

A SUMMARY OF REVIEWS OF *LITERACY BY DESIGN* © 2008

May 2008

Advisory Board:

Michael Beck, President
Beck Evaluation & Testing Associates, Inc.

Keith Cruse, Former Managing Director
Texas Assessment Program

Joseph A. Fernandez, Former Chancellor
New York City Public Schools

A Summary of Reviews of *Literacy by Design* © 2008 Kindergarten through Grade 3

Overview

The following report, *A Summary of Reviews of Literacy by Design*, describes the results of the work of five national experts in early reading who engaged in a critical review of the *Literacy by Design* program © 2008, a comprehensive curriculum program for Grades K-5. Rigby, a Harcourt Achieve imprint, contracted with the Educational Research Institute of America (ERIA) to identify the five literacy experts from across the nation who conducted this review of the program and to prepare this report documenting the results of this independent review. This report includes a text report and commentary about the review process and the tool used to collect the data.

For the purposes of this review, evaluators focused on the beginning reading instruction represented in the *Literacy by Design* program Kindergarten through Grade 3 because these are the grades represented in the evaluation tool that was used to conduct this review. Therefore, this report provides feedback on the early grade levels of the program, Kindergarten through Grade 3.

In addition, some comparisons are presented within this report to compare the *Literacy by Design* program (2008) review results with the results of an earlier review of other early reading programs that was done by the Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel. It is important to note that it would not be a fair comparison to report on how the *Literacy by Design* program compares against the other specific programs that were reviewed by the Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel, as those reviews were done by different people at a different time and they reviewed programs that may also have been changed in the time subsequent to the review. The results and statements about the findings of the Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel are included solely to provide a context for the readers of this report.

The Purpose of This Review

The Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel developed an evaluation tool that would allow educators to evaluate a reading program's systematic focus on the National Reading Panel guidelines addressing phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency instruction. This tool is one way for potential users of a program to

determine whether the program provides a systematic, focused approach to instruction in these areas, while maintaining an emphasis on including motivating fiction and nonfiction books that will engage early readers.

Rigby, a Harcourt Achieve imprint, sought this independent, objective review by national experts in early reading to provide potential users of the program information on the program's alignment with the criteria of the Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel's tool.

Description of the Program

The publisher of *Literacy by Design* provides the following description of the program.

Literacy by Design pairs research-based instruction with classroom practices that work. By consulting educators around the country, leading literacy specialists designed a truly innovative program that addresses the AYP challenges educators face every day.

[The program is]

Designed for Teachers

Concrete strategies and resources to help students excel.

Designed for Students

A specific plan for differentiated instruction ensures students receive the individual attention they need.

Designed for Results

A focus on comprehension, tools to build reading stamina, and ongoing assessment that informs instruction.

All the information teachers need is organized into convenient, streamlined materials that give teachers what they want most: more time to focus on students. From whole class instruction to differentiated instruction to independent application, *Literacy by Design* resources work together seamlessly.

- A variety of fiction and nonfiction selections centered around a single theme provide consistent content and build vocabulary.
- **Big Books** and **Whole Class Charts** (grades K–2) get students excited about reading through teacher modeling.

- Shared text in **Sourcebooks** (grades 3–5) builds a community of learners to support reading development.
- The unique **Comprehension Bridge** carries the focus skills from whole class into small group.
- Precisely leveled books match student needs.
- Materials meet students where they are, providing the targeted instruction that ensures they'll succeed.

[Components of the program support]

Whole Class Instruction

- On grade level skills and strategies
- Comprehensive Teacher's Guide
- Grab-and-Go Booklets offer a full unit of instruction in the convenience of a handy booklet

Bridge to Small Group Instruction

- Comprehension and Writing Bridge Cards
- Link whole class instruction and differentiated small group instruction

Small Group Instruction

- Small Group Reading Teacher's Guide
- Provides a complete small group lesson for every leveled reader
- Also offers Grab-and-Go Booklets

Description of the Evaluation Tool Used

To complete their evaluation of the *Literacy by Design* program, reviewers used *The Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis*. This tool was developed by Dr. Deborah Simmons and Dr. Edward Kame'enui from the University of Oregon as part of a project of the National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators (NCITE), a federally funded national center that worked with publishers and developers of basal programs from 1990-2000.

The tool was created in order to aid states, districts, and schools in the selection of research-based reading programs. The tool is separated by grade level (Kindergarten through Grade 3). Within each grade level, as the foundation of its organization, the tool uses the five elements identified by the National Reading Panel as fundamental to early reading instruction. These five elements include instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.

By rating a series of items (subcategories, or sub-elements, of these five organizing elements) reviewers document and quantify the design and delivery features of a comprehensive reading program. Each of the items to be rated by the reviewer describes a specific characteristic of instruction that research has demonstrated is effective in developing early literacy. For example, one item under Phonemic Awareness in Kindergarten is: “Progresses from the easier phonemic awareness activities to the more difficult (e.g., isolation, blending, segmentation, and manipulation).”

For each specific item, reviewers designate a score from a two-point scale, represented by three circles shown as follows with varying amounts of shading



- | | |
|----------|---|
| 2 points | A full circle, representing that the program “consistently meets/exceeds criterion” |
| 1 point | A partial circle, representing that the program “partially meets/exceeds criterion” |
| 0 points | An empty circle, representing that the program “does not satisfy criterion” |

Within the tool, items within each grade level and section are grouped in sets of items identified as High Priority and items designated as Discretionary. Items designated as High Priority are those that expert review determined to be the most closely aligned with the conclusions of the 2000 National Reading Panel. As such, High Priority items require a higher level of documentation than those items labeled as Discretionary, which are considered important but not as fundamental as the high-priority items.

In scoring each of the items, reviewers were instructed to conduct three different types of analyses:

1. An evaluation of the content of individual lessons was indicated by the label (**w**). For these lesson analyses, reviewers identified the first day of instruction on a skill and then tracked instruction over the following two to three days.
2. An evaluation of the scope and sequence was indicated by the label (**ss**). This analysis was used to evaluate the progression of instruction over time.
3. An evaluation of systematic skill review was indicated by the label (**st**). Reviewers used a skills-trace form to track a skill over ten lessons, to document the content of new instruction and review.

At the end of each grade, Kindergarten through Grade 3, the evaluation tool provides an opportunity for reviewers to give an overall rating of the design of the program and the coherence and systematic nature of instruction within the program.

The Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis is the primary tool being used by many Reading First states. It was also included as part of the Secretary of Education's Leadership Academies (2001- 2002). The Oregon Reading First Center used the tool to evaluate a number of comprehensive reading programs and reported the results on their website.

Priorities Emphasized by this Evaluation Tool

In the introductory materials that appear at the beginning of *The Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis* the authors emphasize that a core reading program should meet the needs of the majority of students and should serve as the primary tool for planning and implementing instruction. The authors of the evaluation tool describe requirements of early reading instruction in this way:

The demands of the phonologic, alphabetic, semantic, and syntactic systems of written language require a careful schedule and sequence of prioritized objectives, explicit strategies, and scaffolds that support students' initial learning and transfer of knowledge and skills to other contexts. The requirements of curriculum construction and instructional design that effectively move children through the "learning to read" stage to the "reading to learn" stage are simply too important to leave to the judgment of individuals. The better the core addresses instructional priorities, the less teachers will need to supplement and modify instruction for the majority of learners. (*The Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis* by Deborah C. Simmons, Ph.D. and Edward J. Kame'enui, Ph.D., Revised 2003)

As a research base for the evaluation tool, authors used the research of the National Reading Panel (2000), the National Research Council (1998), NICHD (1996), and the authors, Simmons and Kame'enui (1998). This research base forms the foundation for identifying which critical elements are represented as individual items within the evaluation tool.

National Reviewers

The five reviewers who completed this thorough and objective review of the *Literacy by Design* program were representative of varied positions of expertise within early reading and representative of geographic regions across the United States. Reviewers included:

- ✓ District Reading Specialist, Ed.D., California
- ✓ Principal, Michigan
- ✓ District Literacy Consultant, Minnesota
- ✓ Instructional Facilitator, Retired District Reading Consultant, Nebraska
- ✓ Coordinator of Literacy, New York

Results of the Review

The results of the review of the *Literacy by Design* program © 2008 were extremely positive across each of the reporting areas. The detailed results of the review for each of the reporting categories are presented in the tables that follow.

It is important to note that this report follows most of the same conventions in terms of the reporting of data that were followed by the earlier review by the Oregon Reading First Center. Readers will note that the categories within the evaluation tool are designated as either “High-Priority Items” or as “Discretionary Items.” Items were designated as such based on the availability of scientifically based research that supported that item.

In addition, it is worth noting that the Oregon Reading First Center reviewers determined that they could not justify reporting the vocabulary and comprehension scores as percentages. The report states that:

The rationale for this decision was twofold: (a) the number of high priority items for selected grades in these essential components are restricted (e.g., there are two high priority items for vocabulary instruction in second grade), which makes the ratings problematic, and (b) the restricted item scale coupled with the lack of convergence in the National Reading Panel (2000) report on vocabulary and reading comprehension (i.e., the panel wasn’t able to conduct a meta-analysis because of limited studies) makes it very difficult to argue convincingly (and from a SBRR footing), that quantification using percentage scores that ostensibly contributes to a rank order of program design and quality is justified.

So the categories for which percentages were generated include only those related to the areas designated by the National Reading First panel: phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency. This same convention is followed within this report. Reviewers' scores are reported for vocabulary and comprehension but are not shown as percentages.

In those categories for which a percentage was generated, researchers at ERIA who tabulated the results from the five national reviewers for this report followed the same procedure for generating a percentage score as that used in the Oregon Reading First Center review. This procedure was as follows. Reviewers scored each item as a 2 (a full circle), 1 (a half-shaded circle), or 0 (an empty circle). These scores were added to generate a total number of points for each summary category (such as Phonemic Awareness). Then, a percentage score was generated by taking this total and dividing it by the total possible points in the summary category. For example, in Phonemic Awareness at Kindergarten, there are five items designated as high-priority items. Thus, if each item received a score of 2 there would be a total of 10 points possible. If a reviewer awarded three scores of 2 ($3 \times 2 \text{ points} = 6$) and two scores of 1 ($2 \times 1 \text{ point} = 2$), the category would receive 8 total points, or 80%.

It is also worth noting that the Oregon Reading First Center identified a score of 75% as the criterion for satisfactory evidence of performance.

Results of 2008 Literacy by Design Review of High-Priority Items: Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, and Fluency

Tables 1 through 4 below show the high-priority item percentage score results of the 2008 national review of this new program, *Literacy by Design*, at each of the grade levels that were reviewed: Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, and Grade 3.

Table 1 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Kindergarten	
Summary Category / High-Priority Items	Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
Phonemic Awareness Instruction 1. Progresses from the easier phonemic awareness activities to the more difficult (e.g., isolation, blending, segmentation, and manipulation). 2. Teaches skills explicitly and systematically. 3. Models phonemic awareness tasks and responses orally and follows with students' production of the task. 4. Integrates letter-sound correspondence instruction to phonological awareness. 5. Focuses on segmentation or the combination of blending and segmenting for greatest transfer.	96%
Letter-Sound Association Instruction 1. Introduces high-utility letter sound instruction early in the sequence (e.g., /m/, /s/, /a/, /r/, /t/) instead of low-utility letter sounds (e.g., /x/, /y/, /z/). 2. Explicitly models the sound of letter prior to student practice and assessment. 3. Incorporates frequent and cumulative review of taught letter sounds to automaticity.	87%
Decoding Instruction 1. Provides explicit strategy for blending words. 2. Provides multiple opportunities within lessons for students to blend and read words.	74%

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Provides sufficient guided practice in decodable word lists and short, controlled connected text. 4. Introduces regular word types (CV or CVC) first in the sequence. 5. Introduces regular words for which students know all letter sounds. 	
<p>Irregular Words Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduces words of high utility (e.g., I, have, etc.) with ample practice for automaticity. 	70%

<p>Table 2 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Grade 1</p>	
<p>Summary Category / High-Priority Items</p>	<p>Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)</p>
<p>Phonemic Awareness Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allocates appropriate amount of daily time to blending, segmenting, and manipulating tasks until proficient. 2. Incorporates letters into phonemic awareness activities. 	90%
<p>Phonics Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progresses <u>systematically</u> from simple word types (e.g., consonant-vowel-consonant) and word length (e.g., number of phonemes) and word complexity (e.g., phonemes in the word, position of blends, stop sounds) to more complex words. 2. Models instruction at each of the fundamental stages (e.g., letter-sound correspondences, blending, reading whole words). 3. Provides teacher-guided practice in controlled word lists and connected text in which students can apply their newly learned skills successfully. 4. Includes repeated opportunities to read words in contexts in which students can apply their knowledge of letter-sound correspondences. 5. Uses decodable text based on specific phonics lessons in the early part of the first grade as an intervening 	88%

<p>step between explicit skill acquisition and the students' ability to read quality trade books. Decodable texts should contain the phonics elements and sight words that students have been taught.</p>	
<p>Irregular Words Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selects words of high utility with ample practice for automaticity. 2. Controls the number of irregular words introduced one at a time. 	<p>50%</p>
<p>Connected Text and Fluency Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduces passage reading soon after students can read a sufficient number of words accurately. 2. Contains regular words comprised of letter-sounds and word types that have been taught. 3. Contains only high-frequency irregular words that have been previously taught. 4. Uses initial stories/passages composed of a high percentage of regular words (minimum 75-80% decodable words). 5. Builds toward a 60 word-per-minute fluency goal by end of grade. 6. Includes sufficient independent practice materials of appropriate difficulty for students to develop fluency. 	<p>85%</p>

<p>Table 3 Review of Literacy by Design Program Grade 2</p>	
<p>Summary Category / High-Priority Items</p>	<p>Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)</p>
<p>Phonics Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches advanced phonic-analysis skills explicitly, first in isolation, then in words and connected text and applies to other program materials (e.g., trade books, anthologies) when students are proficient. 2. Provides teacher guided practice in word lists and controlled contexts in which students can apply newly learned skills successfully. 	<p>80%</p>

3. Teaches explicit strategy to read multisyllabic words by using prefixes, suffixes, and known word parts.	
Irregular Words Instruction	80%
1. Selects words that have high utility; that is, words that are used frequently in grade-appropriate literature and informational text.	
Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction	87%
1. Contains regular words comprised of phonic elements and word types that have been introduced.	
2. Selects majority of high frequency irregular words from list of commonly used words in English.	
3. Builds toward a 90 word-per-minute fluency goal by end of grade 2. Assesses fluency regularly.	

Table 4
Review of Literacy by Design Program
Grade 3

Summary Category / High-Priority Items	Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
Decoding and Word Recognition Instruction	80%
1. Teaches strategies to decode multisyllabic words using the structural features of such words parts as affixes (e.g., <i>pre-</i> , <i>mis-</i> , <i>-tion</i>) to aid in word recognition.	
2. Emphasizes reading harder and bigger words (i.e., multisyllabic words) and reading all words more fluently.	
Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction	80%
1. Contains only words comprised of phonic elements and word types that have been introduced.	
2. Builds toward a 120 word-per-minute fluency goal by end of grade 3. Assesses fluency regularly.	
3. Includes sufficient independent practice materials of appropriate difficulty for students to develop fluency.	

Results of 2008 Literacy by Design Review of Discretionary Items: Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, and Fluency

Tables 5 through 8 below show the discretionary item percentage score results of the 2008 national review of the program, *Literacy by Design*, at each of the grade levels that were reviewed: Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, and Grade 3.

Table 5 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Kindergarten	
Summary Category / Discretionary Items	Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
<p>Phonemic Awareness Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focuses beginning instruction on the phonemic level of phonological units with short words (two to three phonemes; e.g., <i>at, mud, run</i>). 2. Makes students' cognitive manipulations of sounds overt by using auditory cues or manipulatives that signal the movement of one sound to the next. 3. Focuses first on the initial sound (<u>s</u>at), then on the final sound (sa<u>t</u>) in words. 4. Provides brief instructional sessions. (Significant gains in phonemic awareness are often made in 15 to 20 minutes of daily instruction and practice over a period of 9 to 12 weeks.) 	85%
<p>Letter-Sound Association Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sequences the introduction of letter sounds in ways that minimize confusion (e.g., sequence /p/, /b/, /v/; /e/, /i/). 2. Includes a few short vowels early in the sequence so that students can use letter-sound knowledge to segment and blend words. 	100%
<p>Irregular Words Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limits # of words introduced within a lesson. 2. Separates highly similar words (e.g., was/saw). 	90%

Table 6 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Grade 1	
Summary Category / Discretionary Items	Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
<p>Phonemic Awareness Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyzes words at the phoneme level (i.e., working with individual sounds within words). 2. Works with phonemes in all positions in words (initial, final, medial). 3. Progresses from identifying or distinguishing the positions of sounds in words to producing the sound and adding, deleting, and changing selected sounds. 4. Works with increasingly longer words (three to four phonemes). 5. Expands beyond consonant-vowel-consonant words (e.g., <i>sun</i>) to more complex phonemic structures (consonant blends). 	94%
<p>Phonics Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides integrated proactive instruction and practice in words that students first read, spell, and write. 2. Sequences words strategically to incorporate known letters or letter-sound combinations. 3. Being instruction in word families and word patterns (i.e., reading orthographic units of text, such as <i>at, sat, fat, rat</i>) <u>after</u> students have learned the letter-sound correspondences in the unit. 4. Teaches students to process larger, highly represented patterns to increase fluency in word recognition. 	85%
<p>Irregular Words Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategically separates high-frequency words (e.g., <i>was, saw; them, they, there</i>), that are often confused by students. 2. Points out irregularities while focusing student attention on all letters in the word. 	65%

<p>Connected Text and Fluency Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaches explicit strategy to move from reading words in lists to reading words in sentences and passages. 2. Introduces fluency practice (e.g., repeated reading) after students read words in passages accurately. 	<p>100%</p>
--	-------------

<p align="center">Table 7 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Grade 2</p>	
<p>Summary Category / Discretionary Items</p>	<p>Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)</p>
<p>Phonics Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoids assuming that learners will automatically transfer skills from one word type to another. When introducing a new letter combination, prefix, or word ending, models each of the fundamental stages of blending the word and then reading the whole word. 2. Separates auditorily and visually similar letter combinations in the instructional sequence (e.g., does not introduce both sounds for <i>oo</i> simultaneously; separates <i>ai, au</i>). 3. Ensures that students know the sounds of individual letters prior to introducing larger orthographic units (e.g., <i>ill, ap, ing</i>). 4. Offers repeated opportunities for students to read words in contexts where they can apply their advanced phonics skills with a high level of success. 5. Incorporates spelling to reinforce word analysis. After students can read words, provides explicit instruction in spelling, showing students how to map the sounds of letters onto print. 6. Makes clear the connections between decoding (symbol to sound) and spelling (sound to symbol). 	<p>85%</p>
<p>Irregular Words Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sequences high-frequency irregular words to avoid potential confusion. For example, high-frequency words that are often confused by students should be strategically separated for initial instruction. 	<p>78%</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Limits the number of sight words introduced at one time. 3. Preteaches the sight words prior to reading connected text. 4. Provides a cumulative review of important high-frequency sight words as part of daily reading instruction. 	
<p>Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contains only irregular words that have been previously taught. 2. Introduces repeated readings after student read words in passages accurately. 3. Includes sufficient independent practice materials of appropriate difficulty for students to develop fluency. 	77%

Table 8 Review of Literacy by Design Program Grade 3	
Summary Category / Discretionary Items	Percent (%) Received by <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
<p>Decoding and Word Recognition Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separates word parts that are highly similar (e.g., <i>ight</i> and <i>aight</i>). 2. Introduces word parts that occur with high frequency over those that occur in only a few words. 3. Teachers the word parts first and then incorporates the words into sentences and connected text. 4. Extends instruction to orthographically larger and more complex units (e.g., <i>ight</i>, <i>ught</i>, <i>own</i>). 5. Provides explicit explanations, including modeling, “Think-alouds,” guided practice, and the gradual transfer of responsibility to students. 6. Relies on examples more than abstract rules. (Begin with familiar words. Show “nonexamples.” Use words parts rather than have students search for little words within a word. <i>Examples</i>: depart, report.) 7. Makes clear the limitations of structural analysis. 8. Uses extended text in opportunities for application. 	94%

<p>Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contains only irregular words that have been previously taught. 2. Selects majority of high frequency irregular words from list of commonly used words in English. 3. Introduces repeated readings after students read words in passages accurately. 	<p>80%</p>
---	------------

Summary of Grade-Level Findings (for Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Fluency)

After determining the percentages for each of these separate categories, the Oregon Reading First Center then grouped related sets of skills (such as letter-sound association instruction, decoding instruction, and irregular words instruction in Kindergarten) into a broader category that better aligns with the five main categories reported on within the Reading First report (so, for example, in Kindergarten the skills listed above would be collapsed into one broad category of “Phonics Instruction”). This meant that 25 total skills categories became 18 reported summary categories. This allowed for a table at the end of each grade level in the Oregon Reading First Center report that shows the summary of the grade-level ratings. Researchers at ERIA followed the same procedure to arrive at a summary for the 2008 *Literacy by Design* review findings in the high-priority and discretionary categories of phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency. These results are provided for each grade level in Tables 9 through 12 below.

<p align="center">Table 9 2008 National Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Summary of Kindergarten Ratings</p>			
<p align="center">High-Priority Items</p>		<p align="center">Discretionary Items</p>	
<p>Category</p>	<p>2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review</p>	<p>Category</p>	<p>2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review</p>
<p>Phonemic Awareness Instruction (5)</p>	<p>96%</p>	<p>Phonemic Awareness Instruction (4)</p>	<p>85%</p>
<p>Phonics Instruction (9)</p>	<p>77%</p>	<p>Phonics Instruction (4)</p>	<p>95%</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter-Sound Association Instruction (3) 	<p>87%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter-Sound Association Instruction (2) 	<p>100%</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decoding Instruction (5) 	<p>74%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decoding Instruction (0) 	<p>n/a</p>

• Irregular Words Instruction (1)	70%	• Irregular Words Instruction (2)	90%
Kindergarten High-Priority Totals	87%	Kindergarten Discretionary Totals	90%

Table 10 2008 National Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Summary of Grade 1 Ratings			
High-Priority Items		Discretionary Items	
Category	2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review	Category	2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review
Phonemic Awareness Instruction (2)	90%	Phonemic Awareness Instruction (5)	94%
Phonics Instruction (7)	69%	Phonics Instruction (6)	75%
• Phonics Instruction (5)	88%	• Phonics Instruction (4)	85%
• Irregular Words Instruction (2)	50%	• Irregular Words Instruction (2)	65%
Connected Text and Fluency Instruction (6)	85%	Connected Text and Fluency Instruction (2)	100%
First Grade High-Priority Totals	81%	First Grade Discretionary Totals	90%

Table 11 2008 National Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Summary of Grade 2 Ratings			
High-Priority Items		Discretionary Items	
Category	2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review	Category	2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review
Phonics Instruction (4)	80%	Phonics Instruction (10)	82%
• Phonics Instruction (3)	80%	• Phonics Instruction (6)	85%

• Irregular Words Instruction (1)	80%	• Irregular Words Instruction (4)	78%
Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction (3)	87%	Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction (3)	77%
Second Grade High-Priority Totals	84%	Second Grade Discretionary Totals	80%

Table 12 2008 National Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Summary of Grade 3 Ratings			
High-Priority Items		Discretionary Items	
Category	2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review	Category	2008 <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Review
Phonics Instruction (2)	80%	Phonics Instruction (8)	94%
Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction (3)	80%	Passage Reading - Fluency Instruction (3)	80%
Third Grade High-Priority Totals	80%	Third Grade Discretionary Totals	87%

Results of 2008 *Literacy by Design* Review of Design Features (by Grade Level, Kindergarten through Grade 3)

In its report on its review of comprehensive reading programs, the Oregon Reading First Center also provided a percentage based on the reviewers ratings of the design features at each grade level. This rating was scored like the ratings for the items described above and the percentage was calculated following the same procedures. Researchers at ERIA followed the same procedure to determine the results of the review of the design features by the five national reviewers of the *Literacy by Design* program (2008). Table 13 shows the results of the review of the design features for all four grade levels, Kindergarten through Grade 3.

Table 13 2008 National Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Percentages for Reviews of Design Features by Grade (Kindergarten through Grade 3)	
--	--

Grade Level	Design Features Considered	2008 Literacy by Design Program Review
K	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinates and integrates <u>phonemic awareness</u> and <u>phonics</u> instruction and student materials. 2. Provides ample practice on high-priority skills. 3. Provides explicit and systematic instruction. 4. Includes systematic and cumulative review of high priority skills. 5. Demonstrates and builds relationships between fundamental skills leading to higher order skills. 	86%
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aligns and coordinates the words used in phonics/word recognition activities with those used in fluency building. 2. Provides ample practice on high-priority skills. 3. Provides explicit and systematic instruction. 4. Includes systematic and cumulative review of high priority skills. 5. Demonstrates and builds relationships between fundamental skills leading to higher order skills. 	76%
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aligns and coordinates the words used in phonics/word recognition activities with those used in fluency building. 2. Provides ample practice on high-priority skills. 3. Provides explicit and systematic instruction. 4. Includes systematic and cumulative review of high priority skills. 5. Demonstrates and builds relationships between fundamental skills leading to higher order skills. 	76%
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aligns and coordinates the words used in phonics/word recognition activities with those used in fluency building. 2. Provides ample practice on high-priority skills. 3. Provides explicit and systematic instruction. 4. Includes systematic and cumulative review of high priority skills. 5. Demonstrates and builds relationships between fundamental skills leading to higher order skills. 	88%

Overview of Results of Findings for Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Fluency and for Design Features

Table 14 shows the overall findings of the reviews of the critical elements (both high-priority items and discretionary items) and of the design features for each grade level (Kindergarten through Grade 3).

Table 14
2008 National Review of *Literacy by Design* Program
Overview of Results of Findings for Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Fluency and for Design Features
(Kindergarten through Grade 3)

Critical Element	Kindergarten		First Grade	
	High-Priority Items	Discretionary Items	High-Priority Items	Discretionary Items
Phonemic Awareness	96%	85%	90%	94%
Phonics	77%	95%	69%	75%
Fluency	n/a	n/a	85%	100%
Design Features	86%	n/a	76%	n/a
Critical Element	Second Grade		Third Grade	
	High-Priority Items	Discretionary Items	High-Priority Items	Discretionary Items
Phonics	80%	82%	80%	94%
Fluency	87%	77%	80%	80%
Design Features	76%	n/a	88%	n/a

Analysis of Results of Findings for Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Fluency and for Design Features

In its report on its review of comprehensive reading programs, the Oregon Reading First Center discussed the difficulty of comparing programs when the evaluation tool had generated such a large number of different percentages based on the results of reviews of different summary categories (high-priority and discretionary) and the results of the review of the design features. As a result, the Oregon Reading First Center determined that it would order programs based on the

number of categories for which each program received scores lower than 75% (the threshold determined to demonstrate satisfactory evidence of effectiveness). The report describes the rationale for this decision as follows:

To conduct this analysis, we used a criterion of 75% to examine the 22 percentages in each program. That is, for each summary category in the area of phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency (e.g., kindergarten, high-priority, phonemic awareness), if a program earned at least 75% of the total number of points possible, it met the criterion. If a program earned less than 75% of the total number of points possible for that category, it did not meet the criterion. We determined that a criterion of 75% represented a robust and defensible “cut score” for determining the viability of an essential component.

The *Literacy by Design* program (2008) in the current national review received just one score below 75% (and this was slightly below, at 69% for Phonics in Grade 1); 12 of the 13 total high-priority summary categories received scores above 75% by reviewers evaluating the *Literacy by Design* program (2008).

To provide another perspective on the significance of this large number of above-satisfactory scores for the *Literacy by Design* program (2008), it is worth providing some background on the other comprehensive programs that were reviewed by the Oregon Reading First Center in their earlier review. While we cannot compare the results of the current 2008 review directly with the results of the programs reviewed in the Oregon Reading First Center review, because the reviews were done at different times, by different reviewers, and of programs that may have since been updated, looking at the comparative program results from the Oregon Reading First Center review does provide a useful context in which to understand the results of the 2008 national review of the *Literacy by Design* program.

In the Oregon Reading First Center review, only one of the nine comprehensive reading programs reviewed received one or fewer scores below 75% in the high-priority and program design categories. The average number of high-priority summary category and design feature category percentage scores below 75% was 5.9.

As shown in Table 14, the *Literacy by Design* program in the current national review received just one score below 75% across all four grades (Kindergarten through Grade 3) across all categories for which percentages were generated (the grouped high-priority and discretionary categories in phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency and the design features category). There are 22 total summary categories across the grades for which percentage scores were generated. So, the *Literacy by Design* program received 21 out of 22 scores above 75%.

As stated above, while we cannot compare the results of the 2008 review directly with the results of the programs reviewed in the Oregon Reading First Center review, the earlier review by the Oregon Reading First Center can help provide a context in which the current review results can be interpreted. In the Oregon Reading First Center review, none of the nine comprehensive reading programs reviewed received one or fewer scores below 75% out of the overall 22 categories. The average number of percentage scores below 75% was 10.

Table 15 below shows the Oregon Reading First Center rank order of programs by high-priority and discretionary items. Note that the names of the programs reviewed have been removed. This table is provided not to provide information about how to evaluate one program against another, but rather to provide a context for interpreting the results of the 2008 national review of the *Literacy by Design* program. Note that the number in parentheses is the number of categories that were below the 75% criterion.

Table 15
Rank Order of Programs by High-Priority and Discretionary Items
from Oregon Reading First Center Review

K-3 High Priority (Total # < 75%)	K-3 Discretionary (Total # < 75%)	K-3 Total (Total # < 75%)
1. Program A (1)	1. Program B (0)	1. Program B (2)
2. Program B (2)	2. Program C (2)	2. Program A (4)
3. Program C (3)	3. Program A (3)	3. Program C (5)
4. Program D (4)	4. Program D (4)	4. Program D (8)
5. Program E (5)	4. Program G (4)	5. Program E (9)
6. Program F (7)	4. Program E (4)	6. Program G (11)
6. Program G (7)	7. Program F (5)	7. Program F (12)
8. Program H (12)	8. Program H (6)	8. Program H (18)
8. Program I (12)	9. Program I (9)	9. Program I (21)

From looking at Table 15, reviewers have a context for interpreting the results of the 2008 review of the *Literacy by Design* program (2008). The 2008 review resulted in one score of 75% or lower in the high-priority categories, no scores of 75% or lower in the discretionary categories, and one total score of 75% or lower across all categories Kindergarten through Grade Three.

Results of 2008 Review of High-Priority and Discretionary Items: Vocabulary and Comprehension

Although the Oregon Reading First Center reviewers determined that they could not justify reporting the vocabulary and comprehension scores as percentages, they did report the reviewers’ scores on high-priority and discretionary items in vocabulary and comprehension. In order to align with the procedures that the Oregon Reading First Center followed in using the evaluation tool, this report provides the results of the national reviewers’ evaluations on the vocabulary and comprehension items as a tally of the number of elements with each rating, rather than a percentage score. Because there were multiple reviewers (two reviewers evaluated each section in the Oregon Reading First Center review; five reviewers evaluated each section in the 2008 national review), the scores for each item are presented as an average of the scores received.

The results for each grade level are shown in Tables 16 through 19.

<p align="center">Table 16 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Kindergarten Average Scores for Vocabulary and Comprehension (Across Reviewers)</p>		
Items		Average Scores Across Five Reviewers <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
High-Priority Items:	1. Provides direct instruction of specific concepts and vocabulary.	1.8
	2. Provides repeated and multiple exposures to critical vocabulary.	1.2

Vocabulary Instruction	3. Integrates words into sentences and asks students to tell the meaning of the word in the sentence and to use it in a variety of contexts.	1.2
Discretionary Items: Vocabulary Instruction	1. Reviews previously introduced words cumulatively.	0.8
	2. Provides opportunity for daily listening, speaking, and language experience.	2.0
	3. Incorporates exposure to a broad and diverse vocabulary through listening to a wide range of stories and informational texts.	1.6
High-Priority Items: Listening Comprehension	1. Models and systematically reviews critical comprehension strategies (...Literal Comprehension, Retelling)	1.8
	2. Models and guides the students through story structure (e.g., setting), thinking out loud as the elements are being identified.	1.4
	3. Strategically selects and reinforces critical vocabulary during story reading (connects with background knowledge and examples).	1.8
	4. Provides plentiful opportunities to listen to and explore narrative and expository text forms and to engage in interactive discussion of the messages and meanings of the text.	2.0
Discretionary Items: Listening Comprehension	1. Focuses on only a few important elements and introduces additional elements when the students can reliably identify those previously taught.	1.4
	2. Models multiple examples and provides extensive guided practice in listening-comprehension strategies.	1.8
	3. Inserts questions at strategic intervals to reduce the memory load for learners when introducing strategies in stories. (For example, have students retell the important events after each page rather than wait for the end of the story.)	1.8

<p align="center">Table 17 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Grade 1 Average Scores for Vocabulary and Comprehension (Across Reviewers)</p>		
Items		Average Scores Across Five Reviewers <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
High-Priority Items: Vocabulary Instruction	1. Provides direct instruction of specific concepts and vocabulary.	1.6
	2. Provides repeated and multiple exposures to critical vocabulary.	1.0
	3. Integrates words into sentences and asks students to tell the meaning of the word in the sentence and to use it in a variety of contexts.	1.0
Discretionary Items: Vocabulary Instruction	1. Reviews previously introduced words cumulatively.	0.8
	2. Provides opportunity for daily listening, speaking, and language experience.	1.8
	3. Incorporates exposure to a broad and diverse vocabulary through listening to a wide range of stories and informational texts.	2.0
High-Priority Items: Reading Comprehension Instruction	1. Guides students through sample text in which the teachers think out loud as they identify the components of story structure.	2.0
	2. Provides plentiful opportunities to listen to and explore the narrative and expository text forms and to engage in interactive discussion of the messages and meanings of the text.	2.0
	3. Explicitly teaches critical comprehension strategy (e.g., main idea, literal, inferential, retell, prediction).	2.0

Discretionary Items: Reading Comprehension Instruction	1. The text for initial instruction in comprehension: - begins with text units appropriate for the learner - uses familiar vocabulary - activates prior knowledge - uses simple sentences - begins with short passages to reduce the memory load for learners	2.0
	2. Introduces text where the structure of the text is explicit (beginning, middle, and end being obvious).	2.0
	3. Has students discuss the story structure orally and make comparisons with other stories.	2.0

<p align="center">Table 18 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Grade 2 Average Scores for Vocabulary and Comprehension (Across Reviewers)</p>		
Items		Average Scores Across Five Reviewers <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
High-Priority Items: Vocabulary Instruction	1. Provides direct instruction of specific concepts and vocabulary essential to understanding text.	1.0
	2. Provides repeated and multiple exposures to critical vocabulary.	1.0
Discretionary Items: Vocabulary Instruction	1. Variety of methods	1.2
	2. Incorporates exposure to a broad and diverse vocabulary through listening to a wide range of stories and informational texts.	1.6
	3. Integrates words into sentences and asks students to tell the meaning of the word in the sentence and use it in a variety of contexts.	1.6

	4. Reviews previously introduced words cumulatively.	1.0
	5. Teachers strategy for word meanings based on meaning of prefixes and suffixes.	1.2
	6. Introduces the prefix or suffix in isolation, indicating its meaning and then connecting it in words.	1.6
	7. Illustrates the prefix or suffix with multiple examples.	1.4
	8. Restructuring of vocabulary tasks for at-risk, low-achieving students.	1.6
	9. Uses examples when the roots are familiar to students (e.g., <i>remake</i> and <i>replay</i> as opposed to <i>record</i> and <i>recode</i>).	1.6
	10. Separates prefixes that appear similar in initial instructional sequences (e.g., <i>pre</i> , <i>pro</i>).	0.8
High-Priority Items: Reading Comprehension Instruction	1. Teaches conventions of informational text (e.g., titles, chapter headings) to locate important information.	1.6
	2. Teaches explicit strategy to interpret information from graphs, diagrams, and charts.	1.8
	3. Teaches or activates prior knowledge to increase a student's understanding of what is read.	2.0
	4. Teaches skill or strategy (e.g., comprehension, monitoring, summarizing) explicitly with the aid of carefully designed examples and practice.	2.0
	5. Continues skill or strategy instruction across several instructional sessions to illustrate the applicability and utility of the skill or strategy.	2.0
	6. Uses story grammar structure as a tool for prompting information to compare and contrast, organize information, and group related ideas to maintain a consistent focus.	1.2
Discretionary Items: Reading Comprehension	1. Teaches narrative and informational text.	2.0
	2. Organizes instruction in a coherent structure.	2.0
	3. Connects previously taught skills and strategies with new content and text.	2.0

Instruction	4. Cumulatively builds a repertoire of skills and strategies that are introduced, applied, and integrated with appropriate texts and for authentic purposes over the course of the year.	1.8
	5. Teaches analyzing elements of narrative text and comparing and contrasting elements within and among texts.	1.8
	6. Uses graphic organizers on the content of passages.	1.8

<p align="center">Table 19 Review of <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program Grade 3 Average Scores for Vocabulary and Comprehension (Across Reviewers)</p>		
Items		Average Scores Across Five Reviewers <i>Literacy by Design</i> Program (2008 National Review)
High-Priority Items: Vocabulary Instruction	1. Teaches strategies to use context to gain the meaning of an unfamiliar word.	1.4
	2. Repeated and multiple exposures to vocabulary.	1.6
	3. Emphasizes direct instruction in specific concepts and vocabulary essential to understanding text.	1.8
	4. Provides exposure to a broad and diverse vocabulary through listening and reading stories.	2.0
	5. Variety of methods; variety of contexts.	1.8
Discretionary Items: Vocabulary	1. Teaches dictionary usage explicitly with grade-appropriate dictionaries that allow students to access and understand the meaning of an unknown word. Uses words in context and that are encountered frequently.	0.8
	2. Restructuring of vocabulary tasks for at-risk, low achievers.	1.0

Instruction	3. Extends the understanding of concepts and vocabulary of the English language through (1) learning and using antonyms and synonyms; (2) using individual words in compound words to predict meaning; (3) using prefixes and suffixes to assist in word meaning; and (4) learning simple multiple-meaning words.	2.0
High-Priority Items: Reading Comprehension Instruction	1. Teaches background information and/or activates prior knowledge.	2.0
	2. Uses text in which the main idea or comprehension unit is explicitly stated, clear, and in which the ideas follow a logical order.	2.0
	3. Uses known or taught vocabulary and passages at appropriate readability levels for learners.	2.0
	4. Continues skill or strategy instruction across several instructional sessions to illustrate the applicability and utility of the skill and strategy.	2.0
	5. Connects previously taught skills and strategies with new content and text.	1.8
	6. Cumulatively builds a repertoire of multiple strategies that are introduced, applied, and integrated with appropriate texts and for authentic purposes over the course of the year.	2.0
	7. Explicitly teaches comprehension strategies with the aid of carefully designed examples and practice (e.g., comprehension monitoring, mental imagery, question generation, question answering, story structure, summarization).	2.0
Discretionary Items: Reading Comprehension Instruction	1. Provides cooperative learning activities that parallel requirements of instruction.	1.8
	2. Begins with linguistic units appropriate to the learner; for example, uses pictures and a set of individual sentences before presenting paragraph or passage-level text to help students learn the concept of main idea.	1.6
	3. Uses familiar, simple syntactical structures and sentence types.	2.0
	4. Progresses to more complex structures in which main ideas are not explicit and passages are longer.	2.0

It is worth emphasizing that there were a number of high-priority items within reading comprehension in which there was agreement across all five of the reviewers in scoring the item at the highest level (2.0 on a 2-point scale). The review tool contains 36 items in Comprehension across Grades K through 3. Of these 36, 21 received scores of 2.0 on a 2-point

scale in the review of the *Literacy by Design* program. These high-priority comprehension items that were scored at 2.0 included:

- Provides plentiful opportunities to listen to and explore narrative and expository text forms and to engage in interactive discussion of the messages and meanings of the text. (Kindergarten)
- Guides students through sample text in which the teachers think out loud as they identify the components of story structure.
- Provides plentiful opportunities to listen to and explore the narrative and expository text forms and to engage in interactive discussion of the messages and meanings of the text. (Grade 1)
- Explicitly teaches critical comprehension strategy (e.g., main idea, literal, inferential, retell, prediction). (Grade 1)
- The text for initial instruction in comprehension:
 - begins with text units appropriate for the learner
 - uses familiar vocabulary
 - activates prior knowledge
 - uses simple sentences
 - begins with short passages to reduce the memory load for learners (Grade 1)
- Introduces text where the structure of the text is explicit (beginning, middle, and end being obvious). (Grade 1)
- Has students discuss the story structure orally and make comparisons with other stories. (Grade 1)
- Teaches or activates prior knowledge to increase a student's understanding of what is read. (Grade 2)
- Teaches skill or strategy (e.g., comprehension, monitoring, summarizing) explicitly with the aid of carefully designed examples and practice. (Grade 2)
- Continues skill or strategy instruction across several instructional sessions to illustrate the applicability and utility of the skill or strategy. (Grade 2)
- Teaches narrative and informational text. (Grade 2)
- Organizes instruction in a coherent structure. (Grade 2)
- Connects previously taught skills and strategies with new content and text. (Grade 2)
- Teaches background information and/or activates prior knowledge. (Grade 3)
- Uses text in which the main idea or comprehension unit is explicitly stated, clear, and in which the ideas follow a logical order. (Grade 3)

- Uses known or taught vocabulary and passages at appropriate readability levels for learners. (Grade 3)
- Continues skill or strategy instruction across several instructional sessions to illustrate the applicability and utility of the skill and strategy. (Grade 3)
- Cumulatively builds a repertoire of multiple strategies that are introduced, applied, and integrated with appropriate texts and for authentic purposes over the course of the year. (Grade 3)
- Explicitly teaches comprehension strategies with the aid of carefully designed examples and practice (e.g., comprehension monitoring, mental imagery, question generation, question answering, story structure, summarization). (Grade 3)
- Uses familiar, simple syntactical structures and sentence types. (Grade 3)
- Progresses to more complex structures in which main ideas are not explicit and passages are longer. (Grade 3)

This agreement across five reviewers at the highest scoring level is evidence of the strength of the text comprehension elements of the *Literacy by Design* program.

Summary of Instructional Quality by Grade Level

In addition to the individual items ranked on a two-point scale (from 0 to 2), the evaluation tool used by reviewers to evaluate the *Literacy by Design* program (2008) also included space for reviewers to write comments related to the overall instructional quality of the program by grade level. Relevant reviewer comments are provided by grade level in Tables 20 through 23 below and overall comments about the program are provided in Table 24.

Table 20
Summary of Evidence of Instructional Quality -- Kindergarten

	Evidence of <u>Sufficient</u> Instructional Quality	Evidence of <u>Insufficient</u> Instructional Quality
Reviewer #1	Ongoing phonemic awareness – sequenced appropriately Segmenting/blending focus for transfer	I believe more practice (PH AW) is appropriate at this K level – an important element for reading success Did not see a lot of repetition and reinforcement thought may be represented in small group leveled

	<p>Explicit modeling and instruction</p> <p>High-utility letter sound sequence introduced</p> <p>Lots of opportunity for blending in excellent text selections</p>	<p>texts</p> <p>Again more practice per lesson with modeled guided practice</p>
Reviewer #2	<p>Instruction in all areas is explicit and systematic. The different components are connected (i.e., PA instruction relates to phonics instruction)</p>	<p>Cumulative review of high-frequency words and vocabulary is lacking</p>
Reviewer #3	<p>All phonemic awareness skills introduced and developed with appropriate sequential lessons</p> <p>Good introduction of vocabulary and review</p>	<p>Review of high utility words not consistent between lessons.</p> <p>It was difficult to locate when new words other than HF words were introduced. Specific CUC instruction was difficult to locate.</p> <p>The assessment of high frequency (utility) words was given after little use or no review of the words.</p>
Reviewer #4	<p>Phonemic Awareness Instruction – strong</p> <p>Letter Sound Association – strong</p> <p>Decoding Instruction – 4/5 strong</p> <p>Irregular Words Instruction – adequate</p> <p>Vocabulary Instruction -- #1 Provides direct instruction of specific concepts and vocabulary</p> <p>Listening Comprehension – 3/4 meet or exceed</p>	<p>Decoding Instruction – #5: introduced regular words for which students know all letters</p> <p>Vocabulary Instruction – 2/3 do not meet criterion:</p> <p>#2: Provides repeated and multiple exposures to critical vocabulary</p> <p>#3: Integrates words into sentences and asks students to tell the meaning of the words in the sentence and to use it in a variety of contexts</p> <p>Listening Comprehension #2: Models and guides the students through story structure (e.g., setting), thinking out loud as the elements are being identified.</p> <p>Decoding Instruction #5: No evidence of vocabulary chosen and introduced based upon sounds student knew (Decodable books provided to practice.)</p> <p>Vocabulary Instruction #2: Very little or no review other</p>

		<p>than repeated readings of text</p> <p>#3: Students were never asked to explain the meaning of a word in the context of a sentence (It was part of the teacher explanation.) The students were not asked to use the words in a different context.</p> <p>Listening Comprehension #2: Elements of story structure were taught, but only mentioned 1-2 times at the beginning of the year and then mentioned again once mid-year or more at the end of the year.</p>
Reviewer #5	<p>Comprehension – this is highly concentrated on during instruction through various texts throughout the week and revisited throughout the year</p> <p>Phonics – letters introduced at beginning of year to end of year show progression of difficulty from /m/ at beginning to /q/ at end</p>	<p>Vocabulary instruction – words are not revisited and reviewed, only 1 word is presented each day, only some connections are made between words</p> <p>Overall instruction strategies do not vary but are repeated throughout the weeks in both large and small group instruction, i.e., vocabulary words L2-L4 explain, restate, show and L5 – Vocabulary Games</p>

Table 21
Summary of Evidence of Instructional Quality -- First Grade

	Evidence of <u>Sufficient</u> Instructional Quality	Evidence of <u>Insufficient</u> Instructional Quality
Reviewer #1	<p>Connected text and fluency instruction is a major strength</p> <p>Leveled readers provide opportunities for differentiation and exposure to both fiction and informational text</p> <p>Reading comprehension very strong – modeled, shared, guided – independent enhanced by selections</p>	<p>Phonemic awareness – both instruction and practice seems too brief particularly at the beginning of the year</p> <p>Phonics – while there is instruction and practice segmenting and blending, the majority of emphasis is on onset and rime (or word families)</p>
Reviewer #2	<p>Systematic and explicit instruction in decoding and comprehension strategies. Each skill/concept taught is reviewed thoroughly to assist students with</p>	<p>Lack of cumulative review of vocabulary and irregular words</p> <p>Similar to other grade levels, an organized scope and</p>

	<p>automaticity.</p> <p>Stories offer a great blend of fiction and non-fiction.</p> <p>High interest text available to students at each reading level.</p>	<p>sequence of skills presented would be helpful to show how each component of reading progresses.</p>
Reviewer #3	<p>The comprehension strategies were well-presented and review was given. The strategies were presented with various genres and examples.</p> <p>Time for student listening, modeling by teacher, and student discussion was evident in many sequenced lessons.</p>	<p>The high utility words introduction was only 1 lesson with little evidence that they were mentioned or used in text.</p> <p>The review of high utility words was not found in follow up lessons.</p> <p>Vocabulary words were introduced for each theme, however not many reviews or discussion of the specific words were found in follow up lessons.</p> <p>Passages for whole group lessons were not evidence except for decodable books.</p>
Reviewer #4	<p>All high priority items were of sufficient instructional quality: Phonemic Awareness + Phonics Instruction, Irregular Words Instruction, Connected Text and Fluency Instruction, Vocabulary Development, Reading Comprehension Instruction</p> <p>All discretionary items were of sufficient quality except for 2</p>	<p>Irregular Word Instruction #2: Points out irregularities while focusing student attention on all letters in word – no evidence found</p> <p>Vocabulary Instruction #1: Reviews previously taught vocabulary cumulatively – no evidence found</p>
Reviewer #5	<p>Comprehension remains a strong aspect of this program. A lot of time, 70 minutes, is allotted for this development.</p>	<p>In first grade, more than 20 minutes need to be allotted for phonemic/phonic skills.</p>

Table 22
Summary of Evidence of Instructional Quality -- Second Grade

	Evidence of <u>Sufficient</u> Instructional Quality	Evidence of <u>Insufficient</u> Instructional Quality
--	--	--

<p>Reviewer #1</p>	<p>At this grade level, phonics instruction seems appropriate for average-above. May not have enough for those below standard</p> <p>High-frequency / irregular word instruction fairly strong and consistent – excellent small group / independent texts to support</p> <p>Vocabulary instruction rich</p> <p>Reading fluency rubric and guided reading lessons to promote fluency good</p>	<p>Explicit direction and repeated practice with multi-syllabic words using prefixes and suffixes is limited</p> <p>Discretionary items scored low – many of which would support those with fewer skills</p> <p>Comprehension – would look for more whole class attention to conventions of expository text (of the basics – titles, chapter headings, etc.)</p> <p>Explicit strategies are not reinforced throughout 2nd grade level</p>
<p>Reviewer #2</p>	<p>Very thorough comprehension instruction that bridges whole group instruction to small group instruction.</p> <p>Systematic and explicit instruction in vocabulary, fluency, decoding, and comprehension.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Reviewer #3</p>	<p>The instruction of phonics skills was well developed and some practice was included.</p> <p>Only practice that was consistent was choral reading and use of decodable books</p> <p>Most comprehension strategies were introduced and reviewed from lesson to lesson</p>	<p>High utility word introduction was weak with not a great deal of review provided.</p> <p>Some high frequency words were not found on the HF standard word lists.</p> <p>Some comprehension strategies were not introduced to whole group but rather in small group. Not all students would receive some of the strategies because of that.</p> <p>The fluency instruction and assessment was not evident in the materials provided. Not seeing the on-line fluency component I was not able to evaluate the amount of time and quality of passages provided. This would hold true for all grade levels.</p>
<p>Reviewer #4</p>	<p>All high priority items had evidence of sufficient instructional quality except for 1</p> <p>Phonics Instruction – all met</p> <p>Irregular Word Instruction – all met</p>	

	<p>Vocabulary Instruction – all met except #2</p> <p>Passage Reading / Fluency Instruction – all met</p> <p>All discretionary items met except for two.</p> <p>Phonics Instruction – all met</p> <p>Irregular Words Instruction – all met but one</p> <p>Vocabulary Instruction – all met except one</p> <p>Passage Reading – Fluency instruction – all met</p> <p>Reading Comprehension – Comprehension instruction – all met</p>	
Reviewer #5	<p>There is some coordination between the text of small group instruction and the ability to decode words. This is important to include in order to build fluency.</p>	<p>Books available for fluency/reading instruction do not address students reading below grade level.</p>

Table 23
Summary of Evidence of Instructional Quality -- Third Grade

	Evidence of <u>Sufficient</u> Instructional Quality	Evidence of <u>Insufficient</u> Instructional Quality
Reviewer #1	<p>Vocabulary instruction at this level is strong with a variety of strategies development and practice opportunities</p> <p>Fluency instruction aided by leveled texts and variety of fiction and expository</p> <p>Comprehension organization is very well executed with great reinforcements / repetitions</p>	<p>Continue to see a weakness in explicit instruction of multi-syllabic words</p> <p>Practice with affixes does not begin early enough in 3rd grade level</p>
Reviewer #2	<p>Very strong comprehension strategy instruction that is explicit and progressive (modeled, shared, guided, and supportive for independence)</p> <p>Decoding and vocabulary instruction is very complete and supported in a wide variety of texts across varied</p>	n/a

	reading levels	
Reviewer #3	Comprehension strategies were well introduced and explicitly taught in sequential lessons.	Fluency – The amount of text for students to practice fluency was lacking, especially when phonic elements were introduced. There was a lack of readability material during whole group introduction of strategies. Reference material was mentioned only during one theme and no review.
Reviewer #4	Decoding and word recognition Vocabulary instruction – all but #1 Passage reading – fluency instruction Reading Comprehension instruction	
Reviewer #5	Specific to third grade-skills and text were better related. It was much easier to locate text with use of sourcebook.	Words used in phonic lessons are usually not found in fluency texts. Each different text contains unrelated words.

Table 24
Additional Comments Across Grade Levels Kindergarten through Third Grade

Reviewer #1	Both vocabulary instruction and comprehension very strong – difficult to track repetition and reinforcement along the course of the year, but rich modeled, shared, and guided lessons
Reviewer #2	A clearly defined scope and sequence for instruction would be helpful to teachers. The general overview lacks specificity. Scope and sequence overview lacks specificity as to when each skills/strategy is introduced, reinforced, practices, and assessed. These tools are very helpful to teachers.
Reviewer #3	Story structure seemed to be developed in the differentiated small groups. If some students did not advance through all levels they would not be introduced or review lessons on some strategies and story structure.

Reviewer #4	<p>Many things were strong in the program: the equal use of expository and narrative, the focus of the comprehension strategy strands, the whole group and small group instruction opportunities, the additional practice and support of the decodable books, the multiple strategies for locating and using letter/sound relationships, and of course the whole phonemic awareness strand.</p> <p>The second grade program reflects the same strengths and weaknesses of the K and 1st grades. It is strong in the direct explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension.</p> <p>The weakness is in vocabulary instruction and the instruction of high frequency words. There is no cumulative review of vocabulary beyond the story specific experience. There is no instructional plan for high frequency words or follow up practice. Often words were introduced as high frequency words that could not be found in any of the text reading occurring within the concurring lesson or theme framework.</p> <p>As in the previous levels the overall strengths of the program are decoding, fluency instruction (excellent instruction in small group leveled books for elements of prosody – great rubric), and direct explicit instruction of comprehension strategies. The weaker part of the program is that of vocabulary instruction.</p>
Reviewer #5	<p>So far I have found the set-up of this program to be very confusing. You must get different manuals and try to find the small group reading instruction connection to the whole class instruction. If I had a student who was above or below level, where are the skills connections for small group while keeping with the theme? Very confusing</p>

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of the 2008 review of the *Literacy by Design* program © 2008 clearly show that *Literacy by Design* provides effective instruction in early literacy in each of the five areas identified by the National Reading Panel as fundamental to early reading instruction:

- phonemic awareness,
- phonics,
- fluency,
- vocabulary, and
- reading comprehension.

By scoring the *Literacy by Design* program so highly across the various items within the *Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis*, reviewers have provided data to confirm that this new program provides and supports early literacy instruction that aligns with what scientifically based research has proved to be effective.

The *Literacy by Design* program was written to include a systematic, focused approach to instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency. This is evidenced by the consistently high levels of the percentage scores across the summary categories in these areas. As noted above, out of the 22 reporting categories in phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, and design features, the *Literacy by Design* program received 21 scores above 75%, the level indicated by the Oregon group as above satisfactory.

While a systematic emphasis on phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency, as demonstrated in the program scores in the categories above, is important, an emphasis on including motivating fiction and nonfiction books to engage early readers in teaching comprehension and vocabulary is also important. The results of the 2008 review suggest that the *Literacy by Design* program has accomplished this program goal. As noted above, out of the 36 items in Comprehension (high priority and discretionary), 21 received scores of 2.0 on the 2-point scale in the review of the *Literacy by Design* program. This quote from a reviewer speaks to this strength: "Stories offer a great blend of fiction and non-fiction. High interest text available to students at each reading level."

Overall the reviewers of the *Literacy by Design* program responded positively to the program, as evidenced by the scores provided above and by quotes like the following: “Instruction in all areas is explicit and systematic. The different components are connected” and “very thorough comprehension instruction that bridges whole group instruction to small group instruction in vocabulary, fluency, decoding, and comprehension.”