	<p>When errors are detected, the teacher does not elicit the correct response from the student throughout the lesson.</p>
<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •As three students choral read a list of words, the teacher double checks for accuracy by having students repeat a word as needed. •The teacher demonstrates deliberate and focused attention to accuracy in all parts of the lesson and consistently ensures that student produce the correct response (decoding, practice activities, reading text). •The teacher consistently ensures that students effectively apply the decoding strategy when they come to words they need to decode while reading text rather than providing the word or decoding it for them. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •As three students choral read a list of words the teacher allows for some lack of clarity in articulation but in another section of the lesson is more focused on accuracy as students read words individually. •The teacher demonstrates deliberate and focused attention to accuracy in some parts of the lesson, but overlooks or misses errors in places and moves on without having students produce the correct response. •When students stop to decode a word while reading text the teacher is inconsistent. Sometimes she ensures they apply decoding strategies and other times they repeat the provided word. 	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The teacher consistently allows for lack of clarity in articulation and does not deliberately focus on accuracy as students choral read lists of words and read connected text. •The teacher does not demonstrates deliberate and focused attention to accuracy throughout a majority of the lesson, students make multiple errors that are not addressed by the teacher. •When students stop to decode a word while reading text the teacher consistently provides the word and the student repeats the whole word correctly, but does not apply the decoding strategy or skills being practiced.

References:

- Abbott, S. P., & Berninger, V. W. (1999). It's never too late to remediate: Teaching word recognition to students with reading disabilities in grades 4-7. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 223-250.
- Al Otaiba, S., & Fuchs, D. (2002). Characteristics of children who are unresponsive to early literacy intervention: A review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23(5), 300-316.
- Ardoin, S. P., Binder, K. S., Foster, T. E., & Zawoyski, A. M. (2016). Repeated versus wide reading: A randomized control design study examining the impact of fluency interventions on underlying reading behavior. *Journal of school psychology*, 59, 13-38.
- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Nagy, W., & Carlisle, J. (2010). Growth in phonological, orthographic, and morphological awareness in grades 1 to 6. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 39(2), 141-163.
- Blachman, B. A., Schatschneider, C., Fletcher, J. M., Francis, D. J., Clonan, S. M., Shaywitz, B. A., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2004). Effects of Intensive Reading Remediation for Second and Third Graders and a 1-Year Follow-Up. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(3), 444-461.
- Cain, K. (2009). Making sense of text: Skills that support text comprehension and its development. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*, 35(2), 11-14.
- Cain, K., Oakhill, J., & Bryant, P. (2004). Children's reading comprehension ability: Concurrent prediction by working memory, verbal ability, and component skills. *Journal of educational psychology*, 96(1), 31-42.
- Chard, D. J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. J. (2002). A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities*, 35(5), 386-406.
- Cohen, E. J. & Brady, M. P. (2011). Acquisition and Generalization of Word Decoding in Students with Reading Disabilities by Integrating Vowel Pattern Analysis and Children's Literature. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 34(1), 81-113. West Virginia University Press. Retrieved November 1, 2017, from Project MUSE database.
- Compton, D. L., Miller, A. C., Elleman, A. M., & Steacy, L. M. (2014). Have we forsaken reading theory in the name of "quick fix" interventions for children with reading disability?. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(1), 55-73.

- Denton, C. A., & Al Otaiba, S. (2011). Teaching word identification to students with reading difficulties and disabilities. *Focus on exceptional children*, 43(7), 1-16.
- 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(5), 447-466.
- Denton, C. A., Nimon, K., Mathes, P. G., Swanson, E. A., Kethley, C., Kurz, T. B., & Shih, M. (2010). Effectiveness of a supplemental early reading intervention scaled up in multiple schools. *Exceptional Children*, 76(4), 394-416.
- Denton, C. A., Tolar, T. D., Fletcher, J. M., Barth, A. E., Vaughn, S., & Francis, D. J. (2013). Effects of tier 3 intervention for students with persistent reading difficulties and characteristics of inadequate responders. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 633-648.
- Ehri Linnea, C. (2003). Systematic Phonics Instruction: Findings of the National Reading Panel.
- Ehri, L. C. (2005). Learning to read words: Theory, findings, and issues. *Scientific Studies of reading*, 9(2), 167-188.
- Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Stahl, S. A., & Willows, D. M. (2001). Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(3), 393-447.
- Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., ... & Keating, B. (2016). Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade. Educator's Practice Guide. NCEE 2016-4008. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*.
- Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(1), 37-55.
- Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Winikates, D., Mehta, P., Schatschneider, C., & Fletcher, J. M. (1997). Early interventions for children with reading disabilities. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 1(3), 255-276.
- Foorman, B. R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical elements of classroom and small-group instruction promote reading success in all children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 16(4), 203-212.
- Gitomer, D., & Bell, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Chorzempa, B. F. (2002). Contribution of spelling instruction to the spelling, writing, and reading of poor spellers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 669-686.
- Graham, S., & Santangelo, T. (2014). Does spelling instruction make students better spellers, readers, and writers? A meta-analytic review. *Reading and Writing*, 27(9), 1703-1743.
- Gunning, T. G. (2010). *Assessing and correcting reading and writing difficulties*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hudson, R. F., Isakson, C., Richman, T., Lane, H. B. and Arriaza-Allen, S. (2011), An Examination of a Small-Group Decoding Intervention for Struggling Readers: Comparing Accuracy and Automaticity Criteria. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 26,15–27.
- Jenkins, J. R., Peyton, J. A., Sanders, E. A., & Vadasy, P. F. (2004). Effects of reading decodable texts in supplemental first-grade tutoring. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8(1), 53-85.
- Jitendra, A. K., Edwards, L. L., Starosta, K., Sacks, G., Jacobson, L. A., & Choutka, C. M. (2004). Early reading instruction for children with reading difficulties: Meeting the needs of diverse learners. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37(5), 421-439.
- Judge, S., & Bell, S. M. (2010). Reading achievement trajectories for students with learning disabilities during the elementary school years. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 27(1-2), 153-178.
- Juel, C., & Minden-Cupp, C. (2000). Learning to read words: Linguistic units and instructional strategies. *Reading research quarterly*, 35(4), 458-492.
- Kendeou, P., van den Broek, P., Helder, A., & Karlsson, J. (2014). A cognitive model of reading comprehension: Implications for reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 29(1), 10–16.
- Kilpatrick, D.A. (2015). *Essentials of assessing, preventing, and overcoming reading difficulties*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Lane, H. (2014). Evidence-based reading instruction for grades K-5 (Document No. IC-12). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/IC-12_FINAL_12-15-14.Pdf.

- Lovett, M. W., Borden, S. L., DeLuca, T., Lacerenza, L., Benson, N. J., & Brackstone, D. (1994). Treating the core deficits of developmental dyslexia: Evidence of transfer of learning after phonologically-and strategy-based reading training programs. *Developmental psychology, 30*(6), 805.
- Lovett, M. W., Lacerenza, L., Borden, S. L., Frijters, J. C., Steinbach, K. A., & De Palma, M. (2000). Components of effective remediation for developmental reading disabilities: Combining phonological and strategy-based instruction to improve outcomes. *Journal of educational psychology, 92*(2), 263.
- Lovett, M. W., Ransby, M. J., Hardwick, N., Johns, M. S., & Donaldson, S. A. (1989). Can dyslexia be treated? Treatment-specific and generalized treatment effects in dyslexic children's response to remediation. *Brain and Language, 37*(1), 90-121.
- Lovett, M. W., Steinbach, K. A., & Frijters, J. C. (2000). Remediating the core deficits of developmental reading disability: A double-deficit perspective. *Journal of learning disabilities, 33*(4), 334-358.
- Lovett, M. W., Warren-Chaplin, P. M., Ransby, M. J., & Borden, S. L. (1990). Training the word recognition skills of reading disabled children: Treatment and transfer effects. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(4), 769.
- 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*(2), 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*(1), 75-104.
- McLeskey, J., Barringer, M-D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M. C., Winn, J., & Ziegler, D. (2017, January). High-leverage practices in special education. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children & CEEDAR Center.
- Moats, L. (2009). Knowledge foundations for teaching reading and spelling. *Reading and Writing, 22*(4), 379-399.
- Moats, L. C., & Hall, S. (2010). Language essentials for teachers of reading and spelling (LETRS®) Module 7—Teaching phonics, word study, and the alphabetic principle.

- 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: Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- O'Connor, R. E., Bell, K. M., Harty, K. R., Larkin, L. K., Sackor, S. M., & Zigmond, N. (2002). Teaching reading to poor readers in the intermediate grades: A comparison of text difficulty. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(3), 474-485.
- Perfetti, C. (2007). Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. *Scientific studies of reading, 11*(4), 357-383.
- Perfetti, C. A., & Hogaboam, T. (1975). Relationship between single word decoding and reading comprehension skill. *Journal of educational psychology, 67*(4), 461.
- Perfetti, C. A., Landi, N., & Oakhill, J. (2005). The acquisition of reading comprehension skill. In M. J. Snowling & C. Hulme (Eds.), *The science of reading: A handbook* (pp. 227-247). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 18*(1), 22-37.
- Pullen, P. C., Lane, H. B., Lloyd, J. W., Lloyd, J. W., Nowak, R., & Ryals, J. (2005). Effects of explicit instruction on decoding of struggling first grade students: A data-based case study. *Education and Treatment of Children, 28*, 63-75.
- Rashotte, C. A., MacPhee, K., & Torgesen, J. K. (2001). The effectiveness of a group reading instruction program with poor readers in multiple grades. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 24*(2), 119-134.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children committee on the prevention of reading difficulties in young children. Washington, DC: National Research Council.
- Stacy, L. M., Elleman, A. M., Lovett, M. W., & Compton, D. L. (2016). Exploring differential effects across two decoding treatments on item-level transfer in children with significant word reading difficulties: A new approach for testing intervention elements. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 20*(4), 283-295.
- Stockard, J., Wood, T. W., Coughlin, C., & Rasplika Khoury, C. (2018). The Effectiveness of Direct Instruction Curricula: A Meta-Analysis of a Half Century of Research. *Review of Educational Research, 0034654317751919*.

- Swanson, H. L. (1999). Reading research for students with LD: A meta-analysis of intervention outcomes. *Journal of learning disabilities, 32*(6), 504-532.
- Torgesen, J. K. (2005). Recent discoveries from research on remedial interventions for children with dyslexia. *The science of reading, 521-537*.
- Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K., & Conway, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of learning disabilities, 34*(1), 33-58.
- Torgesen, J., Schirm, A., Castner, L., Vartivarian, S., Mansfield, W., Myers, D., Stancavage, F., Durno, D., Javorsky, R., and Haan, C. (2007). National Assessment of Title I, Final Report: Volume II: Closing the Reading Gap, Findings from a Randomized Trial of Four Reading Interventions for Striving Readers (NCEE 2008-4013). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., & Rashotte, C. A. (1997). Prevention and remediation of severe reading disabilities: Keeping the end in mind. *Scientific studies of reading, 1*(3), 217-234.
- Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Rose, E., Lindamood, P., Conway, T., & Garvan, C. (1999). Preventing reading failure in young children with phonological processing disabilities: Group and individual responses to instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 579-593.
- Vaughn, S., & Wanzek, J. (2014). Intensive interventions in reading for students with reading disabilities: Meaningful impacts. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 29*(2), 46-53.
- Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., & Peyton, J. A. (2005). Relative effectiveness of reading practice or word-level instruction in supplemental tutoring: How text matters. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(4), 364-380.
- Whalon, K. J., Al Otaiba, S., & Delano, M. E. (2009). Evidence-based reading instruction for individuals with autism spectrum disorders. *Focus on autism and other developmental disabilities, 24*(1), 3-16.
- Wanzek, J., & Roberts, G. (2012). Reading interventions with varying instructional emphasis for fourth graders with reading difficulties. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 35*(2), 90-101.
- Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (2007). Research-based implications from extensive early reading interventions. *School Psychology Review, 36*(4), 541.

- Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Swanson, E. A., Edmonds, M., & Kim, A. H. (2006). A synthesis of spelling and reading interventions and their effects on the spelling outcomes of students with LD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39*(6), 528-543.
- Wanzek, J., Wexler, J., Vaughn, S., & Ciullo, S. (2010). Reading interventions for struggling readers in the upper elementary grades: A synthesis of 20 years of research. *Reading and writing, 23*(8), 889-912.
- Weiser, B., & Mathes, P. (2011). Using encoding instruction to improve the reading and spelling performances of elementary students at risk for literacy difficulties: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(2), 170-200.
- Williams, K. J., Walker, M. A., Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J. (2017). A synthesis of reading and spelling interventions and their effects on spelling outcomes for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 50*(3), 286-297.
- Wise, B. W., Ring, J., & Olson, R. K. (1999). Training phonological awareness with and without explicit attention to articulation. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 72*(4), 271-304.