



Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading

With Commentary for Classroom Educators

**International Dyslexia Association,
Professional Standards and Practices Committee
2010**

Louisa Moats, Committee Chair
Suzanne Carreker
Rosalie Davis
Phyllis Meisel
Louise Spear-Swerling
Barbara Wilson

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of These Standards

The International Dyslexia Association (IDA) offers these standards to guide the preparation, certification, and professional development of those who teach reading and related literacy skills in classroom or other settings. The term *teacher* is used throughout this document to refer to anyone whose responsibilities include reading instruction. The standards aim to specify what any individual responsible for teaching reading should know and be able to do.

Teacher preparation programs should ascribe to a common set of professional standards for the benefit of the students they serve, including those with diverse learning needs. Adherence to these standards should assure the public that individuals who teach reading are prepared to implement evidence-based and instructionally effective practices for reading instruction.

Background: Why These Standards Are Necessary

Teaching reading effectively requires considerable knowledge and skill. In 2000, the National Reading Panel, drawing upon decades of research, issued a report that identified the five reading skills necessary to become a successful reader: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The report cited the need for highly qualified teachers, but did not spell out the knowledge and skill base necessary to teach students to become successful readers.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress consistently finds that about 36% of all fourth graders read at a level described as “below basic.” Included in this group are students living in poverty, English language learners, and students who demonstrate significant weaknesses with language processes, including but not limited to phonological processing, that are the root cause of dyslexia and related learning difficulties. Of those who are referred to special education services in public schools, approximately 85% are referred because of their problems with language, reading, and/or writing.

The Common Core State Standards, adopted by the majority of states, and other college and career readiness standards, require a shift towards more rigorous expectations for students in reading and writing. Students are required to read complex text efficiently and with high levels of comprehension. This expectation includes students with reading disabilities, and those who struggle for other reasons, such as a language barrier. The IDA Standards focus on the teacher knowledge and skills required to teach these and other standards.

Mastering the Common Core or similar college readiness standards is a challenge for many with reading difficulties. However, informed and effective classroom instruction, especially in the early grades, can prevent most reading problems from developing and ameliorate others. For those students with dyslexia or other learning difficulties, effective intervention from a well-trained instructor can lessen the impact of reading difficulties and increase student success.

How to Use These Standards

The standards outline the 1) content knowledge necessary to teach reading and writing to all students, including those who are at risk for reading difficulty; and 2) practices of effective instruction. Teachers should have the foundational knowledge of language, literacy development, and individual differences to serve all the children in their classroom.

The standards may be used for several purposes, including but not limited to:

- self-study through professional learning communities and other peer collaboration groups;
- course design within teacher certification programs;
- practicum requirements within certification programs;
- professional development efforts
- criteria for membership in IDA’s coalition of organizations that provide training and supervision of teachers, tutors, and specialists;

- criteria for the preparation of those professionals receiving referrals through IDA offices; and
- a content framework for the development of licensing or certification examinations.

How to Read the Standards

The Standards include two major sections. Section I addresses foundation concepts, knowledge of language structure, the principles of structured language teaching, administration and interpretation of assessments, knowledge of dyslexia and other learning disorders, and ethical standards for the profession. Section II addresses the application skills teachers and specialists should demonstrate.

In Section I, Standards A, B, C, and E are presented in two columns. The column on the left refers to content knowledge that can be learned and tested independent of observed teaching competency. The column on the right delineates the practical skills of teaching that depend on or that are driven by content knowledge. The exception to this format is Standard D. It includes a third column on the right that specifies in greater detail what the teacher or specialist should be able to do.

Section II addresses skills to be demonstrated in supervised practice by novice teachers in training, designated Level 1, or by specialists, designated as Level 2. The recommended standards for preparation of teachers and specialists provided in this section are distinguished by these two levels.

SECTION I: KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE STANDARDS

A. Foundation Concepts about Oral and Written Learning

Unlike learning to speak, which occurs when children hear speech in their environment, learning to read does not happen naturally. Most children must be taught foundational concepts of reading. Recently, a convergence of research has identified what children must be taught and how best to teach those skills. The skills include processing of oral language at the phonemic level, the alphabetic principle, and metacognitive strategies. Teachers need to know how to teach these skills and how to support the development of psychological processes such as executive function and working memory, and how to promote motivation to read.

Oral and written language contributes reciprocally to the development of each and both impact the ability to read and write. Receptive and expressive oral language contributes to the ability to listen and to speak; receptive understanding of written language contributes to reading comprehension while expressive use of spoken language contributes to the ability to write.

Content Knowledge	Application
<ol style="list-style-type: none">Understand and explain the language processing requirements of proficient reading and writing<ul style="list-style-type: none">Phonological (speech sound) processingOrthographic (print) processingSemantic (meaning) processingSyntactic (sentence level) processingDiscourse (connected text level) processingUnderstand and explain other aspects of cognition and behavior that affect reading and writing<ul style="list-style-type: none">AttentionExecutive functionMemoryProcessing speedGraphomotor controlDefine and identify environmental, cultural, and social factors that contribute to literacy development (e.g., language spoken at home, language and literacy experiences, cultural values).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><ol style="list-style-type: none">Explain the domains of language and their importance to proficient reading and writing (Level 1).Explain a scientifically valid model of the language processes underlying reading and writing (Level 2).<ol style="list-style-type: none">Recognize that reading difficulties coexist with other cognitive and behavioral problems (Level 1).Explain a scientifically valid model of other cognitive influences on reading and writing, and explain major research findings regarding the contribution of linguistic and cognitive factors to the prediction of literacy outcomes (Level 2).Identify (Level 1) or explain (Level 2) major research findings regarding the contribution of environmental factors to literacy outcomes.

Content Knowledge	Application
<p>4. Know and identify phases in the typical developmental progression of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral language (semantic, syntactic, pragmatic) • Phonological skill • Printed word recognition • Spelling • Reading fluency • Reading comprehension • Written expression <p>5. Understand and explain the known causal relationships among phonological skill, phonic decoding, spelling, accurate and automatic word recognition, text reading fluency, background knowledge, verbal reasoning skill, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing.</p> <p>6. Know and explain how the relationships among the major components of literacy development change with reading development (i.e., changes in oral language, including phonological awareness; phonics and word recognition; spelling; reading and writing fluency; vocabulary; reading comprehension skills and strategies; written expression).</p> <p>7. Know reasonable goals and expectations for learners at various stages of reading and writing development.</p>	<p>4. Match examples of student responses and learning behavior to phases in language and literacy development (Level 1).</p> <p>5. Explain how a weakness in each component skill of oral language, reading, and writing may affect other related skills and processes across time (Level 2).</p> <p>6. Identify the most salient instructional needs of students who are at different points of reading and writing development (Level 2).</p> <p>7. Given case study material, explain why a student is/is not meeting goals and expectations in reading or writing for his or her age/grade (Level 1).</p>

B. Knowledge of the Structure of Language

All students require and benefit from knowledge about the structure of their language; such knowledge is essential for struggling readers. To teach students effectively, teachers need in-depth knowledge about the structure of language including the ability to recognize whether words are phonetically regular or irregular, common morphemes in words, and common sentence structure in English. Without this kind of knowledge, teachers may have difficulty interpreting assessments correctly, or they may provide unintentionally confusing instruction to students. Similarly, to teach spelling and writing effectively, teachers need a knowledge base about language structure, including sentence and discourse structure. Research suggests that for teachers to acquire an understanding of language structure, they need explicit and in-depth instruction in this area.

Content Knowledge	Application
<p>Phonology (The Speech Sound System)</p> <p>1. Identify, pronounce, classify, and compare the consonant and vowel phonemes of English.</p>	<p>1. a. Identify similar or contrasting features among phonemes (Level 1). b. Reconstruct the consonant and vowel phoneme inventories and identify the feature differences between and among phonemes (Level 2).</p>
<p>Orthography (The Spelling System)</p> <p>2. Understand the broad outline of historical influences on English spelling patterns, especially Anglo-Saxon, Latin (Romance), and Greek.</p> <p>3. Define <i>grapheme</i> as a functional correspondence unit or representation of a phoneme.</p> <p>4. Recognize and explain common orthographic rules and patterns in English.</p> <p>5. Know the difference between “high frequency” and “irregular” words.</p> <p>6. Identify, explain, and categorize six basic syllable types in English spelling.</p>	<p>2. Recognize typical words from the historical layers of English (Anglo-Saxon, Latin/Romance, Greek) (Level 1).</p> <p>3. Accurately map graphemes to phonemes in any English word (Level 1).</p> <p>4. Sort words by orthographic “choice” pattern; analyze words by suffix ending patterns and apply suffix ending rules.</p> <p>5. Identify printed words that are the exception to regular patterns and spelling principles; sort high frequency words into regular and exception words (Level 1).</p> <p>6. Sort, pronounce, and combine regular written syllables and apply the most productive syllable division principles (Level 1).</p>
<p>Morphology</p> <p>7. Identify and categorize common morphemes in English, including Anglo-Saxon compounds, inflectional suffixes, and derivational suffixes; Latin-based prefixes, roots, and derivational suffixes; and Greek-based combining forms.</p>	<p>7. a. Recognize the most common prefixes, roots, suffixes, and combining forms in English content words, and analyze words at both the syllable and morpheme levels (Level 1). b. Recognize advanced morphemes (e.g., chameleon or assimilated +prefixes) (Level 2).</p>

Semantics

8. Understand and identify examples of meaningful word relationships or semantic organization.

Syntax

9. Define and distinguish among phrases, dependent clauses, and independent clauses in sentence structure.

10. Identify the parts of speech and the grammatical role of a word in a sentence.

Discourse Organization

11. Explain the major differences between narrative and expository discourse.

12. Identify and construct expository paragraphs of varying logical structures (e.g., classification, reason, sequence).

13. Identify cohesive devices in text and inferential gaps in the surface language of text.

8. Match or identify examples of word associations, antonyms, synonyms, multiple meanings and uses, semantic overlap, and semantic feature analysis (Level 1).

9. Construct and deconstruct simple, complex, and compound sentences (Level 1).

10. a. Identify the basic parts of speech and classify words by their grammatical role in a sentence (Level 1).
b. Identify advanced grammatical concepts (e.g., infinitives, gerunds) (Level 2).

11. Classify text by genre; identify features that are characteristic of each genre, and identify graphic organizers that characterize typical structures (Level 1).

12. Identify main idea sentences, connecting words, and topics that fit each type of expository paragraph organization (Level 2).

13. Analyze text for the purpose of identifying the inferences that students must make to comprehend (Level 2).

C-1. Structured Language Teaching: Phonology

Phonological awareness, basic print concepts, and knowledge of letter sounds are important foundational areas of literacy for all students. Ample research exists to inform teaching of phonological awareness, including research on the phonological skills to emphasize in instruction, appropriate sequencing of instruction, and integrating instruction in phonological awareness with instruction in alphabet knowledge. Poor phonological awareness is a core weakness for students with dyslexia. Without early, research-based intervention, children who struggle in these areas are likely to continue to have reading difficulties. It is important for teachers to understand how to teach these foundational skills, especially to effectively prevent or ameliorate many children’s reading problems, including those of students with dyslexia.

Content Knowledge	Application
1. Identify the general and specific goals of phonological skill instruction.	1. Explicitly state the goal of any phonological awareness teaching activity (Level 1).
2. Know the progression of phonological skill development (i.e., rhyme, syllable, onset-rime, phoneme differentiation).	2. a. Select and implement activities that match a student’s developmental level of phonological skill (Level 1). b. Design and justify the implementation of activities that match a student’s developmental level of phonological skill (Level 2).
3. Identify the differences among various phonological manipulations, including identifying, matching, blending, segmenting, substituting, and deleting sounds.	3. Demonstrate instructional activities that identify, match, blend, segment, substitute, and delete sounds (Level 1).
4. Understand the principles of phonological skill instruction: brief, multisensory, conceptual, and auditory-verbal.	4. a. Successfully produce vowel and consonant phonemes (Level 1). b. Teach articulatory features of phonemes and words; use minimally contrasting pairs of sounds and words in instruction; support instruction with manipulative materials and movement (Level 2).
5. Understand the reciprocal relationships among phonological processing, reading, spelling, and vocabulary.	5. a. Direct students’ attention to speech sounds during reading, spelling, and vocabulary instruction using a mirror, discussion of articulatory features, and so on as scripted or prompted (Level 1). b. Direct students’ attention to speech sounds during reading, spelling, and vocabulary instruction without scripting or prompting (Level 2).
6. Understand the phonological features of a second language or dialect, such as Spanish, and how they may interfere with English pronunciation and phonics.	6. Explicitly contrast first and second language phonological systems, as appropriate, to anticipate which sounds may be most challenging for the second language learner (Level 2).

C-2. Structured Language Teaching: Phonics and Word Recognition

The development of accurate word decoding skills—that is, the ability to read unfamiliar words by applying phonics knowledge—is an essential foundation for reading comprehension for all students. Teachers require the ability to provide explicit, systematic, appropriately sequenced instruction in phonics to all students. This is critical in helping to prevent reading problems in beginning readers. Decoding skills are often a central weakness for students with learning disabilities in reading, especially those with dyslexia. For this population, teachers should also understand the usefulness of multisensory, multimodal techniques to focus students’ attention on printed words, engage students, and enhance memory and learning.

Content Knowledge	Application
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Know or recognize how to order phonics concepts from easier to more difficult. 2. Understand principles of explicit and direct teaching: model, lead, give guided practice, and review. 3. State the rationale for multisensory and multimodal techniques. 4. Know the routines of a complete lesson format, from the introduction of a word recognition concept to fluent application in meaningful reading and writing. 5. Understand research-based adaptations of instruction for students with weaknesses in working memory, attention, executive function, or processing speed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan lessons with a cumulative progression of word recognition skills that build one on another (Level 1). 2. Explicitly and effectively teach (e.g., information taught is correct, students are attentive, teacher checks for understanding, teacher scaffolds students’ learning) concepts of word recognition and phonics; apply concepts to reading single words, phrases, and connected text (Level 1). 3. Demonstrate the simultaneous use of two or three learning modalities (to include listening, speaking, movement, touch, reading, and/or writing) to increase engagement and enhance memory (Level 1). 4. Plan and effectively teach all steps in a decoding lesson, including single-word reading and connected text that is read fluently, accurately, and with appropriate intonation and expression (Level 1). 5. Adapt the pace, format, content, strategy, or emphasis of instruction according to students’ pattern of response (Level 2).

C-3. Structured Language Teaching: Fluent, Automatic Reading of Text

Reading fluency is the ability to read text effortlessly and quickly as well as accurately. Fluency develops among typical readers in the primary grades. Because fluency is a useful predictor of overall reading competence, especially in elementary-aged students, a variety of fluency tasks have been developed for use in screening and progress-monitoring measures. Poor reading fluency is a very common symptom of dyslexia and other reading disabilities; problems with reading fluency can linger even when students' accuracy in word decoding has been improved through effective phonics intervention. Although fluency difficulties may sometimes be associated with processing weaknesses, considerable research supports the role of practice, wide exposure to printed words, and focused instruction in the development and remediation of fluency. To address students' fluency needs, teachers must have a range of competencies, including the ability to interpret fluency-based measures appropriately, to place students in appropriate types and levels of texts for reading instruction, to stimulate students' independent reading, and to provide systematic fluency interventions for students who require them. Assistive technology (e.g., text-to-speech software) is often employed to help students with serious fluency difficulties function in general education settings. Therefore, teachers, and particularly specialists, require knowledge about the appropriate uses of this technology.

Content Knowledge	Application
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand the role of fluency in word recognition, oral reading, silent reading, comprehension of written discourse, and motivation to read. 2. Understand reading fluency as a stage of normal reading development; as the primary symptom of some reading disorders; and as a consequence of practice and instruction. 3. Define and identify examples of text at a student's frustration, instructional, and independent reading level. 4. Know sources of activities for building fluency in component reading skills. 5. Know which instructional activities and approaches are most likely to improve fluency outcomes. 6. Understand techniques to enhance student motivation to read. 7. Understand appropriate uses of assistive technology for students with serious limitations in reading fluency. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess students' fluency rate and determine reasonable expectations for reading fluency at various stages of reading development, using research-based guidelines and appropriate state and local standards and benchmarks (Level 1). 2. Determine which students need a fluency-oriented approach to instruction, using screening, diagnostic, and progress-monitoring assessments (Level 2). 3. Match students with appropriate texts as informed by fluency rate to promote ample independent oral and silent reading (Level 1). 4. Design lesson plans that incorporate fluency-building activities into instruction at sub-word and word levels (Level 1). 5. Design lesson plans with a variety of techniques to build reading fluency, such as repeated readings of passages, alternate oral reading with a partner, reading with a tape, or rereading the same passage up to three times. (Level 1). 6. Identify student interests and needs to motivate independent reading (Level 1). 7. Make appropriate recommendations for use of assistive technology in general education classes for students with different reading profiles (e.g., dyslexia versus language disabilities) (Level 2).

C-4. Structured Language Teaching: Vocabulary

Vocabulary, or knowledge of word meanings, plays a key role in reading comprehension. Knowledge of words is multifaceted, ranging from partial recognition of the meaning of a word to deep knowledge and the ability to use the word effectively when speaking or writing. Research supports both explicit, systematic teaching of word meanings and indirect methods of instruction such as those involving inferring meanings of words from sentence context or from word parts (e.g., common roots and affixes). Teachers should know how to develop students' vocabulary knowledge through both direct and indirect methods. They also should understand the importance of wide exposure to words through reading and listening, to students' vocabulary development. For students with dyslexia and other reading problems, oral vocabulary knowledge is frequently strong, but over time, low volume of reading may tend to reduce these students' exposure to rich vocabulary relative to their typical peers. Explicit teaching of word meanings and encouragement of wide independent reading in appropriate texts are ways to help increase vocabulary development.

Content Knowledge	Application
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Understand the role of vocabulary development and vocabulary knowledge in comprehension.2. Understand the role and characteristics of direct and indirect (contextual) methods of vocabulary instruction.3. Know varied techniques for vocabulary instruction before, during, and after reading.4. Understand that word knowledge is multifaceted.5. Understand the sources of wide differences in students' vocabularies.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Teach word meanings directly using contextual examples, structural (morpheme) analysis, antonyms and synonyms, definitions, connotations, multiple meanings, and semantic feature analysis (Levels 1 and 2).2. Lesson planning reflects:<ol style="list-style-type: none">A. Selection of material for read-alouds and independent reading that will expand students' vocabulary.B. Identification of words necessary for direct teaching that should be known before the passage is read.C. Repeated encounters with new words and multiple opportunities to use new words orally and in writing.D. Recurring practice and opportunities to use new words in writing and speaking.

C-5. Structured Language Teaching: Text Comprehension

Reading comprehension is the ultimate goal of reading instruction. Reading comprehension depends not only upon the component abilities discussed in previous sections, but also upon other factors, such as background knowledge and knowledge of text structure. Comprehension, background knowledge, and motivation are closely tied. Comprehension is easier when background knowledge is high, which in turn increases motivation. Equally, readers most likely will have more background knowledge in areas in which they are motivated to read, which increases comprehension. Appendix A provides references on motivation.

In order to plan effective instruction and intervention in reading comprehension, teachers must understand the array of abilities that contribute to reading comprehension and use assessments to help pinpoint students' weaknesses. For instance, a student with dyslexia, whose reading comprehension problems are associated mainly with poor decoding and dysfluent reading, will need different emphases in intervention than will a student with poor comprehension due to weaknesses in vocabulary and oral comprehension. Teachers must be able to model and teach research-based comprehension strategies, such as summarization and the use of graphic organizers, and apply methods that promote reflective reading, metacognition, and student engagement. Oral comprehension and reading comprehension have a reciprocal relationship; effective oral comprehension facilitates reading comprehension, and wide reading contributes to the development of oral comprehension. Teachers should understand the relationships among oral language, reading comprehension, and written expression, and they should be able to use appropriate writing activities to build students' comprehension. Teachers should also have a rich understanding of children's literature and how best to utilize it with a diverse group of learners.

Content Knowledge	Application
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be familiar with teaching strategies that are appropriate before, during, and after reading and that promote reflective reading. 2. Contrast the characteristics of major text genres, including narration, exposition, and argumentation. 3. Understand the similarities and differences between written composition and text comprehension, and the usefulness of writing in building comprehension. 4. Identify in any text the phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and "academic language" that could be a source of miscomprehension. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. State purpose for reading, elicit or provide background knowledge, and explore key vocabulary (Level 1). b. Query during text reading to foster attention to detail, inference-making, and mental model construction (Level 1). c. Use graphic organizers, note-taking strategies, retelling and summarizing, and cross-text comparisons (Level 1). 2. Lesson plans reflect a range of genres, with emphasis on narrative and expository texts (Level 1). 3. Model, practice, and share written responses to text; foster explicit connections between new learning and what was already known (Level 1). 4. Anticipate confusions and teach comprehension of figurative language, complex sentence forms, cohesive devices, and unfamiliar features of text (Level 2).

5. Understand levels of comprehension including the surface code, text base, and mental model (situation model).

6. Understand factors that contribute to deep comprehension, including background knowledge, vocabulary, verbal reasoning ability, knowledge of literary structures and conventions, and use of skills and strategies for close reading of text.

5. Plan lessons to foster comprehension of the surface code (the language), the text base (the underlying ideas), and a mental model (the larger context for the ideas) (Level 2).

6. Adjust the emphasis of lessons to accommodate learners' strengths and weaknesses and pace of learning (Level 2).

C-6. Structured Language Teaching: Handwriting, Spelling, and Written Expression

Just as teachers need to understand the component abilities that contribute to reading comprehension, they also need a componential view of written expression. Important component abilities in writing include basic writing (transcription) skills such as handwriting, keyboarding, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and grammatical sentence structure; text generation (composition) processes that involve translating ideas into language, such as appropriate word choice, writing clear sentences, and developing an idea across multiple sentences and paragraphs; and planning, revision and editing processes. Effective instruction in written expression depends on teachers' abilities to provide explicit, systematic teaching in each area, as well as to pinpoint an individual student's weaknesses in these different component areas of writing. Teachers must also be able to teach research-based strategies in written expression, such as those involving strategies for planning and revising compositions. They should understand the utility of multisensory methods in both handwriting and spelling instruction. Assistive technology can be especially helpful for students with writing difficulties. Teachers should recognize the appropriate uses of technology in writing (e.g., spell-checkers can be valuable but do not replace spelling instruction and have limited utility for students whose misspellings are not recognizable). Specialists should have even greater levels of knowledge about technology.

Content Knowledge	Application
<p>Handwriting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Know research-based principles for teaching letter naming and letter formation, both manuscript and cursive. 2. Know techniques for teaching handwriting fluency. 	<p>Handwriting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use multisensory techniques to teach letter naming and letter formation in manuscript and cursive forms (Level 1). 2. Implement strategies to build fluency in letter formation, and copying and transcription of written language (Level 1).
<p>Spelling</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognize and explain the relationship between transcription skills and written expression. 2. Identify students' levels of spelling development and orthographic knowledge. 3. Recognize and explain the influences of phonological, orthographic, and morphemic knowledge on spelling. 	<p>Spelling</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explicitly and effectively teach (e.g., information taught is correct, students are attentive, teacher checks for understanding, teacher scaffolds students' learning) concepts related to spelling (e.g., a rule for adding suffixes to base words) (Level 1). 2. Select materials and/or create lessons that address students' skill levels (Level 1). 3. Analyze a student's spelling errors to determine his or her instructional needs (e.g., development of phonological skills versus learning spelling rules versus application of orthographic or morphemic knowledge in spelling) (Level 2).
<p>Written Expression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand the major components and processes of written expression and how they interact (e.g., basic writing/ transcription skills versus text 	<p>Written Expression</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrate basic skill instruction with composition in writing lessons.

generation).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>2. Know grade and developmental expectations for students' writing in the following areas: mechanics and conventions of writing, composition, revision, and editing processes.</p> <p>3. Understand appropriate uses of assistive technology in written expression.</p> | <p>2. a. Select and design activities to teach important components of writing, including mechanics/ conventions of writing, composition, and revision and editing processes.</p> <p>b. Analyze students' writing to determine specific instructional needs.</p> <p>c. Provide specific, constructive feedback to students targeted to students' most critical needs in writing.</p> <p>d. Teach research-based writing strategies such as those for planning, revising, and editing text.</p> <p>e. Teach writing (discourse) knowledge, such as the importance of writing for the intended audience, use of formal versus informal language, and various schemas for writing (e.g., reports versus narratives versus arguments).</p> <p>3. Make appropriate written recommendations for the use of assistive technology in writing.</p> |
|--|---|

D. Interpretation and Administration of Assessments for Planning Instruction

Teachers work hard to understand what students have learned. A teacher's ability to administer and interpret assessments accurately is essential both to planning effective instruction and to early identification of students' learning problems. Appropriate assessments enable teachers to recognize early signs that a child is either on track or may not be progressing as expected in reading development. Effective assessment helps teachers identify students who may be at risk for dyslexia or other learning disabilities. Carefully developed assessment practices permit teachers to target instruction to meet individual student's needs and recognize when to refer students for more extensive diagnostic assessment.

It is important to understand that there are different types of assessments for different purposes (e.g., brief but frequent assessments to monitor progress in specific skills versus more lengthy, comprehensive assessments to provide detailed diagnostic information). Such assessments are an important component of frameworks of multi-tiered systems of support or response to intervention. It is also important to recognize which type of assessment is called for in a particular situation, where to find unbiased information about the adequacy of published tests, and how to interpret this information correctly. It is important for teachers to understand basic principles of test construction and concepts such as reliability and validity. They should also understand how an individual student's component profile may influence his or her performance on a particular test, especially on broad measures of reading comprehension and written expression. For example, a child with very slow reading is likely to perform better on an untimed measure of reading comprehension than on a stringently timed measure; a child with writing problems may perform especially poorly on a reading comprehension test that requires lengthy written responses to open-ended questions.

Understanding assessment enables teachers to help students form positive perceptions of themselves as readers and acquire a love of reading so important for academic success. Classroom teachers use assessment to ensure children are gaining the necessary foundational skills in reading so students feel confident engaging in reading for continuous, lifelong enjoyment and learning.

Content Knowledge	Application	Observable Competencies for Teaching Students with Dyslexia and Related Difficulties
1. Understand the differences among screening, diagnostic, outcome, and progress-monitoring assessments.	1. Match each type of assessment and its purpose (Level 1).	1. Administer screenings and progress monitoring assessments (Level 1)
2. Understand basic principles of test construction, including reliability, validity, and norm-referencing, and know the most well-validated screening tests designed to identify students at risk for reading difficulties.	2. Match examples of technically adequate, well-validated screening, diagnostic, outcome, and progress-monitoring assessments (Level 1).	2. Explain why individual students are or are not at risk in reading based on their performance on screening assessments (Level 1).
3. Understand the principles of progress-monitoring and the use of graphs to indicate	3. Using case study data, accurately interpret progress-monitoring graphs to decide	3. Display progress-monitoring data in graphs that are understandable to students

<p>progress.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Know the range of skills typically assessed by diagnostic surveys of phonological skills, decoding skills, oral reading skills, spelling, and writing. 5. Recognize the content and purposes of the most common diagnostic tests used by psychologists and educational evaluators. 6. Interpret measures of reading comprehension and written expression in relation to an individual child's component profile. 	<p>whether or not a student is making adequate progress (Level 1).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Using case study data, accurately interpret subtest scores from diagnostic surveys to describe a student's patterns of strengths and weaknesses and instructional needs (Level 2). 5. Find and interpret appropriate print and electronic resources for evaluating tests (Level 1). 6. Using case study data, accurately interpret a student's performance on reading comprehension or written expression measures and make appropriate instructional recommendations. 	<p>and parents (Level 1).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Administer educational diagnostic assessments using standardized procedures (Level 2). 5. Write reports that clearly and accurately summarize a student's current skills in important component areas of reading and reading comprehension (Level 2). 6. Write appropriate, specific recommendations for instruction and educational programming based on assessment data (Level 2).
--	--	---

E. Knowledge of Dyslexia and Other Learning Disorders

To identify children with dyslexia and other learning disabilities, teachers need to be able to recognize the key symptoms of these disorders, as well as how the disorders differ from each other. These standards are supported by research and by accepted diagnostic guidelines. It is important that teachers recognize the following characteristics of dyslexia in relation to other reading problems and learning difficulties:

- Dyslexia is a language-based neurological disorder of learning to read and write originating from a core or basic problem with phonological processing intrinsic to the individual. Its primary symptoms are inaccurate and/or slow printed word recognition and poor spelling – problems that in turn affect reading fluency and comprehension and written expression. Other types of reading disabilities include specific difficulties with reading comprehension and/or speed of processing (reading fluency). These problems may exist in relative isolation or may overlap extensively in individuals with reading difficulties.
- Dyslexia often exists in individuals with aptitudes, talents, and abilities that enable them to be successful in many domains.
- Dyslexia often coexists with other developmental difficulties and disabilities, including problems with attention, memory, and executive function.
- Dyslexia exists on a continuum. Many students with milder forms of dyslexia are never officially diagnosed and are not eligible for special education services. They deserve appropriate instruction in the regular classroom and through other intervention programs.
- Appropriate recognition and treatment of dyslexia is the responsibility of all educators and support personnel in a school system, not just the reading or special education teacher.
- Although early intervention is the most effective approach, individuals with dyslexia and other reading difficulties can be helped at any age.
- Students who are English language learners may have dyslexia or other reading difficulties. It is important for educators to determine if a student’s difficulties are based in second language acquisition or due to a reading difficulty.

In order to plan instruction and detect older students with learning disabilities who may have been overlooked in the early grades, teachers also should understand how students’ difficulties may change over time, based on developmental patterns, experience, and instruction, and increased expectations across grades.

Content Knowledge	Application
1. Understand the most common intrinsic differences between good and poor readers (i.e., cognitive, neurobiological, and linguistic).	1. a. Recognize scientifically accepted characteristics of individuals with poor word recognition (e.g., overdependence on context to aid word recognition; inaccurate nonword reading) (Level 1). b. Identify student learning behaviors and test profiles typical of students with dyslexia and related learning difficulties. (Level 2).
2. Recognize the tenets of the NICHD/IDA definition of dyslexia.	2. Explain the reasoning or evidence behind the main points in the definition (Level 1).
3. Recognize that dyslexia and other reading difficulties exist on a continuum of severity.	3. Recognize levels of instructional intensity, duration, and scope appropriate for mild, moderate, and severe reading disabilities (Level 1).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Identify the distinguishing characteristics of dyslexia and related reading and learning disabilities (including developmental language comprehension disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, disorders of written expression or dysgraphia, mathematics learning disorder, nonverbal learning disorders, etc.).5. Identify how symptoms of reading difficulty may change over time in response to development and instruction.6. Understand federal and state laws that pertain to learning disabilities, especially reading disabilities and dyslexia. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Match symptoms of the major subgroups of poor readers as established by research, including those with dyslexia, and identify typical case study profiles of those individuals (Level 2).5. Identify predictable ways that symptoms might change as students move through the grades (Level 2).6. <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Explain the most fundamental provisions of federal and state laws pertaining to the rights of students with disabilities, especially students' rights to a free, appropriate public education, an individualized educational plan, services in the least restrictive environment, and due process (Level 1).b. Appropriately implement federal and state laws in identifying and serving students with learning disabilities, reading disabilities, and dyslexia (Level 2). |
|---|--|

SECTION II: GUIDELINES PERTAINING TO SUPERVISED PRACTICE OF TEACHERS WHO WORK IN SCHOOL SETTINGS

In addition to providing the necessary knowledge base, it is equally important for teacher training programs to provide opportunities for teachers to practice effective, evidence-based teaching until they reach the expected level of expertise to ensure student success.

Training programs for pre-service teachers often distinguish levels of expertise by the skills and experience of the individual and the amount of supervised practice required for certification.

Level I individuals are practitioners with basic knowledge who:

1. implement an appropriate program with fidelity
2. formulate and implement an appropriate, differentiated lesson plan
3. demonstrate proficiency to instruct individuals with a reading disability or dyslexia

To attain Level I status, an individual must:

- pass an approved basic knowledge proficiency exam
- demonstrate (over time) instructional proficiency in all Level 1 areas outlined on IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards, Section I that is responsive to student needs
- document significant student progress with formal and informal assessments as a result of the instruction.

To attain Level II status, an individual must:

- pass an approved basic knowledge proficiency exam
- complete a one-to-one practicum with a student or small group of one to three well-matched students who have a documented reading disability. A recognized, certified instructor* provides consistent oversight and observations of instruction delivered to the same student(s) over time, and the practicum continues until expected proficiency is reached.**
- demonstrate (over time) instructional proficiency in all Level 1 and 2 areas outlined on IDA Standards, Section I that is responsive to student needs.
- provide successful instruction to several individuals with dyslexia who demonstrate varying needs and document significant student progress with formal and informal assessments as a result of the instruction.
- complete an approved educational assessment of a student with dyslexia and/or language-based reading disability, including student history and comprehensive recommendations.

*A recognized or certified instructor is an individual who has met all of the requirements of the level they supervise but who has additional content knowledge and experience in implementing and observing instruction for students with dyslexia and other reading difficulties in varied settings. A recognized instructor has been recommended by or certified by an approved trainer mentorship program that meets these standards. The trainer mentorship program has been reviewed by and approved by the IDA Standards and Practices Committee.

**Documentation of proficiency must be 1) completed by a recognized/certified instructor providing oversight in the specified program; 2) completed during full (not partial) lesson observations; and 3) must occur at various intervals throughout the instructional period with student.

References

Introduction

- Bos, C., Mather, N., Dickson, S., Podhajski, B., & Chard, D. (2001). Perceptions and knowledge of preservice and inservice educators about early reading instruction. *Annals of Dyslexia, 51*, 97–120.
- Cunningham, A. E., Perry, K. E., Stanovich, K. E., & Stanovich, P. J. (2004). Disciplinary knowledge of K-3 teachers and their knowledge calibration in the domain of early literacy. *Annals of Dyslexia, 54*, 139–167.
- Joshi, R. M., Binks, E., Hougen, M., Ocker-Dean, E., Graham, L., & Smith, D. (2009). Teachers' knowledge of basic linguistic skills: Where does it come from? In S. Rosenfield & V. Berninger (Eds.), *Handbook on implementing evidence based academic interventions* (pp. 851–877). New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCutchen, D., Harry, D. R., Cunningham, A. E., Cox, S., Sidman, S., & Covill, A. E. (2002). Reading teachers' knowledge of children's literature and English phonology. *Annals of Dyslexia, 52*, 207–228.
- Moats, L. C. (1994). The missing foundation in teacher education: Knowledge of the structure of spoken and written language. *Annals of Dyslexia, 44*, 81–102.
- Moats, L. C., & Foorman, B. R. (2003). Measuring teachers' content knowledge of language and reading. *Annals of Dyslexia, 53*, 23–45.
- Piasta, S. B., Connor, C. M., Fishman, B. J., & Morrison, F. J. (2009). Teachers' knowledge of literacy concepts, classroom practices, and student reading growth. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 13*(3), 224–248.
- Smartt, S. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2007). *Barriers to the preparation of highly qualified teachers in reading*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Spear-Swerling, L. (2008). Response to intervention and teacher preparation. In E. Grigorenko (Ed.), *Educating individuals with disabilities: IDEA 2004 and beyond* (pp. 273–293). New York: Springer.
- Spear-Swerling, L., Brucker, P., & Alfano, M. (2005). Teachers' literacy-related knowledge and self-perceptions in relation to preparation and experience. *Annals of Dyslexia, 55*, 266–293.
- Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D. D. (2006). *What education schools aren't teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.

Section I A: Foundation Concepts about Oral and Written Learning

Level 1

- Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Learning and thinking about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Baker, L. (2013). *Metacognitive strategies. International guide to student achievement* (pp. 419-421). New York: Routledge.
- Bickart, T. (1998). *Summary report of preventing reading difficulties in young children* (National Academy of Sciences). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Cavanaugh, C. (2012). Oral language and listening skill development in early childhood. In Hougen, M. & Smartt, S. (Eds.) *Fundamentals of literacy instruction & assessment, Pre-K-6*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- De Naeghel, J., Van Keer, H., Vansteenkiste, M., & Rosseel, Y. (2012). The relation between elementary students' recreational and academic reading motivation, reading frequency, engagement, and comprehension: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of educational psychology, 104*(4), 1006.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institutes of Health.
- Shaywitz, S. (2003). *Overcoming dyslexia: A new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level*. New York: Knopf.
- Snow, C., Griffin, P., & Burns, S. (2006). *Knowledge to support the teaching of reading*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spear-Swerling, L., & Sternberg, R. J. (2001). What science offers teachers of reading. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 16, 51-57.

Vaughn, S. & Linan-Thompson, S. (2004). *Research-based methods of reading instruction Grades K-3*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Level 2

Adams, M. J. (1998). The three-cueing system. In F. Lehr & J. Osborn (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning* (pp. 73–99). New York: Guilford Press.

Crawford, E. C., & Torgesen, J. K. (2006, July). *Teaching all children to read: Practices from Reading First schools with strong intervention outcomes*. Presented at the Florida Principal's Leadership Conference, Orlando.

Retrievable from <http://www.fcrr.org/science/sciencePresentationscrawford.ht>

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1997). Early reading acquisition and its relation to reading experience and ability ten years later. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 934–945.

Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). An evaluation of intensive intervention for students with persistent reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39, 447–466.

Denton, C., Foorman, B., & Mathes, P. (2003). Schools that “Beat the Odds”: Implications for reading instruction. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24, 258–261.

Denton, C., Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. (2003). Bringing research-based practice in reading intervention to scale. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 18, 201–211.

Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2007). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention*. New York: Guilford Press.

Genesee, F., Paradis, J., & Crago, M. (2004). *Dual language development & disorders: A handbook on bilingualism & second language learning*. Baltimore: Brookes.

McCardle, P., & Chhabra, V. (2004). *The voice of evidence in reading research*. Baltimore: Brookes.

Rayner, K., & Pollatsek, A. (1989) *The Psychology of Reading* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Spear-Swerling, L. (2004). A road map for understanding reading disability and other reading problems: Origins, intervention, and prevention. In R. Ruddell & N. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading: Vol. 5*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Stanovich, K. E. (2000). *Progress in understanding reading: Scientific foundations and new frontiers*. New York: Guilford Press.

Stone, A. C., Silliman, E. R., Ehren, B. J., & Apel, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders*. New York: Guilford Press.

Vellutino, F. R., Tunmer, W. E., Jaccard, J. J., & Chen, R. (2007). Components of reading ability: Multivariate evidence for a convergent skills model of reading development. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11(1), 3–32.

Section I B: Knowledge of the Structure of Language

Level 1

Binks-Cantrell, E., Washburn, E. R., Joshi, R. M., & Hougen, M. (2012). Peter effect in the preparation of reading teachers. *Scientific Studies of Reading*. v.16, n.6, p. 526-536.

Coyne, M. Kame'enui, E. & Carnine, D. (2007). *Effective teaching strategies for accommodating diverse learners*. (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Ehri, L. C. (2014). Orthographic mapping in the acquisition of sight word reading, spelling memory, and vocabulary learning. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18:1, 5-12.

Ehri, L. C. (2005). Learning to read words: Theories, findings, and issues. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9(2), 167-188.

Grace, K. (2006). *Phonics and spelling through phoneme-grapheme mapping*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Moats, L.C. (2009). *Language essentials for teachers of reading and spelling (LETRS)*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

O'Connor, R. (2007). *Teaching Word Recognition*. Guilford Press

Level 2

- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Nagy, W., & Carlisle, J. (2010). Growth in phonological, orthographic, and morphological awareness in grades 1 to 6. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 39(2), 141-163.
- Brady, S., Gillis, M., Smith, T., Lavalette, M., Liss-Bronstein, L., Lowe, E., et al. (2009). First grade teachers' knowledge of phonological awareness and code concepts: Examining gains from an intensive form of professional development. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 22, 375–510.
- Henry, M. (2003). *Unlocking literacy*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- McCutchen, D., Abbott, R. D., & Green, L. B. (2002). Beginning literacy: Links among teacher knowledge, teacher practice, and student learning. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 69–86.
- Moats, L. C. (2000). *Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Perfetti, C. & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18:22-37.
- Spear-Swerling, L., & Brucker, P. (2004). Preparing novice teachers to develop basic reading and spelling skills in children. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 54, 332–364.
- Spear-Swerling, L., & Brucker, P. (2006). Teacher-education students' reading abilities and their knowledge about word structure. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 29, 113–123.

Section I: C-1: Structured Language Teaching: Phonology

Level 1

- Adams, M., Foorman, B. R., Lundberg, I., & Beeler, T. (Spring/Summer, 1998). The elusive phoneme: Why phonemic awareness is so important and how to help children develop it. *American Educator*, 22(1 & 2), 18–29.
- Seidenberg, M. S. (2013). The science of reading and its educational implications. *Language Learning and Development*, 9, 331-360.

Level 2

- Brady, S. & Shankweiler, D. (Eds.). (1991). *Phonological processes in literacy: A tribute to Isabelle Y. Liberman*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Gillon, G. (2004). *Phonological awareness: From research to practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Neuman, S. B., & Dickinson, D. K. (2002). *Handbook of early literacy research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Scarborough, H. S. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: Phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In B. K. Shapiro, P. J. Accardo, & A. J. Capute (Eds.), *Specific reading disability: A view of the spectrum* (pp. 75–119). Timonium, MD: York Press.
- Scarborough, H. S., & Brady, S. A. (2002). Toward a common terminology for talking about speech and reading: A glossary of the 'phon' words and some related terms. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34, 299–334.

Section I: C-2: Structured Language Teaching: Phonics and Word Recognition

Level 1

- Birsh, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Multisensory teaching of basic language skills* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Moats, L. C. (1998). Teaching decoding. *American Educator*, 22(1&2), 42–49, 95–96.

Level 2

- Blachman, B. A., Schatschneider, C., Fletcher, J. M., Francis, D. J., Clonan, S., Shaywitz, B., et al. (2004). Effects of intensive reading remediation for second and third graders. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 444–461.
- Calhoun, M. B. (2005). Effects of a peer-mediated phonological skill and reading comprehension program on reading skill acquisition for middle school students with reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38(5), 424–433.
- Catone, W. V., & Brady, S. (2005). The inadequacy of individual educational program goals for high school students with word-level reading difficulties. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 55(1), 53–78.
- Christensen, C. A., & Bowey, J. A. (2005). The efficacy of orthographic rime, grapheme-phoneme

- correspondence, and implicit phonics approaches to teaching decoding skills. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 9, 327–349.
- Ehri, L. C. (2004). Teaching phonemic awareness and phonics: An explanation of the national reading panel meta-analysis. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 153–186). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Joseph, L. M., & Schisler, R. (2009). Should adolescents go back to the basics?: A review of teaching word reading skills to middle and high school students. *Remedial and Special Education* 30 (3), 131–147.
- Lovett, M. W., Barron, R. W., & Benson, N. J. (2003). Effective remediation of word identification and decoding difficulties in school-age children with reading disabilities. In H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Learning Disabilities* (pp. 273–292). New York: Guilford Press.
- Mathes, P. G., Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., Francis, D. J., & Schatschneider, C. (2005). The effects of theoretically different instruction and student characteristics on the skills of struggling readers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40, 148–182.
- McCandliss, B., Beck, I. L., Sandak, R., & Perfetti, C. (2003). Focusing attention on decoding for children with poor reading skills: Design and preliminary tests of the word building intervention. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 7, 75–104.
- Torgesen, J. K. (2004). Lessons learned from research on interventions for students who have difficulty learning to read. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 355–381). Baltimore: Brookes.

Section I: C-3: Structured Language Teaching: Fluent, Automatic Reading of Text

Level 1

- Carreker, S. (2005). Teaching reading: Accurate decoding and fluency. In J. Birsh (Ed.), *Multisensory teaching of basic language skills* (2nd ed., pp. 213–255). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator*, 22(1&2), 8–15.
- Hasbrouck, J. E., & Tindal, G. A. (2006). Oral Reading Fluency norms: A valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 59 (7), 636–644.
- Hudson, R. F., Lane, H. B., & Pullen, P. C. (2005). Reading fluency assessment and instruction: What, why, and how? *The Reading Teacher*, 58, 702–714.
- Kuhn, M. (2004/2005). Helping students become accurate, expressive reading: Fluency instruction for small groups. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(4), 338–345.
- Meyer, M. (Winter, 2002) Repeated reading: An old standard is revisited and renovated. *Perspectives* (The International Dyslexia Association Quarterly Newsletter), 15–18.
- Meyer, M. S., & Felton, R. H. (1999). Repeated reading to enhance fluency: Old approaches and new directions. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 49, 293–306.
- Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 58, 510–519.
- Samuels, S. J. (1997). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, 50, 76–81.

Level 2

- Chard, D., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. (2002) A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 386–406.
- Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., & Katch, L. E. (2004). Beyond the reading wars: Exploring the effect of child-instruction interactions on growth in early reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8, 305–336.
- Ehri, L. C. (1997). Sight word learning in normal readers and dyslexics. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia* (pp. 163–189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Walz, L., & Germann, G. (1993). Formative evaluation of academic progress: How much growth should we expect? *School Psychology Review*, 22, 27–48.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5(3), 239–256.

- Good, R. H., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(3), 257–288.
- Hamilton, C., & Shinn, M. R. (2003). Characteristics of word callers: An investigation of the accuracy of teachers' judgments of reading comprehension and oral reading skills. *School Psychology Review, 32*(2), 228–240.
- Hosp, M. K., Hosp, J. L., & Howell, K.W. (2007). *The ABC's of CBM: A practical guide to curriculum-based measurement*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Katzir, T., Kim, Y., Wolf, M., O'Brien, B., Kennedy, B., Lovett, M., et al. (2006). Reading fluency: The whole is more than the parts. *Annals of Dyslexia, 56*(1), 51–82.
- National Center for Education Statistics, 2002. *Fourth grade students reading aloud: NAEP 2002 special study of oral reading*. Washington, DC: National Assessment of Educational Progress, United States Department of Education, Institute for Education Sciences.
- Samuels, S. J., & Flor, R. F. (1997). The importance of automaticity for developing expertise in reading. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 13*, 107–121.
- Speece, D. L., & Ritchey, K. D. (2005). A longitudinal study of the development of oral reading fluency in young children at risk for reading failure. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(5), 387–399.
- Stahl, S. A., & Heubach, K. (2005). Fluency-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of literacy research, 37*, 25–60.
- Therrien, W. J., Wickstrom, K., & Jones, K. (2006). Effect of a combined repeated reading and question generation intervention on reading achievement. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 21*(2), 89–97.
- Torgesen, J., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K., Conway, T., et al. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*, 33–58.

Section I: C-4: Structured Language Teaching: Vocabulary

Level 1

- Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2006). *Vocabulary handbook*. Berkeley, CA: Consortium on Reading Excellence.
- Ebbers, S. (2006). *Vocabulary through morphemes*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life, Second Edition: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Biemiller, A. (1999). Language and reading success. In J. Chall (Ed.), *From reading research to practice, A series for teachers*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Biemiller, A. (2005). Size and sequence in vocabulary development: Implications for choosing words for primary grade instruction. In E. H. Hiebert and M. L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The knowledge deficit: Closing the shocking education gap for American children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Level 2

- Carlisle, J., & Rice, M. S. (2003). *Reading comprehension: Research-based principles and practices*. Baltimore: York Press.
- Dickinson, D. K., & Smith, M. W. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low-income children's vocabulary and story comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*, 104–123.
- Graves, M. (2006). *The Vocabulary book: Learning and instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Hirsch, E. D. (2001). Overcoming the language gap. *American Educator, 25*(2), 4, 6–7.
- Kamil, M. (2004). Vocabulary and comprehension instruction: Summary and implications of the National Reading Panel findings. In P. McCardle and V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 213–234).
- Marzano, R., Simms, J. (2013). *Vocabulary for the Common Core*. Bloomington, IN. Marzano Research Laboratory.

- Metsala, J. L. (1999) Young children's phonological awareness and nonword repetition as a function of vocabulary development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 3–19.
- Paynter, D. E., Bodrova, E., & Doty, J. K. (2005). *For the love of words: Vocabulary instruction that works, Grades K–6*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Simpson, J. A. (Ed.). (1989). *The Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd Edition, Vol. VII). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stahl, S. A., & Nagy, W. E. (2006) *Teaching word meanings*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tannenbaum, K. R., Torgesen, J. T., & Wagner, R. K. (2006). Relationships between word knowledge and reading comprehension in 3rd grade children. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 10*, 381–398.

Section I: C-5: Structured Language Teaching: Text Comprehension

Level 1

- Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2006). *Improving comprehension with questioning the author: A fresh and expanded view of a powerful approach*. New York: Scholastic.
- Beck, I., McKeown, M., Hamilton, R., & Kucan, L. (1998). Getting at the meaning. *American Educator, 22*, 66–85.
- Caccamise, D., & Snyder, L. (Eds.). (2009). Reading comprehension: Issues and instructional applications. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy, 35*(2).
- Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator, 22*, 8–15.
- Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 64*, 479–530.
- Willingham, D. T. (2006). How knowledge helps: It speeds and strengthens reading comprehension, learning, and thinking. *American Educator, 30*(1), 30–37.
- Willingham, D. T. (2006-07). The usefulness of brief instruction in reading comprehension strategies. *American Educator, 30*(4), 39–45.

Level 2

- Barnes, M. A., Johnston, A. M., & Dennis, M. (2007). Comprehension in a neurodevelopmental disorder, Spina Bifida Myelomeningocele. In K. Cain & J. V. Oakhill (Eds.), *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 193–217). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. V. (2007). Reading comprehension difficulties: Correlates, causes, and consequences. In K. Cain & J. V. Oakhill (Eds.), *Children's comprehension problems in oral and written language: A cognitive perspective* (pp. 81–103) New York: Guilford Press.
- Carlisle, J. R., & Rice, M. S. (2002). *Improving reading comprehension: Research-based principles and practices*. Baltimore: York Press.
- Catts, H. W., Fey, M. E., Zhang, X., & Tomblin, J. A. (1999). Language basis of reading and language disabilities: Evidence from a longitudinal investigation. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 3*, 331–361.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. B., & Simmons, D. C. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*, 174–206.
- Gattardo, A., Stanovich, K., & Siegel, L. (1996). The relationships between phonological sensitivity, syntactic processing, and verbal working memory in the reading performance of third-grade children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 63*, 563–582.
- Gersten, R., Fuchs, L. S., Williams, J. P., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching reading comprehension strategies to students with learning disabilities: A review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*, 279–320.
- Graesser, A. C. (2008). An introduction to strategic reading comprehension. In D. S. McNamara (Ed.), *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, intervention and technologies* (pp. 3–26). New York: Erlbaum.
- Hirsch, E. D. (2006). Building knowledge: The case for bringing content into the language arts block and for a knowledge-rich curriculum core for all children. *American Educator, 30*(1), 8–21, 28–29, 50–51.
- Kamil, M. (2004). Vocabulary and comprehension instruction: Summary and implications of the National Reading Panel findings. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 213–234). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Kintsch, E. (2005). Comprehension theory as a guide for the design of thoughtful questions. *Topics in language*

disorders, 25(1), pp. 51–64.

- National Reading Technical Assistance Center (2010). *A Review of the Current Research on Comprehension Instruction*. Retrieval from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/support/index.html>
- Perfetti, C. & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a Theory of Comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(1), 22-37.
- Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be the instruction of? In M. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). Reading for understanding: Toward a research and development program in reading comprehension. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
(<http://www.rand.org/multi/achievementforall/reading/readreport.html>.)
- Scarborough, H. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research* (pp. 97–110). New York: Guilford Press.
- Scott, C. (2004). Syntactic contributions to literacy development. In C. Stone, E. Stillman, B. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.). *Handbook of Language & Literacy* (pp. 340–362). New York: Guilford Press.
- Shankweiler, D., Lundquist, E., Katz, L., Stuebing, K. K., Fletcher, J. M., Brady, S., et al. (1999). Comprehension and decoding: Patterns of association in children with reading difficulties. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 31, 24–35, 69–94.
- Stahl, K.A.D. (2004). Proof, practice, and promise: Comprehension strategy instruction in the primary grades. *The Reading Teacher*, 57, 598–609.
- Sweet, A. P., & Snow, C. E. (2003). *Rethinking reading comprehension*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Vaughn, S., & Klingner, J. K. (1999). Teaching reading comprehension through collaborative strategic reading. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 34, 284–292.
- Westby, C. (2004). A language perspective on executive functioning, metacognition, and self-regulation in reading. In C. A. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 398–427). New York: Guilford Press.
- Williams, J. P. (2006). Stories, studies, and suggestions about reading. *Scientific studies of reading*, 10(2), 121–142.

Section I: C-6: Structured Language Teaching: Handwriting, Spelling, and Written Expression

Level 1

- Berninger, V., & Wolf, B. (2009) *Teaching students with dyslexia and dysgraphia*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Graham, S., McArthur, C.A., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Best practices in writing instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Joshi, M., Treiman, R., Carreker, S., & Moats, L. C. (2008/2009) How words cast their spell: Spelling is an integral part of learning the language, not a matter of memorization. *American Educator*, 32(4), 6–16, 42–43.
- Moats, L. C. (Winter 2005/06). How spelling supports reading: And why it is more regular and predictable than you think. *American Educator*, 12–22, 42–43.

Level 2

- Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Jones, J., Gould, L., Anderson-Youngstrom, M., Shimada, S., et al. (2006). Early development of language by hand: Composing, reading, listening, and speaking connections; three letter-writing modes; and fast mapping in spelling. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 29, 61–92.
- Berninger, V. W., & Amtmann, D. (2003). Preventing written expression disabilities through early and continuing assessment and intervention for handwriting and/or spelling problems: Research into practice. In H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of Learning Disabilities* (pp. 345–363). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cassar, M., Treiman, R., Moats, L., Pollo, T. C., & Kessler, B. (2005). How do the spellings of children with dyslexia compare with those of nondyslexic children? *Reading and Writing*, 18, 27–49.

- Edwards, L. (2003). Writing instruction in kindergarten: Examining an emerging area of research for children with writing and reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 36*, 136.
- Englert, C. S., Wu, X., & Zhao, Y. (2005). Cognitive tools for writing: Scaffolding the performance of students through technology. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 20*, 184–198.
- Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Elementary School Journal, 101*, 251–272.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools – A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Troia, G. (Ed.). (2009) *Instruction and assessment for struggling writers: Evidence-based practices*. New York: Guilford Press.

Section I D: Interpretation and Administration of Assessments for Planning Instruction

Level 1

- Chapman, J.W. & Tunmer, W.E. (2007). Language-related differences between discrepancy-defined and non-discrepancy-defined poor readers: A longitudinal study of dyslexia in New Zealand. *Dyslexia, 13*(1), 42–66
- Hasbrouck, J., & Haager, D. (Eds.). (2007). Monitoring children’s progress in academic learning. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy 33*(2).
- Lyon, G. R., Shaywitz, S., & Shaywitz, B. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia, 53*, 1–14.
- Torgesen, J. K. (2004). Avoiding the devastating downward spiral: The evidence that early intervention prevents reading failure. *American Educator, 28*(3), 6–9, 12–13, 17–19, 45–47.

Level 2

- Cutting, L. E., & Scarborough, H. S. (2006). Prediction of reading comprehension: Relative contributions of word recognition, language proficiency, and other cognitive skills can depend on how comprehension is measured. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 10*, 277–299.
- Deno, S. L. (2003). Developments in curriculum-based measurement. *Journal of Special Education, 37*, 184–192.
- Fletcher, J. M., Lyon, G. R., Fuchs, L. S., & Barnes, M. A. (2007). *Learning disabilities: From identification to intervention*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Fuchs, L. (2004). The past, present, and future of curriculum-based measurement research. *School Psychology Review, 33*, 188–192.
- Fuchs, D., Compton, D. L., Fuchs, L. S., & Bryant, J. (2008). Making "secondary intervention" work in a three-tier responsiveness-to-intervention model: Findings from the first-grade longitudinal reading study at the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 21*, 413–436.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Compton, D. L. (2004). Identifying reading disabilities by responsiveness-to-instruction: Specifying measures and criteria. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 27*, 216–227.
- Good, R. H., Simmons, D. C., & Kame’enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*, 257–288.
- Hogan, T. P., Catts, H. W., & Little, T. D. (2005). The relationship between phonological awareness and reading: Implications for the assessment of phonological awareness. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 36*, 285–293.
- Jenkins, J. R., Johnson, E., & Hileman, J. (2004). When is reading also writing: Sources of individual differences on the new reading performance assessments. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 8*, 125–152.
- Keenan, J. M., Betjemann, R. S., & Olson, R. K. (2008). Reading comprehension tests vary in the skills they assess: Differential dependence on decoding and oral comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 12*, 281–300.
- Pennington, B. (2009). *Diagnosing learning disorders* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K., & Conway, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes

from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34, 33–58.

Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., & Hickman, P. (2003). Response to instruction as a means of identifying students with reading/learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 69, 391–409.

Vellutino, F. R., Scanlon, D. M., Sipay, E. R., Small, S. G., Chen, R., Pratt, A., & Denckla, M. B. (1996). Cognitive profiles of difficult-to-remediate and readily remediated poor readers: Early intervention as a vehicle for distinguishing between cognitive and experimental deficits as basic causes of specific reading disability. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 601–638.

Section I E: Knowledge of Dyslexia and Other Learning Disorders

Level 1

Aaron, P. G., Joshi, R. M., Gooden, R., & Bentum, K. (2008). Diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities based on the component model of reading: An alternative to the discrepancy model of LD. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 41, 67–84.

Hudson, R. R., High, L., & Al Otaiba, S. (2007). Dyslexia and the brain: What does current research tell us? *The Reading Teacher*, 60(6), 506–515.

Lyon, R., Shaywitz, S., & Shaywitz, B. (2003). A definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 53, 1–14.

Moats, L. C., & Dakin, K. (2007). *Basic facts about dyslexia*. Baltimore: The International Dyslexia Association.

Level 2

Catts, H. W., Hogan, T. P., & Adlof, S. M. (2005). Developmental changes in reading and reading disabilities. In H. W. Catts & A. Kamhi (Eds.), *The connections between language and reading disabilities* (pp. 25–40). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Leach, J. M., Scarborough, H. S., & Rescorla, L. (2003). Late-emerging reading disabilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 211–224.

Ehri, L., & Snowling, M. (2004). Developmental variation in word recognition. In A. C. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders* (pp. 443–460). New York: Guilford Press.

Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. (2009) *Developmental disorders of language, learning, and cognition*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pennington, B. (2009). *Diagnosing learning disorders* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Olson, R. K. (2004). SSSR, environment, and genes. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8(2), 111–124.

Rayner, K., Foorman, B. F., Perfetti, C. A., Pesetsky, D., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2002). How should reading be taught? *Scientific American*, 286(3), 84–91.

Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., Peyton, J. A., & Jenkins, J. R. (2002). Timing and intensity of tutoring: A closer look at the conditions for effective early literacy tutoring. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 17, 227–241.

Wolf, M. (2007). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. New York: Harper Collins.

Wolf, M., & Bowers, P. G. (1999). The double-deficit hypothesis for the developmental dyslexias. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 415–438.

Appendix A: Motivation

While researchers have studied motivation from a variety of perspectives, it is clear that motivation plays a major role in reading development and achievement. If we want students to become motivated to read and to engage deeply in reading, it is critical that teachers and reading specialists help students build the strong foundational skills that are outlined in the IDA Standards. Mastery of these skills will motivate children to spend more time reading, and increased reading will increase their achievement and academic success. Teachers should also consider individual reading motivators so that students choose to engage in reading for continuous, lifelong enjoyment and learning.

References:

- Ali, J., & McInerney, D.M. (2005). *An analysis of the predictive validity of the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM)* [Electronic version]. Paper presented at the AARE 2005 International Educational Conference, Sydney, Australia. SELF Research Center, AL105403.
- Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dimensions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(4), 452-477.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148.
- Blackwell, L., Trzesniewski, K., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention. *Child Development, 78*(1), 246-263.
- Brophy, J. (2008). Developing students' appreciation for what is taught in school. *Educational Psychologist, 43*(3), 13-141.
- Chapman, J.W., & Tunmer, W. E. (1995). Development of young children's reading self-concepts: An examination of emerging subcomponents and their relationships with reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(1), 154-167.
- Dweck, C. S. (2010). The perils and promises of praise. *Educational Leadership, 68*(1), 16-20.
- Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J.T. Spence (Ed.) *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco: Freeman.
- Gambrell, L.B., Palmer, B.M., Codling, R.M., & Mazzoni, S.A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 49*(7), 518-533.
- Marinak, B.A. & Gambrell, L.B. (2008). Intrinsic motivation and rewards: What sustains young children's engagement with text. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 47*(1), 9-26.
- Nolen, S.B. (2007). Young children's motivation to read and write: Development in social contexts. *Cognition & Instruction, 15*(2), 219-270.
- Pressley, M. (1998). *Reading instruction that works*. NY: The Guilford Press.
- Taylor, B. M., Frye, B. J., & Maruyama, G. M. (1990). Time spent reading and reading growth. *American Education Research Journal, 27*, 351-362.

Stahl, S. A. (2004). What do we know about fluency? In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 187-211). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Mathew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21(4), 360-407.

Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E.L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(1), 19-31.

Appendix B: Children's Literature Bibliography

The following books provide an engaging way to support the early literacy skills of letter learning, letter-sound relationships and phonemic awareness.*

Alphabet for All!

- Arnosky, J. 1999. *Mouse Letters: A Very First Alphabet Book*. New York: Clarion.
- Baker, Keith. 2012. *LMNO Peas*. New York: Beach Lane Books.
- Bingham, Kelly & Zelinsky, P.O. 2012. *Z is for Moose*. New York: Greenwillow Books.
- Bunting, Eve . 2002. *Girls A to Z*. Ill. Suzanne Bloom. Honesdale, PA: Boyds Mills Press.
- Cabatingan, E. & Myers, M. 2012. *A is for Musk Ox*. New York: Roaring Book Press.
- Cahoon, H. 1999. *Word play ABC*. New York: Walker and Company.
- Catalanotto, P. 2002. *Matthew A.B.C.* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Chandra, D. & Narakashi, K. 1999. *A is for Amos*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.
- Cohen, I. 1997. *ABC discovery! An Alphabet Book of Picture Puzzles*. New York: Dial Books.
- Edwards, W. .2002. *Alphabeasts*. Tonawanda, NY: Kids Can Press.
- Horenstein, H. 1999. *A is for...?: A photographer's Alphabet of Animals*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Hyman, T.S. 2000. *The Alphabet Game*. New York: SeaStar Books.
- Inkpen, Mick 2000. *Kipper's A to Z. An Alphabet Adventure*. New York, NY: Red Wagon Books, Harcourt, Inc.
- Lester, A. 1998. *Alice and Aldo*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lichtenheld, T. & Fields-Meyer, E. 2011. *E-mergency!* San Fransisco: Chronicle Books.
- Most, B. 2000. *ABC T-rex*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt.
- Rosenthal, A.K. & Durand, D. 2011. *Al Pha's Bet*. New York: Putnam Juvenile.
- Sierra, J. & Sweet, M. 2009. *The Sleepy Little Alphabet*. Knopf Books for Young Readers.
- Sneed, Bradley D. 2002. *Picture a Letter*. New York, NY: Phyllis Fogelman Books, imprint of Penguin Putnam, Inc.
- Walton, R. & Miglio, P. 1998. *So Many Bunnies: A Bedtime ABC and Counting Book*. New York: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard.

Alliteration

- Edwards, P.D. 1996. *Some Smug Slug*. Ill. H. Cole. New York: HarperCollins.
- Edwards, P.D. & Cole, H. 1997. *Dinorella: A Prehistoric Fairy Tale*. New York: Hyperion.
- Enderle, J., Tessler, S., & O'Brien (1997). *Six Sandy Sheep*. Honesdale, PA: Boyds Mills. .
- Jonas, A. 1997. *Watch William Walk*. New York: Greenwillow.
- Lindbergh, R. & Pearson, T.C. 1997. *The Awful Aardvarks Go to School*. Ill. T.C. Pearson.
- Most, B. 1998. *A Pair of Protoceratops*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Most, B. 1998. *A Trio of Triceratops*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Always Time for Poetry and Verse

- Apperley, D. 2002. *Good Night, Sleep Tight, Little Bunnies*. New York, NY: Scholastic, Inc.
- Church, C.J. 2002. *Do Your Ears Hang Low?* New York, NY: The Chicken House, Scholastic Inc.
- Cotton, C. & Cartwright, R. (2002). *At the Edge of the Woods*. New York, NY: Henry Holt & Company.
- Crews, N. 2004. *The Neighborhood Mother Goose*. New York: Greenwillow Books.
- Davies, N. & Hearld, M. 2012. *Outside your Window: A First Book of Nature*.
- Florian, D. 1999. *Laugh-eteria*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Florian, D. 2012. *Poem Runs: Baseball Poems and Paintings*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.
- Florian, D. & Neubecker R. 2012. *Shiver Me Timbers! Pirate Poems & Paintings*. New York: Beach Lane Books.
- Florian, D. 2012. *UnBEElievables: Honeybee Poems and Paintings*. New York: Beach Lane Books.
- George, K.O. & Carpenter, N. (2012). *Emma Dilemma: Big Sister Poems*. New York: Clarion Books.
- Goldstone, B. & Lent, B. 1998. *The Beastly Feast*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Harper, C. M. 2002. *There was a Bold Lady who Wanted a Star*. New York, NY: Megan Tingley Books, Little, Brown and Company.
- Harris, P. & Cartwright, R. 1997. *Mouse Creeps*. New York: Dial.
- Hillenbrand, W. 2002. *Fiddle-I-Fee*. New York, NY: Gulliver Books, Harcourt Inc.
- Hoberman, M. A. 2012. *Forget-Me-Nots: Poems to Learn by Heart*. New York: Hachette Book Group.

- Janeczko, P.B. & Raschka, C. 2009. *A Foot in the Mouth*. Somerville, MA: Candlewick Press.
- Lewis, J.P. & Desimini, L. 1998. *Doodle Dandies: Poems that take shape*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lewis, J. P. 2012. *National Geographic Book of Animal Poetry*. Washington, DC: National Geographic Children's Book.
- Lewis, J. P. & Bloch S. *The Underwear Salesman & Other Jobs for Better or Verse*. New York: Antheneum Books for Young Readers.
- Martin, Bill. 2009. *The Bill Martin Jr. Big Book of Poetry*. New York: Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.
- Mayo, M. 2002. *Wiggle Waggle Fun*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Mitton, T. & Parker-Rees. 2002. *Down by the Cool of the Pool*. Ill. Guy Parker-Rees. New York, NY: Orchard Books, imprint of Scholastic Inc.
- Montgomery, M. & Montgomery W. (2002). *Over the Candlestick*. Atlanta, GA: Peachtree Publishers.
- Nakamura, K.R. & Riley, L. (2002). *Song of Night. It's Time to Go to Bed*. Ill. Linnea Riley. New York, NY: The Blue Sky Press, imprint of Scholastic, Inc.
- Nichol, B. 1997. *Biscuits in the Cupboard*. Toronto: Stoddart Kids.
- Opie, I (Ed.) & Wells, R. 1999. *Here Comes Mother Goose*. Cambridge, MA: Candlewick.
- Root, P. 1998. *One Duck Stuck*. Cambridge MA: Candlewick.
- Rose, D. L. & Munsinger, L. (2002). *Birthday Zoo*. Morton Grove, IL: Albert Whitman & Company. .
- Rotner, S. 2001. *Parts*. New York, NY: Walker & Company.
- Ruddell, D. & Rankin, J. 2009. *A Whiff of Pine, a Hint of Skunk*. New York: Margaret K. Mc Elderly Books.
- Schertle, A. & Mathers, P. 2009. *Button Up! Wrinkled Rhymes*. New York: Harcourt Publishing Company.
- Shulman, L. & Wolff, A. 2002. *Old MacDonald had a Woodshop*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Sidman, Joyce. & Zagarenski, P. 2009. *Red Sings from Treetops: A Year in Colors*. Houghton Mifflin Books for Children.
- Sklansky, Amy E., Firehammer, K., Koeser, S. & McQuiitty, C. 2002. *From the doghouse*. New York, NY: Henry Holt & Company.
- Wadsworth, O. A. & Vojtech, A. 2002. *Over in the Meadow*. New York, NY: North-South Books.
- Wescott, N.B. 1987. *Peanut Butter and Jelly: A Play Rhyme*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Wheeler, L. & Ohora, Z. 2013. *The Pet Project: Cute and Cuddly Vicious Verses*. New York: Antheneum Books for Young Children.

Zelinsky, P. 2002. *Knick-Knack Paddywhack!* New York, NY: Dutton Children's Books, division of Penguin Putnam Books for Young Readers.

Playing With Words

Baker, K. 1999. *Quack and Count*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Banks, K. & Kulikov, B. 2006. *Max's Words*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

Banks, K. & Kulikov, B. 2011. *Max's Castle*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

Baranski, J.S. & Han, Y. 2001. *Round as a Pancake*. New York: Dutton. ISBN 0-525-46173-6.

Black, M.I. & Kevin Hawks. 2009. *Chicken Cheeks*. New York: Simon & Schuster Book for Young Readers.

Bynum, J. 1999. *Altoona Baboona*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

Carr, J. & Donohue, D. 1999. *Frozen Noses*. New York: Holiday House.

Dorling Kindersley Publishing. 2002. *My First Word Book*. New York, NY: DK Publishing, Inc.

Falwell, C. 1998. *Word Wizard*. New York: Clarion Books.

Fleming, C. & Karas, G.B. 2002. *Muncha! Muncha! Muncha!* New York, NY: Anne Schwartz Book, Atheneum Books for Young Readers.

Fox, M. & J. Horacek. 2004. *Where is the Green Sheep?* San Diego: Harcourt.

Godwin, L. & Root, B. 2002. *Central Park Serenade*. New York, NY: Joanna Cotler Books, Imprint of HarperCollins.

Godwin, L. & Morgan, M. 2002. *What the Baby Hears*. New York, NY: Hyperion Books for Children.

Gravett, E. 2007. *Orange Pear Apple Bear*. New York: Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers.

Hines, A.G. & Pham, L. 2001. *Who's Shoes?* New York, NY: Harcourt, Inc.

Hines, A.G. & Pham, L. 2002. *Which Hat is That?* New York, NY: Harcourt, Inc.

Hoberman, M.A. & Wescott, N.B. 1998. *Miss Mary Mack*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Hubbard, W.M. 2002. *Whoa Jealousy!* New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

London, J. & Rex, M. 1999. *Wiggle Waggle*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.

McCall, F. & Keeler, P. (2002). *A Huge Hog is a Big Pig*. New York, NY: Greenwillow Books, an imprint of HarperCollins.

- McLeod, E. 1998. *I Heard a Little Baa*. Buffalo, NY: Kids Can Press. ISBN 1-55074-496-8.
- McMullan, K. & McMullan, J. 2002. *I Stink!* New York, NY: Joanna Cotler Books, imprint of HarperCollins Publishers.
- Minters, F. & Bynum, J. 2001. *Too Big, Too Small, Just Right*. New York: Harcourt.
- Nikola-Lisa, W. & Tate, D. 2002. *Summer Sun Risin'*. New York, NY: Lee & Low Books Inc.
- Ochiltree, D. 2002. *Pillow Pup*. New York, NY: Margaret K. McElderry Books, imprint of Simon & Schuster Children's Publishing Division.
- Rand, A. & P. 1957. *Sparkle and Spin: A Book about Words*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- Rosenthal, A.K. & Bloch S. 2012. *I Scream! Ice Cream! A Book of Wordles*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- Rosenthal, A.K. & Lichtenheld, T. 2012. *Wumbers*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- Roth, C. & Paparone, P. 2002. *The Little School Bus*. New York, NY: North-South Books.
- Schotter, R. & Potter, G. 2006. *The Boy who Loved Words*. (Giselle Potter)
- Sierra, J. & Hillenbrand, W. 2001. *Preschool to the Rescue*. New York: Harcourt.
- Singer, M. & Manders, J. 2002. *Quiet Night*. New York, NY: Clarion Books, imprint of Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Ziefert, H. & Brown, R. 1997. *Baby Buggy, Buggy Baby*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ziefert, H. & Brown, R. 1997. *Night Knight*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Rhythm & Rhyme

- Archer, D. 2013. *Urgency Emergency! Big Bad Wolf*. Park Ridge, IL: Albert Whitman & Company.
- Archer, D. 2013. *Urgency Emergency! Itsy Bitsy Spider*. Park Ridge, IL: Albert Whitman & Company
- Bryan, S. & Murphy, T. 2011. *A Boy and His Bear*. New York: Arcade Publishing.
- Bryan, S. & Murphy, T. 2011. *A Boy and His Bunny*. New York: Arcade Publishing
- Bryan, S. & Murphy, T. 2011. *A Girl and Her Gator*. New York: Arcade Publishing
- Martin, E.W. 2013. *Dream Animals: A Bedtime Journey*. New York: Random House for Young Readers.
- Pearson, S. & Shepherd, A. 2013. *Mouse House Tales*. Mapplewood, NJ: Blue Apple Books.
- Pendziwol, J.E. & Arsenault, I. 2013. *Once Upon a Northern Night*. Toronto, ON: Groundwood Books.

Robinson, F. 2011. *What Animals Really Like*. New York: Abrams Book.

Thomas, J. 2009. *Rhyming Dust Bunnies*. New York: Beach Lane Books.

Wilcox, L. & Monks, L. 2003. *Falling for Rapunzel*. London: Puffin Books.

*Book list provided by Lisa Patrick, PhD and Patricia Scharer, PhD, The Ohio State University

©2010, by The International Dyslexia Association® (IDA).

All rights reserved.

IDA encourages the reproduction and distribution of this document.

If portions of the text are cited, appropriate reference must be made.

This document may not be reprinted for the purpose of resale.