



**2002 Reading/Language
Arts/English Language
Development (RLA/ELD)
Adoption**

**Final Report
California State Board of Education
January 2002**

“A marvelous woman with a passion for life and education.”

Gayle Wilson, Former California First Lady



To

Kathryn Myrle Dronenburg

Born: May 20, 1946, Hayward, California
Died: March 9, 2002, El Cajon, California

Kathryn Myrle Dronenburg served on the State Board of Education from January 1990 to January 2001. She was extensively involved in the preparatory work that resulted in this historic adoption of reading, language arts, and English language development programs. Owing in great part to her leadership, the State of California has for the first time in its history adopted instructional materials in this vital subject area that:

- Ensure that every student receives a balanced, comprehensive, content-standards-aligned program that includes the foundational skills of phonemic awareness and systematic, explicit phonics in the early grades.
- Address in great depth the needs of students with disabilities, English learners, and students whose academic achievement is substantially below grade level.

A teacher, a parent, and a knowledgeable and inspirational contributor to public education in California, Mrs. Dronenburg championed the cause of improving instruction in reading and mathematics. She was a tireless advocate for the rights of disabled students to a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. She was a leader in the development of California's first English language development standards. She believed – genuinely and wholeheartedly – in the ability of all students to achieve at high levels no matter what challenges they might confront.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
BACKGROUND	3
ADOPTION PROCESS.....	4
PROGRAMS ADOPTED AND REJECTED.....	7
SPECIAL ISSUES.....	9
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	10

REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS

Basic RLA/ELD Programs - Adopted

• Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, <i>The Reader’s Choice</i> , Grades 6-8.....	18
• Holt, Rinehart and Winston, <i>Literature and Language Arts</i> , Grades 6-8.....	19
• Houghton Mifflin Company, <i>Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy</i> , Grades K-6.....	20
• McDougal Littell, <i>McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program</i> , Grades 6-8.....	21
• Prentice Hall, <i>Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes</i> , Grades 6-8.....	22
• SRA/McGraw-Hill, <i>SRA/Open Court Reading</i> , Grades K-6.....	23

Basic RLA/ELD Programs - Rejected

○ Harcourt School Publishers, <i>Trophies</i> , Grades K-6.....	24
○ Metropolitan Teaching & Learning Co., <i>The Metro Early Reading Program</i> , Grades K-2.....	25
○ Pearson Education, Inc. – Electronic Education, <i>Waterford Early Reading Program</i> , Grades K-2.....	26

Reading Intervention Programs for Students in Grades 4-8 - Adopted

• Glencoe/McGraw-Hill (Sopris West), <i>Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum</i> , Grades 4-8.....	27
• Hampton Brown, <i>High Point</i> , Grades 4-8.....	28
• Scholastic, <i>READ 180</i> , Grades 4-8.....	29
• SRA/McGraw-Hill, <i>SRA/Reach Program</i> , Grades 4-8.....	30
• Wright Group/McGraw-Hill, <i>Fast Track Reading Program</i> , Grades 4-8.....	31

Reading Intervention Programs for Students in Grades 4-8 - Rejected

- Prentice Hall, *Prentice Hall Reading Intervention System*, Grades 4-832
- Rhoades & Associates, *Rhoades to Reading*, Grades 4-8.....33

Reading Intervention Programs for English Learners for Grades 4-8 - Adopted

- Hampton Brown, *High Point*, Grades 4-834

Reading Intervention Programs for English Learners for Grades 4-8 - Rejected

- Heinle & Heinle, *Launch Into Reading*, Grades 6-8.....35
- Meta Learning Systems, Inc., *MetaPhonics Language Arts ELD Intervention Program*, Grades 4-836
- Pearson Education, *Scott Foresman Accelerating English Language Learning Program*, Grades 4-837

Primary Language Programs - Rejected

- Harcourt School Publishers, *Trofeos*, Grades K-6.....38

APPENDIX A – 2002 Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development
Evaluation Criteria

APPENDIX B – List of Learning Resource Display Centers

INTRODUCTION

At its January 2002 meeting, the State Board of Education (State Board) completed the 2002 Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development (RLA/ELD) Adoption. The overall results were:

- Basic RLA-ELD Programs: six adopted, and three rejected.
- Reading Intervention Programs for Students in Grades 4-8: five adopted, and two rejected.
- Reading Intervention Programs for English Learners in Grades 4-8: one adopted, and three rejected.
- Primary Language Programs: the one program submitted was rejected.

The adopted programs are anticipated to remain available for purchase with restricted state funds through June 30, 2008. One follow-up RLA/ELD adoption (based upon the same evaluation criteria) is anticipated in 2004 or 2005; any programs submitted and found to meet the evaluation criteria at that time will be added to the adoption list.

BACKGROUND

The 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption is a significant event in California's major effort to improve student achievement in this core subject area. This effort can be traced back to the November 1997 adoption of the *English-Language Arts Content Standards*. These grade-level-specific content standards set the foundation for the development and subsequent State Board approval of the *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* in 1998 (published by California Department of Education, 1999). The standards and framework together reflect a consensus on the approach and practice of reading/language arts/English language development instruction for California's public school students.

The 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption is the fourth in a series of four core subject, primary instructional materials adoptions required by Assembly Bill 2519 (Chapter 481, Statutes of 1998). AB 2519 specified that basic reading/language arts materials be adopted by March 2002, and that evaluation criteria for those materials be approved at least 18 months earlier. The State Board took action in March 2000 to accelerate the adoption timeline from March 2002 to January 2002 to provide additional time for districts and schools to pilot materials in the spring and summer of 2002. By approving the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* in December 1998 and the evaluation criteria (see Appendix A) in December 1999, and then adopting instructional materials in January 2002, the State Board fulfilled its statutory obligations.

The Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission (Curriculum Commission) recommends and the State Board traditionally adopts basic RLA/ELD instructional materials, as defined in *Education Code* section 60010(a). Basic programs are designed for use by students as the principal learning resource that meets in content and organization the basic requirements of the intended course. Typically, a course covers one academic school year. Supplemental materials (covering less than an entire course) were not considered within this

adoption. Seventeen meetings of the Curriculum Commission's RLA/ELD Subject Matter Committee (SMC), as well as public hearings by the Curriculum Commission and the State Board, were held in the process of developing and adopting the evaluation criteria. There was a subsequent special meeting held in February 2000 to provide additional clarity to publishers regarding the evaluation criteria.

As noted above, this adoption included four types of programs: (1) Basic RLA/ELD Programs that may include any combination of kindergarten through grade 8; (2) Reading Intervention Programs for students in Grades 4-8, (3) Reading Intervention Programs for English Learners in Grades 4-8, and (4) Primary Language Programs (i.e., basic RLA/ELD programs in languages other than English) that may include any combination of kindergarten through grade 8.

ADOPTION PROCESS

PUBLISHERS' INVITATION TO SUBMIT MEETING

An Invitation to Submit (ITS) Meeting was held in March 2001. The ITS meeting invited the publishing community to consider participation in the 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption and provided publishers with guidelines and necessary technical information needed for their participation. More than one hundred individuals (representing 35 publishing companies) attended the meeting.

CRP/IMAP APPOINTMENT AND TRAINING

In preparing recommendations to forward to the State Board, the members of the Curriculum Commission were assisted by a number of volunteers who composed the Content Review Panels/Instructional Materials Advisory Panels (CRPs/IMAPs). CRPs and IMAPs were appointed by the State Board with the advice of the Curriculum Commission in February 2001. The Curriculum Framework and Instructional Resources (CFIR) Division staff assisted the Curriculum Commission in its training of reviewers for the 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption. The nine CRP/IMAP teams were comprised of 103 members, including classroom teachers, school administrators, local board members, and parents (guardians).

The IMAP and CRP members participated in professional development training sessions that included the *English-Language Arts Content Standards*, the *Reading/Language Arts Framework*, the State Board-approved evaluation criteria, and the adoption process. The training and deliberations included formal presentations and question-and-answer sessions by publishers on each of the 21 submitted programs.

CRP/IMAP REVIEW AND ADVISORY RECOMMENDATIONS

During August 2001, CRP/IMAP members and Curriculum Commission members received complete sets of instructional materials that were assigned to each panel to review and evaluate according to the criteria. Panelists conducted their independent reviews of the materials during the balance of August, all of September, and through mid-October.

During the week of October 14-19, 2001, the CRPs and IMAPs met in Sacramento for deliberations. All members shared the notes and citations they had developed during their independent reviews of the materials. The CRP/IMAP members met in their assigned panels for most of the week, with a member of the Curriculum Commission acting as a group facilitator with support from the CFIR Division staff (and, in some cases, staff from other offices). Publishers were provided time to respond to formal questions developed by the CRP/IMAP members.

The deliberation process and training session were conducted in accordance with the *Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act*. Various publisher representatives and interested members of the public attended the panel discussions. At announced times each day, deliberations would pause to provide an opportunity for public comment.

The CRPs/IMAPs worked collaboratively during deliberations week to produce a completed, joint CRP/IMAP Advisory Report for each program with the following sections: Program Summary, Recommendation, Alignment with the *English-Language Arts Content Standards*, Program Organization, Assessment, Universal Access, Instructional Planning and Support, and (optionally) Other Comments. The reports included citations that were exemplary (not exhaustive) of the panels' findings and recommendations. The advice of the CRPs/IMAPs was considered by the Curriculum Commission in conjunction with other information in determining whether the individual programs submitted by publishers satisfied (or did not satisfy) the evaluation criteria and applicable provisions of law. The advice of the CRPs/IMAPs was also shared with the State Board, along with the Curriculum Commission's specific recommendation on each program.

LEGAL AND SOCIAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW

All instructional materials were reviewed November 2-4, 2001, to ensure that they meet the standards contained in *Education Code* sections 60040-60045, 60048, 60200 and State Board policy as outlined in the *Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content*. These standards address such areas as the accurate portrayal of cultural and racial diversity, equitable and positive roles for males, females, disabled people, ethnic and cultural groups, and the elderly. This was the second adoption to implement the provisions of AB 116 (Chapter 276, Statutes of 1999) that prohibits (with certain exceptions) the inclusion of commercial brand names, specific commercial product references, or corporate or company logos in adopted instructional materials.

Thirty-nine volunteers from around the state were selected to review the 21 submitted programs. There were 104 citations found in the submitted materials. In most cases, the affected publishers agreed to make minor revisions to their programs to resolve the citations. A few citations were appealed, some being sustained and some being overturned.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND REVIEW

Instructional materials submitted for adoption were displayed for public review and comment, beginning in August 2001, at 24 Learning Resources Display Centers (LRDCs) throughout the

state (see Appendix B). The general public was given an opportunity to provide written comments. Public hearings were held by the Curriculum Commission (prior to making its recommendations) and by the State Board (prior to taking action to complete the adoption process).

CURRICULUM COMMISSION REVIEW AND DELIBERATIONS

On November 16, 2001, the members of the Curriculum Commission reviewed all of the CRP/IMAP Advisory Reports. During the RLA/ELD Subject Matter Committee (SMC) Meeting, each program was discussed in-depth, covering the review of minor edits and corrections as recommended by the CRP/IMAP Advisory Report and individual Commissioners who had conducted their own independent reviews of the programs. After the discussion at the SMC level, each program submission received a roll-call vote. The motion was stated in the affirmative. A majority vote from the SMC was required for any program to be recommended.

After receipt of the SMC report at the full Commission level, there was further discussion. Following this discussion, the Commission Chair proceeded to ask for a motion and a second on each program submission. Again, the motion was stated in the affirmative; there was a final roll-call vote for each program. At both levels, the recommendations were either (1) to recommend or (2) to recommend with minor edits and corrections. At the full Commission level, the affirmative votes of nine members were required to approve a recommendation. The Curriculum Commission's recommendations were presented to the State Board in December 2001 for information, then in January 2002 for action.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTIONS

On January 9, 2002, following a public hearing, the State Board took the following actions:

- Adopted and rejected the RLA/ELD instructional materials submissions in accordance with the recommendations of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission.
- Approved as the specific written explanation of the reasons for rejecting each of the submission not adopted that the State Board found the submission did not adequately meet the criteria for adoption, taking into account the totality of the information received, in accordance with *Education Code* section 60200(d).
- Approved the Curriculum Commission's report (amended as appropriate) as the final report of the 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption.
- Found that fewer than five submissions meet the criteria for adoption for kindergarten and grades one and two, and accepted the review conducted by the Curriculum Commission and CDE staff of the degree to which the criteria and procedures used to evaluate the submitted materials were consistent with the State Board's adopted curriculum framework, in accordance with *Education Code* section 60200(e)(2). [See below.]

EDITS MEETING

On November 29, 2001, the publishers' Edits and Corrections Meeting was held, presided over by the Curriculum Commission Chair and the Chair of the Commission's RLA/ELD Subject Matter Committee. Six programs were recommended by the Curriculum Commission (and subsequently adopted by the State Board) with minor edits and/or corrections (as defined by the State Board's *Edits and Corrections Policy*). The recommended edits did not affect program content. At this meeting, publishers were required to present how they would address the edits and corrections as recommended by the Curriculum Commission and how it would look in the final print format. A memorandum memorializing the meeting and confirming agreements regarding edits and corrections was sent to each affected publisher. Publishers whose programs were adopted by the State Board were required to complete all edits and corrections recommended by the Curriculum Commission between March 15 and May 15, 2002.

PUBLISHERS' RESPONSIBILITIES IF ADOPTED

According to the provisions of *Education Code* sections 60061 and 60061.5 (and relevant provisions of Title 5 of the *California Code Of Regulations*), publishers are required to comply with "most favored nation" provisions that (in effect) ensure that publishers furnish the instructional materials to every school district in California at the lowest price offered to any purchaser elsewhere in the nation. In addition, publishers are required to fill textbook orders within 60 days of the date of a submitted purchase order. Should the publisher or manufacturer fail to deliver instructional materials within 60 days of the receipt of a purchase order from a school district, the school district may assess as damages an amount up to five hundred dollars for each working day the order is delayed beyond 60 calendar days.

PROGRAMS ADOPTED AND REJECTED

Basic RLA/ELD Programs - Adopted

- Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, *The Reader's Choice*, Grades 6-8*
- Holt, Rinehart and Winston, *Literature and Language Arts*, Grades 6-8
- Houghton Mifflin Company, *Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy*, Grades K-6*
- McDougal Littell, *McDougal Littell Reading & Language Arts Program*, Grades 6-8*
- Prentice Hall, *Prentice Hall Literature: Timeless Voices, Timeless Themes*, Grades 6-8*
- SRA/McGraw-Hill, *SRA/Open Court Reading*, Grades K-6*

* Adopted with minor edits and corrections.

Basic RLA/ELD Programs - Rejected

- Harcourt School Publishers, *Trophies*, Grades K-6.
- Metropolitan Teaching & Learning Company, *The Metro Early Reading Program*, Grades K-2.
- Pearson Education, Inc. – Electronic Education, *Waterford Early Reading Program*, Grades K-2.

Reading Intervention Programs for Students in Grades 4-8 - Adopted

- Glencoe McGraw-Hill (Sopris West), *Language! A Literacy Intervention Curriculum*, Grades 4-8*
 - Hampton Brown, *High Point*, Grades 4-8*
 - Scholastic, *READ 180*, Grades 4-8
 - SRA/McGraw-Hill, *SRA/Reach Program*, Grades 4-8
 - Wright Group/McGraw Hill, *Fast Track Reading Program*, Grades 4-8
- * Adopted with minor edits and corrections.

Reading Intervention Programs for Students in Grades 4-8 - Rejected

- Prentice Hall, *Prentice Hall Reading Intervention System*, Grades 4-8
- Rhoades & Associates, *Rhoades to Reading*, Grades 4-8

Reading Intervention Programs for English Learners in Grades 4-8 - Adopted

- Hampton Brown, *High Point*, Grades 4-8*
- * Adopted with minor edits and corrections.

Reading Intervention Programs for English Learners in Grades 4-8 - Rejected

- Heinle & Heinle, *Launch Into Reading*, Grades 6-8
- Meta Learning Systems, Inc., *MetaPhonics Language Arts ELD Intervention Program*, Grades 4-8
- Pearson Education, *Scott Foresman Accelerating English Language Learning Program*, Grades 4-8.

Primary Language Programs - Rejected

- Harcourt School Publishers, *Trofeos*, Grades K-6.

SPECIAL ISSUES

FOCUS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS

In this 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption, all publishers were asked to provide additional instructional materials for English learners. The purpose of these additions to the submitted program is to ensure that all students will participate successfully in the basic reading/language arts program and will achieve mastery of the English-language arts standards. The instructional materials submitted as basic programs include teacher and pupil English language development support materials for English learners of approximately 30 to 45 minutes each day to be used *in addition and connected to* the basic instruction in the regular classroom.

Publishers were also asked to submit reading intervention programs that would provide intensive instruction for students in grades four and above who are at the beginning through intermediate levels of English proficiency and who may have little prior schooling or limited literacy (estimated two- to three-hour comprehensive program). The materials must incorporate the elements for English language development and be designed so that the intensive, accelerated, and extensive English language development complements and supports literacy instruction.

In addition, publishers were asked to develop comprehensive programs of reading/language arts in the key languages of the state for those students on waiver as defined by Proposition 227. These Primary Language Programs would parallel the English-language arts programs and would be aligned with the *English-Language Arts Content Standards* and the *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* with appropriate modifications for the primary language. The Primary Language Programs were to be designed to transition students to English and to include all the same components as English-language arts programs.

RLA/ELD EVALUATION CRITERIA APPROVED

The evaluation criteria used for this adoption were approved by the State Board in December 1999. They were based on the *English-Language Arts Content Standards* and the *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools*. Chapter 9 of the *Reading/Language Arts Framework* focuses on the "Development and Evaluation of Instructional Materials." The chapter emphasizes that instructional materials should thoughtfully and logically address the development of skills and knowledge that should be built throughout the grade levels. The State Board-adopted evaluation criteria reflect and extended these principles.

HISTORY-SOCIAL SCIENCE, SCIENCE, AND MATHEMATICS CONTENT STANDARDS IN RLA/ELD MATERIALS

The RLA/ELD Evaluation Criteria specifically require the inclusion of other core content standards, when appropriate, in the submitted instructional materials. These standards, when included, must be accurate and consistent. In Criteria Category 1 (Alignment with *English-Language Arts Content Standards*), the criteria state that "informational text to support standards in reading comprehension and writing applications is included for all grades. When included, informational text addressing topics in history-social science, science, and mathematics is

accurate and consistent with grade-level standards." In addition, in Criteria Category 2 (Program Organization), the criteria state, "in order to protect language arts instructional time, those K-3 content standards in history-social science and science that lend themselves to instruction during the language arts time period are addressed within the language arts materials, particularly in the selection of expository texts that are read to students, or that students read."

FEWER THAN FIVE BASIC PROGRAMS RECOMMENDED AND ADOPTED

Fewer than five basic instructional materials programs in reading/language arts/English language development were recommended by the Curriculum Commission and adopted by the State Board for kindergarten and for grades one through five, seven, and eight. In accordance with *Education Code* section 60200(e)(1), adoption of fewer than five was permitted at grades three, four, five, seven, and eight, because fewer than five programs were submitted. With respect to kindergarten and grades one and two, the Curriculum Commission and CDE staff conducted a review and concluded:

- (1) It was the rigor and specificity of the evaluation criteria in addition to the content standards and *Reading/Language Arts Framework* that resulted in fewer than five basic instructional programs in reading/language arts/English language development being recommended for adoption.
- (2) Overall, the rejected programs failed to meet the evaluation criteria, although positive comments were made about some aspects of them in the review process.
- (3) In the review process, the evaluation criteria were applied fairly and consistently to each program.

The State Board approved the review and conclusions in accordance with the requirements of *Education Code* section 60200(e)(2) for these grade levels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The State Board of Education commends and extends sincere appreciation to the following individuals for the leadership they provided throughout the planning and implementation of the 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption:

Marilyn Astore, Chair, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001; (Retired) Assistant Superintendent, Sacramento County Office of Education

Patrice Abarca, Chair, Curriculum Commission, 2001; Teacher, Los Angeles Unified School District

Marion Joseph, State Board of Education Member and Liaison to the Curriculum Commission

The State Board of Education commends and extends sincere appreciation to other members of the Curriculum Commission who provided leadership in conducting the 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption:

Roy Anthony, Chair, Visual Performing Arts Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Teacher, Grossmont Union High School District

Catherine Banker, Member, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Consultant, Mt. Baldy, California

Mary Coronado, Member, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Teacher, Sacramento City Unified School District

Edith Crawford, Member, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Vice Principal, Mira Loma High School, San Juan Unified School District

Milissa Glen-Lambert, Member, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Teacher, Los Angeles Unified School District

Lora L. Griffin, Vice Chair, Visual Performing Arts Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Retired Educator, Sacramento City Unified School District

Viken "Vik" Hovsepian, Chair, Mathematics Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Teacher, Hoover Senior High School, Glendale USD

Veronica Norris, Chair, Health Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Attorney at Law

Janet Philibosian, Vice Chair, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001

Leslie Schwarze, Member, Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Trustee, Novato Unified School District

Richard Schwartz, Chair, Science Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Teacher, Torrance Unified School District

Susan Stickel, Vice Chair, Curriculum Commission, 2001; Assistant Superintendent, Elk Grove Unified School District

Karen Yamamoto, Chair, History-Social Science Subject Matter Committee, 2001; Teacher, Washington Unified School

Special thanks are extended to the following State Board members for their leadership in the adoption process:

Reed Hastings State Board of Education President (2001 and 2002)

Nancy Ichinaga, State Board of Education Member and Liaison to the Curriculum Commission

Special thanks are extended to the following State Board staff for their support in the adoption process:

Deborah Franklin, Education Programs Consultant

Greg Geeting, Assistant Executive Director

The State Board of Education commends and extends sincere appreciation to:

Content Review Panel (CRP) members for their expertise in reading/language arts/English language development and helping to ensure that the instructional materials adopted were accurate and based on current and confirmed research:

Arturo Abarca, Teacher – Los Angeles Unified School District

Vicki Alterwitz, Director of Secondary Schools Reading Intervention Program - Sacramento County Office of Education

Norma Baker, Ed.D., Principal - Inglewood Unified School District

Lynn Carlisle, Assistant Superintendent - Marysville Joint Unified School District

Cheryl Cartin, Curriculum Specialist - Elk Grove Unified School District

Kathleen Cooper, Administrator, Reading Support Center - Sacramento City Unified School District

Vonnie DiCecco, Ph.D., Education Specialist - California Department of Education

Marco Dominguez, Ph.D., Professor of Spanish – Los Angeles Community College District

Elizabeth Eaves, English Language Arts Coordinator, UC Office of the President

Alice Furry, Ph.D., Director, Reading Lions Project - Sacramento County Office of Education

Karen Hayashi, Elementary Reading Specialist Coordinator - Elk Grove Unified School District

Folasade Oladele, Ed.D., Administrator - Oakland Unified School District

Lynda Peddy, Director of California Reading and Literature Project - CSU Sacramento

Marjorie Thompson, Retired Principal

Dale Webster, Mentor Teacher – Los Angeles Unified School District

Nancy White, Ed.D., Special Education Teacher - San Francisco Unified School District & Director of Slingerland Multi-Sensory Structured Language Course

Joyce Wright, Ed.D., Director of Elementary & Middle School Programs & Reading Intervention – Sacramento County Office of Education

Sonja Yates, Ed.D., Superintendent - Central School District

Instructional Materials Advisory Panel (IMAP) members for their knowledge, commitment, and leadership in the evaluation of Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development instructional materials submitted for adoption:

Christine Ahearn, Teacher - Manhattan Beach Unified School District

Rene Amy, Business Owner - Amiable Construction

Marla Armstrong, Teacher - Long Beach Unified School District

Eric Arnett, Reading Coach/Teacher - Sacramento City Unified School District

Meagan Azevedo, Reading/Language Arts Coordinator - Santa Clara County Office of Education

Linda Bastrire, Teacher - Visalia Unified School District

Elizabeth Burr, Principal/Reading Coordinator - Curtis Creek School District

William Carlson, School Board Member - Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District

Carlos Carrasco, Slingerland Tutor - Hope's Door Institute for Stuttering Acceptance

Emily Clark-Vivier, Teacher - Dixon Unified School District

Gayle Cloud, Board Member - Riverside Unified School District

Trudy Cowan, Teacher - Ontario-Montclair School District

Marla Deutsch, Resource Specialist - Sunnyvale School District

Ann Edwards, Teacher - Chino Valley Unified School District

Betty Flanary, Curriculum Specialist - Sacramento County Office of Education

Marian Fogle, Teacher – Los Angeles Unified School District

Lolita Foster, Teacher - Evergreen School District

Nancy Fradin, Educator - Los Angeles Unified School District

Kendra Frerich, Teacher - Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District

Anaissa Gini, Director of Primary Language Development Program - UC San Diego California Reading and Literature Project

Kelley Green, Program Coordinator - Inglewood Unified School District

Ruth Green, Board of Education Member, Santa Barbara Elementary & High School District

Marvilene Hagopian, Executive Assistant – Sacramento County Office of Education

Kerry Hamill, Board of Education Member - Oakland Unified School District

Marlena Hebern, Teacher - Mariposa County Unified School District

Colleen Hinman, Parent

Carrie Huckell, Teacher - Santee School District

Myron Jantzen, Associate Director, California Reading and Literature Project Reading - CSU Sacramento

Brenda Jefferson, Reading Specialist – Los Angeles County Office of Education

Staci Kaelin, Special Projects Coordinator - Gridley Unified School District

Victoria Kelly, SELPA Program Specialist - San Luis Obispo County Schools

Lori Kissinger, Miller-Unruh Reading Specialist - Conejo Valley Unified School District

Mary Kortbein, Literacy Coach - Rincon Valley Unified School District

Linda LaMarre, Superintendent - Curtis Creek School District

Jeffery Lee, Executive Director - Alliance for Quality Education

Christine Lewy, Reading/Language Arts Program Specialist - Bakersfield City School District

Gwen Locke, Literacy Coach - Fremont Unified School District

Deanne Loewen, Teacher - Bakersfield City School District

Laura Lofgren, Reading Coach - North Sacramento School District

Charlotte Lowell, School Board Member – Palo Alto Unified School District

Robin Lund, Curriculum Specialist, Elementary & Middle School Programs – Sacramento County Office of Education

Julie Maravilla, Mentor Teacher - Los Angeles Unified School District

Debbie Martinez, Teacher - Garden Grove Unified

Cheryl Melton, Regional Reading Specialist - Long Beach Unified School District

Marsha Memmott, Teacher - Turlock Joint Elementary School District

Luis Montoya, Bilingual Coordinator – Los Angeles Unified School District

Diane Moresi, Assistant Superintendent - Rincon Valley Unified School District

Edy Mourtos, Regional Director, California Reading and Literature Project - San Jose State University

Diane Mugford, Teacher - Novato Unified School District

Simma Nemeth, Teacher - Redlands Unified School District

Pamela Nevills, PhD., Program Manager/Regional Services - San Bernardino County Office of Education

Ramona Ohlin, Teacher - San Diego Unified School District

Doris Pacheco, Gifted Education Consultant

Man Lai Peckham, Assistant Principal - Poway Unified School District

William Penick, Retired - United States Navy

Judith Perlis, Teacher – Los Angeles Unified School District

Alta Ray, Reading Program Expert - Los Angeles Unified School District
Dorothy Riley, Retired Teacher
Helen Rockett, Ph.D., Literacy Trainer - Chino Valley Unified School District
Jose Rodriguez, Teacher - Los Angeles Unified School District
Clarisa Rojas, Co-Executive Director California Reading and Literature Project, UC San Diego
Carlotta Ruiz, Reading Coach - North Sacramento School District
Luz Salazar, SB395 Trainer – California Teachers Association
Larelyn Sartini, Elementary Reading Specialist - Elk Grove Unified School District
Michele Schutt, Teacher - Los Angeles Unified School District
Paula Silver, Teacher – Los Angeles Unified School District
Sheila Sims, Curriculum Coach - Oakland Unified School District
Susan Smith, Elementary Language Arts Coordinator - San Diego County Office of Education
Marilyn Steele, Associate Director California Reading and Literature Project – UCLA
Connie Tate, Literacy Consultant - Stanislaus County Office of Education
Janis Thompson, Staff Development/Curriculum Literacy Coach - Rincon Valley Unified School District
Jane Timberlake, Music Specialist
Deborah Tjerrild, Miller-Unruh Reading Specialist - Gonzales Unified School District
Gay Todd, Ed.D., Director: Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment - Marysville Joint Unified School District
Linda Toren, Associate Director California Reading and Literature Project - CSU Sacramento
Suzanne Unguez Grady, Teacher - Gonzales Unified School District
Karen Valdes, Reading Coordinator - Riverside County Office of Education
Cecille Valoria, ELL Teacher - Center Unified School District
Marta Waisman, Teacher & Consultant - San Dieguito Union High School District
Tonya Walls, Curriculum Coach - Oakland Unified School District
Anne White, Board of Trustees Member - Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District
Darby Williams, Executive Director Capital Region Professional Development Center - Sacramento County Office of Education
Donna Wilmot, Teacher - Standard School District
Kathy Wilson, Curriculum Coach - Oakland Unified School District
Jean Wilson, Teacher - Long Beach Unified School District
Kristin Wing, Literacy Consultant - Stanislaus County Office of Education

The State Board of Education commends and extends sincere appreciation to the following individuals who provided the training for the CRP/IMAP members:

Dr. Alice Furry, Director, Reading Lions Center

B.J. Thorsnes, Curriculum Specialist, San Francisco State University

Dr. Robin Scarcella, Professor and Linguist, University of California, Irvine

The State Board of Education commends and extends sincere appreciation to the following staff of the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division for their tireless support throughout the adoption process.

Sherry Skelly Griffith, Director, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division

Suzanne Rios, Administrator, Instructional Resources Unit

Sandi Adams-Jones, Staff Manager I and Department-Publisher Liaison

Deborah Keys, Lead Consultant

Special thanks are extended to the following staff of the Standards and Assessment Division who reviewed the programs to ensure that they conformed to the State Board's *Policy on Preparation for State Tests and the Standardized Testing and Reporting System (STAR)* and the provisions of *Education Code* section 60611:

Paul Michelson, Consultant

Special thanks are also extended to the following staff of the California Department of Education staff for their ongoing efforts to improve instructional materials for students and for their particular support of this adoption process:

Leslie Fausset, Chief Deputy Superintendent for Policy and Programs

Scott Hill, Chief Deputy Superintendent for Accountability and Administration

Joanne Mendoza Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Branch

Thomas Adams, Administrator, Curriculum Frameworks Unit

Jeanne James, Consultant

Christopher Dowell, Consultant

Tom Akin, Consultant

Stacy Sinclair, Consultant

Kathleen Jacobsen, Consultant

Olga Uribe, Consultant

Martha Rowland, Consultant

Richard Alford, Staff Services Analyst

Ken McDonald, Staff Services Analyst

Christine Bridges, Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Larry Dunn, Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Jennifer Harrison, Adoption Support

Belen Mercado, Staff Services Analyst

Teri Ollis, Staff Services Analyst

Nancy Plasencia, Staff Services Analyst

Lino Vicente, Staff Services Analyst

Marie Wilkerson, Adoption Support

Richard Munyer, Adoption Support

Terri Yan, Executive Secretary

Tracie Yee, Staff Services Analyst

Finally, the State Board of Education commends and extends sincere appreciation to the publishers of instructional resources that participated in the 2002 RLA/ELD Adoption.

**2002 K-8 READING/LANGUAGE ARTS/
ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT ADOPTION CRITERIA
(Adopted by the State Board of Education on December 8, 1999)**

INTRODUCTION

Since 1997, California has adopted critical elements of a comprehensive system for reading and language arts. This system includes State Board of Education approved content standards, a framework, and a statewide assessment system. The *English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools* and the *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* provide the basic foundation for the design of instructional materials. All students, including students with special needs, will be tested on mastery of the English-language arts content standards in the statewide testing program. The testing program includes STAR (SAT9 and Standards Based Test), a high school exit exam (in development) and an English Language Development Test (in development). All students will be required to take the first two exams, and English learners will be required, in addition, to take the English Language Development Test.

All students must have equal opportunities to master these standards and equal opportunities to perform well on the assessments. California is moving toward a system where instructional materials are designed to ensure that: 1) virtually every student participates in the regular classroom and has access to the basic curriculum; and 2) teachers are provided with the support they need to ensure that all students succeed.

The diversity of California's student population demands a unique design for instructional materials. All students should fully participate in a basic reading/language arts program of one to two and one half hours in length, utilizing comprehensive instructional materials that address all of the language arts content standards for each grade level in a coherent fashion. The instructional materials should thoughtfully and logically address the development of skills and knowledge within the strands that build through the grade levels. Instructional materials that are designed in this way will be a key element in ensuring that students are prepared to pass the required assessments.

The basic reading/language arts program should utilize instructional materials that are designed to foster universal access, which means access for all students. These materials would include specific suggestions, in the teacher's edition, for providing universal access to the curriculum as well as standards-based extensions of the curriculum for advanced students. Instructional materials should describe specific ways for the teacher to address the learning needs of all students and thereby ensure access for all students to the basic grade-level materials and instruction. Instructional materials for the basic reading/language arts program should be developed for the following minimal daily time periods: one hour at kindergarten; two and a half hours at grades one through three; two hours at the upper elementary grades (grades four through

five or six); and at least one and up to two hours at the intermediate grades (grades six or seven and eight).

In addition to the basic program, some students will need extra assistance to successfully complete grade-level content. All publishers are asked to provide additional instructional materials for special populations of students. The purpose of these additions to the program is to ensure that students will participate successfully in the basic reading/language arts program and will achieve mastery of the English-language arts standards. These materials would include 1) teacher and pupil English language development support materials for English learners of approximately 30 to 45 minutes each day to be used *in addition and connected to* the basic instruction in the regular classroom; 2) teacher and pupil special education support materials for special education pupils of approximately 30 to 45 minutes each day to be used *in addition and connected to* the basic instruction in the regular classroom.

Publishers are also encouraged to provide instructional materials for three special populations of students (students in grades four through eight whose reading achievement is significantly below grade level, English learners in grades four through eight who are at the beginning through intermediate levels of English proficiency, and students studying in languages other than English) as described in the box below. Required and optional program components are noted below. By providing teachers with the tools to organize instruction around the needs of learners and supplying teachers with the appropriate instructional materials their students need, California can maximize the chances that each student will have the opportunity to learn the skills and knowledge embodied in the standards.

This document provides criteria for evaluating reading/language arts instructional materials in five categories: (1) alignment with the content in the *English-Language Arts Content Standards*; (2) program organization; (3) assessment; (4) universal access; (5) instructional planning and support. Instructional materials in reading language arts must support teaching that is aligned with the standards and the framework. Materials that fail to meet the content criteria in category 1 will not be considered satisfactory for adoption. Within category 4, universal access, some criteria are optional and some are required. The criteria in categories 2 through 5 will be considered holistically. In addition to the five categories, all instructional materials must meet all applicable requirements contained in codes and regulations, including Education Code sections 60040, 60041, 60042, and 60044, and applicable sections of the Title 5 Regulations.

Required components

All publishers must design basic reading/language arts instructional materials that incorporate principles of universal access for the following minimal daily time periods:

- ◆ 1 hour in kindergarten
- ◆ 2.5 hours in grades 1-3
- ◆ 2 hours in grades 4-5/6
- ◆ 1, 1.5 or 2 hours in grades 6/7-8

In addition, all publishers must design two additional supporting components that reinforce and extend the basic program:

- ◆ 30-45 minutes for English learners
- ◆ 30-45 minutes for special education pupils

Optional programs

- ◆ Publishers may choose to provide a comprehensive, intensive, accelerated reading/language arts program designed for students in grades four through eight whose reading achievement is significantly below grade level.
- ◆ Publishers may choose to develop a comprehensive language arts program designed specifically for English learners in grades four through eight whose proficiency in English is at the beginning through intermediate levels. These programs would be designed to accelerate the learning of English and would address all of the English-language arts content standards by grade level.
- ◆ Publishers may choose to provide a language arts program in languages other than English for those students on waiver, provided those programs are comprehensive, systematic, and are designed to transition students successfully to English. These programs must be consistent with the content of the *Reading/Language Arts Framework*.

Criteria Category 1: Alignment with English-Language Arts Content Standards

- ◆ Instructional materials as defined in Education Code Section 60010 (h) provide instruction designed to ensure that students master each of the *English-Language Arts Content Standards*.
- ◆ Instructional materials reflect and incorporate the content of the *Reading/Language Arts Framework*.
- ◆ Instruction reflects current and confirmed research in reading/language arts instruction.
- ◆ Standards that require extensive teaching and are clear prerequisites for later standards are afforded sufficient instructional time.
- ◆ Careful attention is given in the early grades, and in the optional intensive reading/language arts programs, to the standards for early reading and the importance of the alphabetic writing system.
- ◆ The basic reading/language arts curriculum in kindergarten through grade three provides explicit, sequential, logical, systematic instruction and diagnostic support in:
 - ✓ Phonemic awareness (through grade one)
 - ✓ Phonics
 - ✓ Decoding
 - ✓ Word-attack skills
 - ✓ Spelling
 - ✓ Vocabulary
 - ✓ Comprehension skills
 - ✓ Writing skills and strategies and their application
 - ✓ Written and oral English language conventions
 - ✓ Listening and speaking skills and strategies and their application
- ◆ In phonics instruction, all the sound-spelling correspondences are taught in a sequential and logical design.
- ◆ The basic reading/language arts curriculum for grades four through eight provides explicit, systematic, sequential, logical instruction and diagnostic support in:
 - ✓ Word-attack skills (e.g., decoding and structural as applied to multi-syllabic words)
 - ✓ Spelling
 - ✓ Vocabulary
 - ✓ Comprehension skills, including contextual skills
 - ✓ Text-handling and strategic reading skills
 - ✓ Writing skills and strategies and their applications to a variety of purposes, as specified in the content standards
 - ✓ Written and oral English language conventions
 - ✓ Listening and speaking skills and strategies and their application
- ◆ Content must be written in a manner that is grammatically correct.
- ◆ Sufficient pre-decodable and decodable texts are included at the early stages to allow students to develop automaticity and practice fluency. Those materials designated by the publisher as decodable must have at least 75% of the words comprised solely of previously taught sound-spelling correspondences, and from 15% to 20% of the words comprised of previously taught high frequency words and story words. High frequency words introduced

in pre-decodable and decodable texts are taken from a list of the most commonly used words in English, prioritized by their utility. Sufficient is defined as the following:

- ✓ Kindergarten - at least 15 pre-decodable books (pre-decodable is defined as small books used to teach simple, beginning, high frequency words usually coupled with rebus)
 - ✓ Kindergarten - approximately 20 decodable books, integrated with the sequence of instruction
 - ✓ First grade - Two books per sound-spelling totaling a minimum of 8,000 words of decodable text over the course of a year
 - ✓ Second grade - approximately 9,000 words of decodable text, two decodable books per sound-spelling determined by the instructional sequence of sound-spelling correspondences for students who still need this instruction
- ◆ Each decodable text contains a list at the back of all the high frequency words and sound-spelling correspondences introduced in that book, as well as those previously taught in the series.
 - ◆ A list of books for independent reading that spans at least three grade levels and matches the topics of the units are included.
 - ◆ Reading selections, including those read to students and those students read, are of high quality, interesting, motivational, multicultural, and age-appropriate for students.
 - ◆ Reading materials used for in-class work and homework as students progress through the grades are suggested or included to ensure that students read the amount of text specified in the standards at various grade levels.
 - ◆ Teacher's editions suggest reading material for students to read, outside of class, at least 20 minutes a day in grade one and 30 minutes a day in grades two and beyond.
 - ◆ High-quality literature is an integral part of language arts instruction at every grade level.
 - ◆ Informational text to support standards in reading comprehension and writing applications is included for all grades. When included, informational text addressing topics in history-social science, science, and mathematics is accurate and consistent with grade-level standards.
 - ◆ Writing in response to text is an integral part of instruction at all appropriate grade levels. Instruction in writing strategies and applications progresses in breadth, depth, and sophistication as specified in each grade-level writing standard.
 - ◆ Instructional materials follow the specific types of writing required in the content standards at each grade level. In addition to the traditional narrative forms, materials will include instruction in the following types of writing: research reports, persuasive compositions, as well as technical and career-related documents as defined by the grade level standards.
 - ◆ Instructional content reflects the reciprocal and related processes of reading, writing, conventions, and listening and speaking. The content integrates standards across domains and standards within language arts and across core academic disciplines of history-social science and science, as well as other content areas where appropriate.
 - ◆ Instructional resources provide strategies for teachers and materials for developing academic language (i.e. the more difficult, abstract, technical and specialized vocabulary and concepts used in texts and tests).
 - ◆ Instructional materials provide assignments designed to have students listen to, read, speak and write academic language.

- ◆ All instructional materials are an integral part of the grade level content for reading/language arts. Extraneous materials not aligned to the standards are minimal in number and must not detract from the students' mastery of English-language arts standards.

Criteria Category 2: Program Organization

- ◆ Scope and sequence align with English - Language Arts Content Standards and strands, although within each grade level the standards and the strands do not have to be addressed in the order in which they appear in the standards.
- ◆ Reading/language arts instructional materials are designed for the following minimal daily time periods for the regular instructional program:
 - ✓ 1 hour in kindergarten
 - ✓ 2.5 hours in grades 1-3
 - ✓ 2 hours in grades 4-5/6
 - ✓ 1 to 2 hours in grades 6/7-8
 - ✓ In addition, all publishers are asked to provide ELD support materials for 30-45 minutes daily, and special education support materials for 30-45 minutes daily leading to mastery of English-language arts content standards and success within the basic program.
- ◆ In order to protect language arts instructional time, those K-3 content standards in history-social science and science that lend themselves to instruction during the language arts time period are addressed within the language arts materials, particularly in the selection of expository texts that are read to students, or that students read.
- ◆ Instructional design reflects a coherent and linguistically logical sequence of instruction.
- ◆ Instructional materials may group related standards and address them simultaneously for purposes of coherence and utility.
- ◆ The introduction and sequencing of topics is progressive, continuous and arranged for an optimal rate of learning and appropriate pacing.
- ◆ The instructional design enhances students' retention and generalization of what is learned.
- ◆ More time and emphasis are afforded major encompassing ideas.
- ◆ Students are taught skills and given activities to practice skills, including opportunities to connect and apply those skills.
- ◆ Dimensions of complex tasks are analyzed and broken down into component parts; each part is taught in a logical progression.
- ◆ Specific objectives are identified and sequenced.
- ◆ Content increases in difficulty: prerequisite skills are taught before more sophisticated ones; prerequisite skills are mastered prior to advanced application.
- ◆ Materials and assessment include a cumulative and/ or spiraled review of skills.
- ◆ Individual and group learner proficiencies are used to make determinations about additional instruction (review, re-teaching, or accelerating the pace).
- ◆ Similar and confusing content and strategies are separated.
- ◆ The amount of new information is controlled and connected to prior learning, and students are explicitly assisted to make connections.
- ◆ Teacher communication to students is clear, using vocabulary and language structures that students understand.
- ◆ Materials rule out likely misinterpretations, identify and correct common misconceptions held by students, and provide teachers with suggestions of how to correct those misconceptions.
- ◆ Instructional materials include directions for:
 - ✓ Direct teaching
 - ✓ Demonstration

- ✓ Teacher modeling
- ✓ Guided and independent practice and application
- ✓ Appropriate pacing of lessons
- ✓ Pre-teaching and re-teaching as needed
- ◆ Instructional materials include adequate practice and review (sufficient review, distributed review, cumulative review, varied review).
- ◆ Instructional materials provide extra practice for students who need it.
- ◆ Instructional materials are standards based and include acceleration or enrichment materials, various assignments, and/or suggestions for advanced learners.

Criteria Category 3: Assessment

- ◆ Assessments measure the understanding and application of skills and knowledge embedded in the instructional program.
- ◆ Assessments measure standards in several formats for immediate follow-up to instruction, for practice, and for review in order to keep teachers informed on how well students have mastered the standards.
- ◆ Assessments help teachers determine the effectiveness of their instruction by:
 - ✓ Conducting assessments at strategic points of instruction (entry level, monitoring of progress and summative) as suggested on pages 218 and 220 in the *Reading/Language Arts Framework*
 - ✓ Monitoring student progress at the end of each unit of instruction
 - ✓ Determining instructional program activity options (e.g. review, preteach or reteach, provide additional practice, maintain or accelerate pacing, provide intensive intervention)
- ◆ Assessments vary in administration (group and individual) and in types of tasks (e.g. multiple choice, short answer, essay, and oral presentation).
- ◆ Materials offer guidance on the importance of uses and interpretations for at least two kinds of assessment: (1) those embedded in the instructional program; and (2) those norm-referenced to comparison groups of students.

Criteria Category 4: Universal Access

Introduction

The goal of reading/language arts programs in California is to ensure access to high-quality curriculum and instruction for all students and teachers so they can meet or exceed the state's English-language arts content standards. To reach that goal, teachers must be provided with instructional materials that will provide them with the necessary content and pedagogical tools to teach students to master the standards. Teachers need assistance in using assessments for planning programs, differentiating curriculum and instruction, determining effective grouping strategies, and implementing other strategies for meeting the needs of students with reading difficulties, special education students, advanced learners, English learners, and students with a combination of these needs. The basic reading/language arts materials must encompass a range of materials for teacher and pupil editions sufficient to meet the needs of students at various benchmark and strategic levels of intervention.

Instructional materials present comprehensive guidance for teachers in providing effective, efficient instruction for all students. Instructional materials must be constructed to meet the needs of those who enter school above, at, or one or more grade levels below the content standards, and therefore are adaptable to each student's point of entry. Such differentiated instruction will always need to be focused on the standards. All suggestions and procedures for meeting the instructional needs of students are not to be added as superficial afterthoughts to the main focus of instruction. Rather, the instructional materials need to be constructed so that the teacher is not expected to create extensive modifications in order to meet the learning needs of a full range of students.

This category covers criteria for universal access of all instructional materials; however, publishers should give special attention to materials developed for four specific groups outlined in this section: special education; students in grades four through eight who are significantly below grade level in reading; advanced learners; and English learners (EL).

The following design principles are guidelines for publishers to use in creating materials that will allow access for all students.

Design Principles for Perceptual Alternatives

- ◆ Consistent with federal copyright law, provide all student text in digital format so that it can easily be transcribed, reproduced, modified, and distributed in braille, large print (only if the publisher does not offer such an edition), recordings, American Sign Language videos for the deaf, or other specialized accessible media exclusively for use by pupils with visual disabilities or other disabilities that prevent use of standard materials.
- ◆ Provide written captions and/or written descriptions in digital format for audio portions of visual instructional materials, such as videotapes (for those students who are deaf or hearing impaired).
- ◆ Provide educationally relevant descriptions for those images, graphic devices, or pictorial information essential to the teaching of key concepts. (When key information is presented solely in graphic or pictorial form, it limits access for students who are blind or who have

low vision. Digital images with verbal description provide access for those individuals and also provide flexibility for instructional emphasis, clarity, and direction.)

Design Principles for Cognitive Alternatives

- ◆ Use "considerate text" design principles which include:
 - ✓ Adequate titles for each selection
 - ✓ Introductory subheadings for chapter sections
 - ✓ Introductory paragraphs
 - ✓ Concluding or summary paragraphs
 - ✓ Complete paragraphs including clear topic sentence, relevant support, and transitional words and expressions (e.g., furthermore, similarly)
 - ✓ Effective use of typographical aids - boldface print, italics
 - ✓ Adequate, relevant visual aids connected to the print: illustrations, photos, graphs, charts, maps
 - ✓ Manageable versus overwhelming visual and print stimuli
 - ✓ Identification and highlighting of important terms
 - ✓ List of reading objectives or focus questions at the beginning of each selection
 - ✓ List of follow-up comprehension and application questions
- ◆ Provide optional information or activities to enhance students' background knowledge. (Some students face barriers because they lack the necessary background knowledge. Pre-testing prior to an activity will alert teachers to the need for advanced preparation. Instructional materials can include optional supports for background knowledge, to be used by students who need them.)
- ◆ Provide cognitive supports for content and activities: a) provide assessment to determine background knowledge; b) summarize those key concepts from the standards that the content addresses; c) provide scaffolding for learning and generalization; d) build fluency through practice.

Design Principles for Means of Expression

- ◆ Explain in the teacher's edition that there are a variety of ways for students with special needs to use the materials and demonstrate their competence, e.g. for students who have dyslexia or who have difficulties physically forming letters, writing legibly, or spelling words. Suggest in the teacher's edition modifications that teachers could use to allow students to access the materials and demonstrate their competence. Examples of modifications of means of expression might include (but are not limited to) student use of computers to complete pencil and paper tasks, use of on-screen scanning keyboards, enlarged keyboards, word prediction, and spellcheckers.
- ◆ Publishers should provide support materials that will give students opportunities to develop oral and written expression.

The following design principles are guidelines for publishers to use in creating materials that will allow access for specific groups of students:

(a) Special Education - criteria for an additional 30-45 minutes of instructional materials

- ◆ Instructional materials should present comprehensive guidance for teachers in providing effective, efficient instruction for special needs students. Instructional materials for special needs students must be standards-aligned, assessment-based, instructional programs leading to mastery of all the language arts content standards. These are intervention instructional materials that can be used to ensure that students will be successful in the basic curriculum. These resources can be delivered by the classroom or specialist teacher.
- ◆ There must be sufficient instructional materials for increased instructional time. For students in grades K-3, materials include a minimum of 30 additional minutes of instruction daily and in grades four to eight, a minimum of 45 additional minutes. These additional instructional materials tie specifically to, reinforce, and extend the regular classroom instruction, and:
 - ✓ Provide additional opportunities for teachers to check for understanding.
 - ✓ Increase background knowledge and prerequisite skills and concepts.
 - ✓ Provide additional vocabulary development opportunities.
 - ✓ Provide additional practice.
 - ✓ Assist students in organizing and sorting tasks within assignments.
 - ✓ Re-teach previously taught material.
 - ✓ Pre-teach material which will be covered the next day.
 - ✓ Vary the pacing - accelerating two years into one - moving as quickly as possible.
 - ✓ Scaffold instruction (for example, if students are studying plot, provide three levels of difficulty in the reading materials students will use to study plot).
 - ✓ If books on tape are used, provide discussion on features of the text, key concepts, etc., either for class discussion or on the tape.
 - ✓ Provide explicit instruction in the physical presentation of text and/or text structure in order to facilitate reading comprehension (for example, explain to students what logic underlies the use of italics, bold, underlining, font changes and/or color).
 - ✓ Allow additional opportunities for student expression and participation.

(b) Intensive instruction for students in grades four and above who are significantly below grade level in reading (estimated 2.5 to 3 hour comprehensive program). Publishers may, but are not required to, provide this intervention program. Publishers may submit such an intervention program as a "stand-alone."

- ◆ There are two purposes of reading/language arts instruction for students in grades four and above who are, for whatever reason, significantly below grade level in reading achievement: 1) the students must be taught to read; and 2) the students must be taught those grade level standards they have not previously mastered. These are assessment-based, comprehensive programs. Programs for these students must include intensive intervention designed to accelerate student access to the basic reading/language arts program and mastery of grade level standards.
- ◆ These materials must:
 - ✓ Provide for intensive, accelerated, comprehensive intervention for students who are significantly below grade level in reading instruction, designed to move them as quickly as possible to grade level achievement in reading

- ✓ Provide explicit and systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, word attack skills including decoding, phonics, comprehension, vocabulary development, and additional practice materials
- ✓ Include a comprehensive diagnostic assessment that determines student's placement into the program, as well as frequent and comprehensive curriculum-embedded assessments of student progress in skill development.
- ✓ Provide a range within the instructional materials which allows flexibility to start students at the beginning, or wherever they need to be, according to appropriate assessment data.
- ✓ Suggest appropriate grouping based on students' needs.
- ✓ Scaffold instruction (for example, if students are studying plot, provide three levels of difficulty in the reading materials students will use to study plot - please refer to *Reading/Language Arts Framework* for information regarding scaffolding).
- ✓ Provide explicit instruction in the physical presentation of text and/or text structure in order to facilitate reading comprehension. For example, explain to students what logic underlies the use of italics, bold, underlining, font changes and/or color.
- ✓ Allow additional opportunities for student expression and participation.

(c) Design Principles for Advanced Learners (to be included within basic materials)

- ◆ Teacher and student editions include suggestions or materials for advanced learners who need an enriched or accelerated program or assignments.
- ◆ Materials provide suggestions to help students study a particular author, theme, or concept in more depth and conduct a more complex analysis with attention to additional independent readings.
- ◆ Materials remind teachers of standards at higher-grade levels to help teachers provide a challenge for all students.

(d) English Learners (EL) - criteria for 30-45 minutes of additional instructional materials

- ◆ Materials help teachers teach English learners to master the *English-Language Arts Content Standards*--notably, to read, write, comprehend and speak at personally and academically proficient levels.
- ◆ Lessons address the various English language proficiency levels of English learners as determined by the state-approved English Language Development Test (in development).
- ◆ For English learners in grades four through eight who are at the intermediate through early advanced levels of English proficiency and for all English learners in grades K-3, materials include a minimum of 30-45 additional minutes of English language development instruction daily that is systematically connected to the basic reading/language arts program. The materials are designed to enable students to be successful in the basic reading/language arts program. The materials provide additional support in areas in which students are likely to have difficulty—primarily the following strands and substrands of the English-language arts standards:
 - ✓ Academic language
 - ✓ Vocabulary and concept development
 - ✓ Sentence structure
 - ✓ Grammar

- ✓ Phonologically-based spelling
- ✓ Listening and speaking comprehension
- ✓ Organization and delivery of oral communication
- ✓ Speaking applications
- ◆ Publishers provide a chart in the teachers' edition showing how new or difficult sounds and features of the English language are taught and reinforced. Comparisons with the five or more most common languages in California will be incorporated as appropriate.
- ◆ The additional instructional materials include appropriate timed segments that address the following instructional components:
 - ✓ Checking for understanding
 - ✓ Pre-teaching for upcoming lessons
 - ✓ Re-teaching previous material
 - ✓ Scaffolding
 - ✓ Extra, targeted practice
 - ✓ Opportunities for students to practice producing language
- ◆ Publishers provide specific direction in the teachers' edition regarding the use of instructional materials that support and develop key concepts. Instructional materials include, when appropriate, picture cards with words, transparencies, charts and computer software, as well as suggestions for realia that are easily accessible to the teacher.

(e) Intensive instruction for students in grades four and above who are at the beginning through intermediate levels of English proficiency and who may have little prior schooling or limited literacy (estimated 2 to 3 hour comprehensive program). Publishers may, but are not required to, provide this program. Publishers may submit such a program as a "stand-alone."

- ◆ Publishers may develop, for students in grades four through eight whose proficiency in English is at the beginning through intermediate levels, an intensive, comprehensive reading/language arts program addressing literacy and language development. The materials incorporate the elements for English language development described above and are designed so that the intensive, accelerated, and extensive English-language development complements and supports literacy instruction.

(f) Comprehensive reading/language arts materials in languages other than English

- ◆ As an option, publishers may develop comprehensive programs of reading/language arts in the key languages of the state for those students on waiver as defined by Proposition 227. Primary language programs parallel English-language arts programs and are aligned with the English-language arts content standards and the *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools* with appropriate modifications for the primary language. Primary language programs are designed to transition students to English and must include all the same components as English-language arts programs.
- ◆ English language development materials must also accompany primary language materials for English learners. These ELD materials help develop language and allow the primary language skills learned to be applied in English with additional teaching of skills unique to the language.

Criteria Category 5: Instructional Planning and Support

(See pages 8 and 9 of Reading/Language Arts Framework for the Key to Curricular and Instructional Profiles. In addition, see profiles within the section of each grade level)

Teacher editions should include the following:

- ◆ Instructional materials provide a clear road map for teachers to follow when planning instruction.
- ◆ Instructional materials include a teacher planning guide describing how to use all the components of the program in order to meet all the English-language arts standards and the relationships between the components.
- ◆ Publishers provide teachers with instructional examples and practice opportunities for students as the students develop in the sophistication of writing.
- ◆ The teacher's edition describes: what to teach, how to teach and when to teach.
- ◆ Learning objectives and instruction are explicit and the relationship of lessons to standards or skills within standards is explicit.
- ◆ Lesson plans, and the relationships of parts of the lesson, are clear.
- ◆ Critical components of lessons are prioritized.
- ◆ Terms from standards are used appropriately in the instructions.
- ◆ Each lesson includes a list of necessary materials.
- ◆ All assessment, instructional tools and informational technology resources include technical support and suggestions for appropriate use of technology.
- ◆ Electronic learning resources, when included, are integral parts of the program.
- ◆ The teacher resource materials provide background information about each reading selection, including author, context, content, and information about illustrations, if any.
- ◆ Materials include instructions for the teacher on salient features of the reading material and suggestions on how to use each reading selection in the lesson or lessons.
- ◆ Materials include specific guidance for teachers on how to use texts at different levels to increase reading fluency.
- ◆ Instructional practices recommended in the instructional materials are based on current and confirmed research wherever such research exists.
- ◆ Materials discuss and address common misconceptions held by students.
- ◆ Materials suggest grouping strategies appropriate to the instructional objectives.
- ◆ Homework extends and reinforces classroom instruction, and provides additional practice of skills that have been taught.
- ◆ Materials include suggestions on how to explain students' progress towards standards.
- ◆ Materials include suggestions for parents on how to support student achievement.
- ◆ Format makes it easy to distinguish instructions for teachers from those for students.
- ◆ Pre-teaching, re-teaching, extension and acceleration activities are clearly labeled.
- ◆ Answer keys are provided for all workbooks and other related student activities.
- ◆ Publishers provide charts of time and cost of staff development services available for preparing teachers to fully implement the basic reading/language arts program.

Partial list of references:

California Department of Education, *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools*, 1999.

California Department of Education, *English-Language Arts Content Standards*, 1997.

Kinsella, Kate, "Considerate Text Principles," Presentation to California Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission, May 1998.

National Center to Improve Tools of Educators (NCITE); <http://idea.oregon.edu/~ncite/>

Orkwis, Raymond and Kathleen McLane, *A Curriculum Every Student Can Use: Design Principles for Student Access*, The ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education, The Council for Exceptional Children, 1998.

California Special Education Reading Task Force and California Department of Education, *The California Reading Initiative and Special Education in California: Critical Ideas to Focus Meaningful Reform*, 1999.

LEARNING RESOURCES DISPLAY CENTERS

Peg Gardner
Humboldt County Office of Education
901 Myrtle Avenue
Eureka, CA 95501
(707) 445-7077/FAX (707) 445-7073
pgardner@humboldt.k12.ca.us

Bob Benoit
Attention: Jo Ann Fox
Butte County Office of Education
5 County Center Drive
Oroville, CA 95965
(530) 532-5814/FAX (530) 532-5828
bbenoit@bcoe.org
jfox@bcoe.org

Gladys Frantz
Alameda County Office of Education
313 West Winton Avenue
Hayward, CA 94544
(510) 670-4235
FAX (510) 670-4207
gfrantz@acoe.k12.ca.us

Victor Gee
Alameda County Office of Education
313 West Winton Avenue
Hayward, CA 94544
(510) 670-4538
FAX (510) 670-4207
vgee@acoe.k12.ca.us

Andrea Fiske
Attention: Monique Shepard
Sacramento County Office of Education
9738 Lincoln Village Drive
Sacramento, CA 95827
(916) 228-2349/FAX (916) 228-2360
afiske@scoe.net

Karen Elizabeth Smith
Sonoma County Office of Education
5340 Skylane Blvd.
Santa Rosa, CA 95403-1082
(707) 524-2837/FAX (707) 578-0220
kesmith@scoe.org

V. Ruth Smith
Stanislaus County Office of Education
1100 H Street
Modesto, CA 95354
(209) 525-4990/FAX (209) 525-6630
rsmith@stan-co.k12.ca.us

Janie Rocheford
Fresno County Office of Education
1111 Van Ness
Fresno, CA 93721-2000
(559) 265-3038/FAX (559) 265-3028
Jrocheford@fcoe.k12.ca.us

Anne Bagby
Monterey Peninsula U.S.D.
540 Canyon Del Rey, Suite 1
Monterey, CA 93940-5702
(831) 899-7156/FAX (831) 899-2165
abagby@monterey.k12.ca.us

Heather Dabel
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
1300 17th Street
Bakersfield, CA 93301
(661) 636-4527/FAX (661) 636-4042
hedabel@zeus.kern.org

Heather Dabel
Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office
705 South Union
Bakersfield, CA 93301
(661) 636-4527/FAX (661) 636-4042
hedabel@zeus.kern.org

Lorna Lueck, Co-Director
University of California
Davidson Library
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
(805) 893-7111/FAX (805) 893-4676
lueck@library.ucsb.edu

Matt Zuchowicz, Co-Director
Santa Barbara County Office of Ed.
4400 Cathedral Oaks Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93160-6307
(805) 964-4711x247/FAX (805) 683-3597
mattzuch@sbceo.k12.ca.us

Cindy Munz
San Bernardino County Office of Education
601 North "E" Street
San Bernardino, CA 92410-3093
(909) 386-2666/FAX (909) 386-2688
cindy_munz@sbcss.k12.ca.us

Beverly Edwards
Textbook Services
1320 West Third Street
Room 180
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 625-6994/FAX (213) 481-1479
bedwards@lausd.k12.ca.us

Sharon McNeil
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Bellflower Annex
Library Services
9300 Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242-2890
(562) 922-6359/FAX (562) 940-1669
mneil_sharon@lacoed.edu

Mary Ann Liette
Riverside County Office of Education
Central Receiving
4383 Tequesquite
Riverside, CA 92501
(909) 826-6684/FAX (909) 826-6924
mliette@rcoe.k12.ca.us

Mary Ann Liette
Riverside County Office of Education
3939 13th Street
Riverside, CA 92502
(909) 826-6684/FAX (909) 826-6924
mliette@rcoe.k12.ca.us

Sandra Lapham
Orange County Office of Education
Technology and Resource Center
200 Kalmus Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92628
(714) 966-4209/FAX (714) 434-0231
sandra_lapham@ocde.k12.ca.us

Sandra Lapham
Orange County Office of Education
1715 E. Wilshire Avenue, Suite 713
Santa Ana, CA 92705
(714) 541-1052/FAX (714) 541-1085

Kathy Shirley
San Diego County Office of Education
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, CA 92111-7399
(858) 292-3557/FAX (858) 467-1549
kshirley@sdcoe.k12.ca.us

Susan Martimo
California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall, 6th floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-5979/FAX (916) 657-5148
smartimo@cde.ca.gov

Rovina Salinas
Contra Costa County Office of Education
77 Santa Barbara Road
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-4215
(925) 942-5332/FAX (925) 942-5398
rsalinas@cccocoe.k12.ca.us

Ann Dalton
San Francisco Unified School District
Textbooks, Libraries, and Media Services
2550 25th Avenue, North Wing
San Francisco, CA 94116
(415) 759-2955/FAX (415) 731-6620
adalton@muse.sfusd.edu

Karol Thomas
San Mateo County Office of Education
The SMERC Library
101 Twin Dolphin Drive
Redwood City, CA 94065-1064
(650) 802-5651/FAX (650) 802-5665
kthomas@smcoe.k12.ca.us

John Magneson
Merced County Office of Education
632 West 13th Street
Merced, CA 95340
(209) 381-6639/FAX (209) 381-6774
jmagneson@mcoe.org

Steve Woods
Tulare County Office of Education
7000 Doe Avenue, Suite A
Visalia, CA 93291
(559) 651-3077/FAX (559) 651-1012
steview@tcoe.org

Joan Kunkler
California Polytechnic State University
Kennedy Library
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
(805) 756-2273/FAX (805) 756-2346
jkunkler@sci-fi.lib.calpoly.edu
carolegeile@calpoly.edu

Patti Johnson
Office of Ventura County Superintendent of Schools
570 Airport Way
Camarillo, CA 93010
(805) 388-4407/FAX (805) 388-4427
crodrigues@vcss.k12.ca.us
pajohnson@vcss.k12.ca.us

Lorene Sisson, CoDirector
San Jose State University
College of Education, Clark Library
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0028
(408) 924-2823
FAX (408) 924-2701
sisson@email.sjsu.edu

Diane Perry
Santa Clara County Office of Education
1290 Ridder Park Drive, #232
San Jose, CA 95131-2398
(408) 453-6800/FAX (408) 453-6815
Diane_Perry@sccoe.org

December 2001