~~Tennessee Reading Policy~~

~~The Tennessee Reading Panel supports a comprehensive, cohesive reading program for all educational institutions in the state of Tennessee. The program is consistent with State Curriculum Standards and current research in reading and best practice. The overall goal is to inform and improve instruction and to help all students in Tennessee become successful readers.~~

~~The Tennessee policy addresses the five student rights to excellent literacy instruction. The International Reading Association encourages states to adopt and implement effective literacy instruction for all children. Those rights are:~~

~~**Students have the right to be taught reading by certified teachers who have taken two or more courses in the teaching of reading and/or who have demonstrated their proficiency in the teaching of reading.** These certified teachers keep their skills up to date through effective professional development. The state requires reading courses for all teachers K-12 or requires that all K-12 teachers show proficiency in the teaching of reading. The state requires ongoing professional development for teachers.~~

~~**Students who struggle as readers have the right to receive additional help from qualified reading specialists.** The state supports reading professionals/specialists, provides or supports intervention programs for struggling readers at all grade levels, and has state staff positions specifically dedicated to the promotion of reading.~~

~~The commitment of the state is evident in attention to student reading achievement, for example, through support for second language learners, support for the development of home/school partnerships, state initiatives, analyses of multiple measures of reading performance, development of state standards, and the provision of support to local districts.~~

~~**Students have a right of access to a wide variety of books and other reading materials in classroom and school library media centers.** Students have a right as well to access technology that will enhance their reading achievement. The state provides ample support for building and maintaining good collections in classrooms and school library media centers. The state or province provides access to technology to all students, including those in schools in low income communities.~~

~~**Students have the right to be taught beginning reading through methods chosen on the basis of their needs as learners.** The state encourages the use of multiple methods in beginning reading, with methods selected on the basis of~~

students' needs in learning to read, and does not mandate the use of one particular method.

Students have the right to reading assessment with multiple methods that provide information about their strengths and needs as learners, involve them in making decisions about their own learning, and lead to clear implications for instruction. The state uses multiple measures of reading achievement and does not rely only on standardized tests or use single test scores to make promotion, placement, or graduation decisions.

To ensure the prevention and correction of reading difficulties as well as improving reading instruction for all students, districts and schools must adopt a three-tier reading model for reading instruction.

The Three Tier Model for Reading Instruction

Tier I addresses the needs for the majority of students. Using flexible grouping and targeting specific skills, classroom teachers are provided with the training and the tools they need. (a) a core reading program based on scientific reading research, (b) ongoing assessments and benchmark testing of students to determine instructional needs at least three times per year (fall, winter and spring), and (c) ongoing professional development and support to provide teachers with the necessary tools to ensure every student receives quality reading instruction.

Tier II addresses the needs of those students where focused instruction within the classroom is not enough. These students require additional instruction beyond the usual time allotted for core reading instruction. Tier II gives the students an additional thirty minutes of intensive small-group reading instruction daily. The aim is to support and reinforce skills being taught by the classroom teacher.

Tier III addresses the small percentage of students who have received Tier II instruction and continue to show marked difficulty in acquiring necessary reading skills. These students require instruction that is more explicit, more intensive, and specifically meets their individual needs. It is suggested students at this level receive an additional thirty minutes can be provided for the students.

Necessary Services and Support

The following services and supportive groups must agree improved student reading achievement is a high priority and work to provide the necessary programming, resources and funding to sustain high quality reading instruction:

- Teacher Professional Development
- Teachers Working in Teams
- Building and District Leadership Support, Resources and Funding
- Public Support and Advocacy
- Family/Community Partnerships
- Teacher Preparation Through Higher Education
- Teacher Preparation Through Alternative Route
- State Leadership Support, Resources and Funding

~~Recommendations of the Tennessee Reading Panel~~

~~The Tennessee Reading Panel suggests the following:~~

1. ~~Use the State Board of Education Language Arts Curriculum Standards, current research and identified best practices to provide the resources and training necessary for teachers and teacher educators to ensure all teachers are knowledgeable and competent to improve reading instruction for all students.~~

2. ~~Share the successful reading professional development program designed by the Tennessee Department of Education with all K-3 schools.~~

3. ~~Implement a systemic plan to continuously monitor the progress of students to determine reading proficiency in the essential components of reading at all levels using assessment data.~~

4. ~~Base reading instruction on Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR) and appropriate assessment data. Teachers at all levels must have a strong understanding of the way students learn. Establish a comprehensive and coordinated K-12 literacy program in each local education agency (LEA). Teams of teachers should meet regularly to align and plan instruction across the curriculum, ensure articulation across grade levels, and explore practices that will improve reading instruction.~~

5. ~~Implement a comprehensive and coordinated K-12 literacy program supported by access to a variety of adequate resources including licensed reading specialists, trained literacy coaches, trained paraprofessionals, appropriate materials, and on-going professional development.~~

6. ~~Provide a daily minimum of 90 minutes or more of uninterrupted, direct, and explicit reading instruction using a comprehensive SBRR program that systematically and effectively includes the five essential elements of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension), taught appropriately per grade level.~~

7. ~~Adopt the Three-Tier Reading Model with an intense daily intervention program to meet the needs of all students.~~

8. ~~Use SBRR methods, programs, and materials for instruction, remediation, and practice.~~

9. ~~Use SBRR assessments to inform instruction and determine flexible grouping through ongoing progress monitoring.~~

10. ~~Integrate reading standards in all 7-12 licensure areas.~~

11. ~~Support and encourage collaboration among institutions of higher education, local education agencies and other agencies or organizations (e.g., TACTE, TAILACTE, TRA, SDE) to continue to study student achievement as related to the performance of new teacher graduates.~~

12. ~~Establish a literacy network and on-line clearinghouse that distributes, disseminates, and promotes information concerning existing programs and support systems to school districts throughout Tennessee.~~

13. ~~Focus on the fifteen elements of effective Adolescent Literacy Programs listed in the "Reading Next" report which include:~~

    - ~~Direct, explicit comprehension instruction~~
    - ~~Effective instructional principles embedded in content~~
    - ~~Motivation and self-directed learning~~
    - ~~Text-based collaborative learning~~
    - ~~Strategic tutoring~~
    - ~~Diverse texts~~
    - ~~Intensive writing~~
    - ~~A technology component~~
    - ~~Ongoing formative assessment of students~~
    - ~~Extended time for literacy~~
    - ~~Teacher professional development~~
    - ~~Ongoing summative assessment~~
    - ~~Teacher working in teams~~
    - ~~District and School Leadership~~
    - ~~A comprehensive and coordinated literacy program~~

14. ~~Develop and implement a state-wide literacy awareness campaign.~~

15. ~~Create a coalition of multiple stakeholders including students, teachers, parents, faith-based leaders, political leaders, representatives of media, government officials, and civic leaders within each district or county to work collaboratively and cooperatively to meet the literacy needs of all age groups.~~

16. ~~Cultivate relationships with schools, social service, health, religious, and cultural organizations that provide support for children, parents and prospective parents. Encourage these groups and agencies to work together to promote and improve literacy.~~
17. ~~Provide high quality pre-school programs for all children.~~

References

Anderson, R.C. & Nagy, W.E. (1991). Word meaning. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 690-724). New York: Longman.

Beck, I.L. & McKeown, M.G. (1983). Learning words well--A program to enhance vocabulary and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 622-625.

Beck, I.L., Perfetrti, C.A., & McKeown, M.G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 74 (4), 506-521.

Biancarosa, G. & Snow, C. E. (2004). Reading Next--A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: A Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York. (p. 39.). Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Big Ideas in Beginning Reading. (2004). Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://reading.uoregon.edu/appendices/contents.php.

Blachowicz, C.L.Z. (1986). Making connections: Alternatives to the vocabulary notebook. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 643-649.

Brabham, E.G. & Villaume, S.K. (2002). Vocabulary instruction: Concerns and visions. *The Reading Teacher*, 56, 264-268.

Brice Heath, S. (1983). A lot of talk about nothing. *Language Arts*, 60, 39-48.

Brice Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

CIERA. (2004). Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://www.ciera.org.

Comer, J.P. (1988, January). Is "parenting" essential to good teaching? *National Education Association, NEA Today*. 6, 34-40.

Community Schools: Fact Sheet for Media. (2201). Coalition for Community Schools. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.iel.org/press/ccsfactsheet.html

Adopted: 10/21/2005 — Page 7 of 10

Revised: 10-14-16 IV O Reading Policy 3 104 Attachment Redline.docx10-14-16 IV O Reading Policy 3 104 Attachment Redline.docx10-14-16 IV O Reading Policy 3 104 Attachment Redline.docx3.104 Reading

Critical Issue: Establishing Collaboratives and Partnerships. (1995). North Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved January 24, 2005 from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrshp/le300.html

Critical Issue: Partnerships Between Schools and Businesses. (1995). North Regional Education Laboratory. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrshp/le3partn.htm

Critical Issue: Restructuring Schools to Support School (1995). North Regional Education Laboratory. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http:www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/css/cs100.htm.

Cunningham, A.E., & Stanovich, K.E (1991). Tracking the unique effects of print exposure in children: Associations with vocabulary, general knowledge, and spelling. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 264-274.

DIBELS. (2004). Official DIBELS Home Page. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://dibels.uoregon.edu.

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, 104-122.

District Administration. (2002, September). Quality Teacher Preparation. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.districtadminstration.com.

Duffelmeyer, F.A. (1985). Teaching word meaning from an experience base. *The Reading Teacher*, 39, 6-9.

Epstein, J.L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share." *Phi Delta Kappan*. 76(9). p. 701.

Fielding, L.G., Wilson, P.T., Anderson, R.C. (1986). A new focus on free reading: The role of trade books in reading instruction. In T. Rapheel & R.E. Reynolds (Eds.), *The contexts of school-based literacy*. New York: Random House.

Florida Center for Reading Research. (2003). *The Science of Reading*. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from the Florida State University Center Web site: http://www.fcrr.org.

For the Best Results, Schools Need Partners. (2000). The George Lucas Educational Foundational. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from http://www.edutopia.org/php/article.php?id=Art_590&key=189.

Framing the Discussion and Tips for Community Outreach. (2003). *NCLB Practical Guide*. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.learningfirst.org/lfa-web/rp?pa=doc&docId=4.

Graves, M.F., Juel, C., & Graves, B.B. (1997). *Teaching reading in the twenty first century*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Graves, M.F. & Watts-Taffe, S.M. (2002) The place of word consciousness in a research-based vocabulary program. A. E Farstrup, & S.J. Samuels, (Eds.) *What research has to say about reading instruction*. (p. 142). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Herman, P.A., Andersoj, R.C., Pearson, P.D. & Nagy, W.E. (1987). Incidental acquisition of word meanings from expositions with varied text features. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 263-284.

International Reading Association (IRA). (2003). *Investment in teacher preparation in the United States*. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1060_teacher_preparation.pdf.

Investment in Teacher Preparation in the United States. (2003). *International Reading Association*. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1060 teacher preparation.pdf

Iwicki, A.L. (1992). Vocabulary connections. *The Reading Teacher*, 45, 736.

McKeown, M.G., Beck, I.L., Omanson, R.C., & Pople, M.T. (1985). Some effects of the nature and frequency of vocabulary instruction on the knowledge and use of words. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 522-535.

Nelson-Herber, J. (1986). Expanding and defining vocabulary in content areas. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 626-633.

Nagy, W.E., Herman, P.A., & Anderson R.C. (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 233-253.

Nagy, W. E., Winsor, P., Osborn, J., & O'Flahaven, J. (1994) Structural analysis: Some guidelines for instruction. In F. Lehr & J. Osborn (Eds.), *Reading, language, and literacy: Instruction for the twenty-first century* (pp. 45-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Reading Panel (NRP). (2000, December). U.S. Department of Education. Public Health Service. National Institutes of Health. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Washington DC: National Institution of Health.

NCLB Practical Guide. (2002). No Child Left Behind. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.nochildleftbehind.gov.

NIFL. (n.d.). National Institute for Literacy. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://www.nifl.gov.

Partnerships Between Schools and Businesses. (1992). North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/css/cs100.htm.

Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension. A.E. Farstrup, and , S.J. Samuels, (Eds.) *What research has to say about reading instruction,* (pp. 291-309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Put Reading First. (2001, September). U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http://www.nifl.gov.

Reading First: Federal Guidelines for Reading First Professional Development Plans. (2004). North Central Regional Education Laboratory. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from www.ncrel.org.

Reading Next. (2004). A Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York. *Alliance for Excellent Education.* Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.all4ed.org.

Roller, C. M. (ed.). (2001). The IRA Excellence in Reading Teacher Preparation Commission's Report: Current Practices in Reading Teacher Education at the Undergraduate Level in the United States. *Learning to Teach Reading: Setting the Research Agenda.* Delaware: International Reading Association.

Sanders, M. (n.d.). A study of the role of "community" in comprehensive school, family, and community partnership programs. Nation Network of Partnership Schools. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/default.htm.

Scott, J. A., & Nagy, W. E. (1997). Understanding the definitions of unfamiliar verbs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32, 184-200.

Seven Keys to Excellence in Reading Achievement. (2003). Iowa Association of School Boards. Retrieved January 25, 2005 from http://www.ia-sb.org/studentachievement/reading_Key1.asp.

Stahl, S.A. (1986). Three principles of effective vocabulary instruction. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 662-668.

Stahl, S. A. (1999). *Vocabulary development*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Stahl. S. A. & Fairbanks, M.M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 72-110.
Stahl, S.A. & Kapinus, B.A. (1991). Possible sentences: Predicting word meanings to teach content area vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher*, 45, 36-43.

Stahl, S.A., Richek, M.G., & Vandevier, R. (1991). Learning word meanings through listening: A sixth-grade replication. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.) *Learning factors /teacher factors: Issues in literacy research. Fortieth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 185-192). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Standards for Reading Professionals. (2004). International Reading Association. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http://www.reading.org/resources/issues/reports/professional_standards.html.

Sternburg, R.J. (1987). Most vocabulary is learned from context. In M.G. McEeown & M. E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp.89-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Supplemental and Intervention Programs Review. (2004). Oregon Reading First. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from http://oregonreadingfirst.uoregon.edu/SIreport.php.

TACTE. (2005). Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from http://plato.ess.tntech.edu/tacte.

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Help My Child Read: Reading Resource. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.ed.gov/parents/read/resources/edpicks.jhtml?src=ln.

Vaughn, S. & Thompson, S. (2004). *Research Based Methods of Reading Instruction: Grades K-3*. Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (VASCD).

What Is a Partnership Program? (2004). National Network of Partnership Schools. Retrieved January 27, 2005 from http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/program2.htm.