

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO**  
**LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE**

**REPRESENTATIVES**

Rick Miera, Vice Chair  
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales  
Jimmie C. Hall  
Dennis J. Roch  
Mimi Stewart  
Jack E. Thomas

**ADVISORY**

Andrew J. Barreras  
Ray Begaye  
Eleanor Chávez  
Nathan P. Cote  
Nora Espinoza  
Mary Helen Garcia  
Karen E. Giannini  
John A. Heaton  
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton  
Shirley A. Tyler

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501  
Phone: (505) 986-4591 Fax: (505) 986-4338  
<http://lesc.nmlegis.gov>



**SENATORS**

Cynthia Nava, Chair  
Mary Jane M. García  
Gay G. Kernan  
Lynda M. Lovejoy

**ADVISORY**

Vernon D. Asbill  
Stephen H. Fischmann  
Howie C. Morales  
John Pinto  
Sander Rue  
William E. Sharer

Frances Ramírez-Maestas, Director  
David Harrell, PhD, Deputy Director

December 13, 2010

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Legislative Education Study Committee

**FR:** Pamela Herman, J.D.

**RE:** ***STUDY READING CURRICULA IN TEACHER EDUCATION (HJM 16) WORK GROUP: FINAL REPORT***

---

In the 2010 regular session, the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) endorsed and the New Mexico Legislature passed House Joint Memorial 16 (HJM 16), *Study Reading Curricula in Teacher Education*.

The memorial requested that:

- the New Mexico Deans and Directors of the Colleges of Education form a work group to examine the curricula and assigned text materials of all required reading courses in programs that prepare teachers for state licensure, to determine if those courses meet the statutory requirement that they be based on current scientifically based research;
- representatives on the work group include three deans and directors of undergraduate teacher preparation programs and alternative teacher licensure programs and three members of the LESG, as well as such other representatives as those members might designate;
- the group establish the methodology of the study, including qualifications of reading experts to review the curricula and materials, the process by which the reviews would be

- conducted, the scope of work of the reading experts, the standards to be used to evaluate the curricula and materials, and the timetable for completion of the study; and
- a report with findings and recommendations be provided to the appropriate interim legislative committee and the Governor by November 1, 2010.

The included report represents the Final Report of the HJM 16 Work Group.

### **Background: Legislative Action Regarding Teacher Preparation in the Science of Reading**

Reading is the fundamental skill upon which all formal education is based. However, on the 2009 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), only approximately 31 percent of fourth grade students in the United States scored at or above proficient in reading; and in New Mexico, only approximately 20 percent of students scored proficient or better, placing New Mexico 42<sup>nd</sup> in the nation for fourth grade reading proficiency. As the Annie E. Casey Foundation stated in its 2010 report *Early Warning! Why Reading by the End of Third Grade Matters*, there are long-term consequences to below-grade level reading achievement at that age, in terms of future learning and earning potential, global competitiveness for the nation's work force, and general productivity.

In 2000, the National Reading Panel, assembled in response to Congressional mandate, issued a report that assessed the status of research-based knowledge about teaching children to read, including the effectiveness of various approaches as demonstrated in experimental peer-reviewed studies. The report of the National Reading Panel provided educators and policymakers with a new understanding of what schools must do, especially in the primary grades, to prevent reading problems and ensure that nearly all students in the early grades learn to read well enough to learn from what they read as they proceed through school.

Recognizing the importance of the relationship between reading and educational success, the LESC has heard presentations on early literacy during every interim since 2001, and has sponsored successful legislation and appropriated funds to provide resources for literacy for young students. In an effort to ensure that the teachers in the state's schools entered the classroom qualified to teach reading effectively, in 2001, the Legislature passed LESC-endorsed legislation to amend the statutory requirements for teacher licensure to require that:

- a person seeking standard or alternative elementary licensure have completed six hours of reading courses; and a person seeking standard or alternative secondary licensure have completed three hours of reading courses in subject matter content; and
- the Public Education Department (PED) withhold approval from a college of education or teacher preparation program that fails to offer a course on teaching reading that:
  - Ø is based upon current research;<sup>1</sup>
  - Ø aligns with department-adopted reading standards; and
  - Ø includes strategies and assessment measures to ensure that beginning teachers are proficient in teaching reading.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2003, the statute was amended to refer to "scientifically-based reading research."

In 2004, the LESC heard a presentation regarding implementation of this requirement by PED, which included the convening of a panel to review syllabi and texts of the reading courses in all teacher preparation programs in the state.

In 2009, however, the LESC heard testimony concerning a report by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) entitled *Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: Are New Mexico's Education School Graduates Ready to Teach Reading and Mathematics in Elementary Classrooms?* The report claimed, based on its own review of New Mexico teacher preparation program reading curricula and syllabi, that most programs in New Mexico were not preparing candidates to teach the science of reading, and that the programs used a wide variety of reading textbooks most of which did not address the science of reading.

The New Mexico Deans and Directors of Colleges of Education presented a rebuttal to the report to the LESC at its December 2009 meeting, contesting the methodology of the study. The deans volunteered at that time to sponsor a study using in-state reading experts, and worked with LESC members and staff to formulate HJM 16, *Study Reading Curricula in Teacher Education*, which the LESC endorsed and which was passed by the 2010 Legislature, setting the stage for the six-month-long study that resulted in the attached report.

### **HJM 16 Work Group Membership**

The HJM 16 Work Group included the following members:

- Representative Jimmie C. Hall
- Dr. Jerry Harmon, Dean, College of Education and Technology, Eastern New Mexico University
- Dr. Richard Howell, Dean, College of Education, University of New Mexico
- Senator Cynthia Nava, LESC Chair
- Representative Mimi Stewart
- Ms. Erica Volkens, Director of Education Programs, Central New Mexico Community College

Two members of the LESC staff provided support to the Work Group:

- Ms. Frances Ramírez-Maestas, Director
- Ms. Pamela Herman, Senior Research Analyst II

### **Presenters**

Representative Mimi Stewart and Dr. Richard Howell will present the Final Report of the HJM 16 Work Group.

***STUDY READING CURRICULA IN TEACHER  
EDUCATION, HJM 16***

**WORK GROUP FINAL REPORT**

**HJM 16 Work Group  
New Mexico Deans and Directors of Colleges of Education  
December 13, 2010**



# ***STUDY READING CURRICULA IN TEACHER EDUCATION, HJM 16*** **WORK GROUP FINAL REPORT**

## **Table of Contents**

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Composition of the Work Group	1
III. Findings and Recommendations of the Work Group	2
IV. Methodology for the Study	5
V. Lessons Learned	8
VI. Some Reviewer Suggestions for Improving Reading Courses in New Mexico Teacher Preparation Programs	10
VII. Roster of Reviewers	12
VIII. Matrix of Reviewer Findings for Each Program	13
IX. Responses from the Programs	23
X. Background	37
XI. List of Appendices Provided on CD	38
XII. Attachments	
A. HJM 16, <i>Study Reading Curricula in Teacher Education</i>	
B. HJM 16 Reading Program Materials Analysis Rubric	
C. HJM 16 Program Interview Protocol	



## I. Introduction

In the 2010 regular session, the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) endorsed and the Legislature passed House Joint Memorial (HJM) 16, *Study Reading Curricula in Teacher Education* (see Attachment A).

The memorial requested that:

- the New Mexico Deans and Directors of Colleges of Education form a work group to examine the curricula and assigned text materials of all required reading courses in programs that prepare teachers for state licensure, to determine if those courses meet the statutory requirement that they be based on current scientifically based research;
- representatives on the Work Group include three deans and directors of standard and alternative teacher licensure programs and three members of the LESL, as well as such other representatives as those members might designate;
- the Work Group establish the methodology of the study, including qualifications of reading experts to review the curricula and materials, the process by which the reviews would be conducted, the evaluation matrix utilized, the scope of work of the reading experts, the standards to be used to evaluate the curricula and materials, and the timetable for completion of the study; and
- the Work Group report the results of its study, with findings and recommendations, to the appropriate interim legislative committee and the Governor by November 1, 2010.

This report represents the final report of the HJM 16 Work Group. In addition, appendices on CD include reviewers' findings for each required reading course in each program reviewed, interview notes, and final summaries.

## II. Composition of the Work Group

As requested by HJM 16, the Work Group included three Deans and Directors of colleges of education and alternative licensure programs and three members of the LESL:

- Representative Jimmie C. Hall, Bernalillo County;
- Dr. Jerry Harmon, Dean, College of Education and Technology, Eastern New Mexico University;
- Dr. Richard Howell, Dean, College of Education, University of New Mexico;
- Senator Cynthia Nava, Doña Ana County, LESL Chair;
- Representative Mimi Stewart, Bernalillo County; and
- Ms. Erica Volkers, Director of Education Programs, Central New Mexico Community College.

They were supported by two LESL staff members:

- Ms. Frances Ramírez-Maestas, Director, LESL; and
- Ms. Pamela Herman, Senior Research Analyst, LESL.

### III. Summary of Findings and Recommendations

#### a. Findings

As described in greater detail in Section IV, the reviewers were asked to review the syllabi and course materials (required texts, readings, assignments, etc.) for each of the required reading courses provided by the nine public and two private elementary education and teacher licensure programs that participated in the study, based on a matrix designed by the Work Group and placed on-line by the University of New Mexico College of Education for data entry. The matrix called for evidence, and findings based on the evidence, for:

- coverage of the science of reading;
- quality of instruction in the science of reading;
- strategies for comprehension as explicit steps to understand both fictional and informational text;
- assessment and screening strategies integrated into each component of the course; and
- access to additional, appropriate resources to support students at risk of failure in the least restrictive environment.

Finding: *The Work Group finds that, in general, the reviewers thoroughly reviewed the materials provided by the programs and made the specific findings of the nature called for in the study design. These are summarized in Sections VI and VIII, and included in full for each course on CD.*

Finding: *The Work Group finds that, while the reviewers' assessments pointed to a wide variance among the eleven participating programs in the degree to which their required reading courses for elementary teachers prepared candidates in the science of reading instruction, every program showed room for improvement on one or more of the criteria used in the reviews.*

Finding: *The Work Group finds that many New Mexico teacher education programs "missed the target" in addressing the science of reading instruction to a disappointing degree. While there were bright spots, among reviewers' most critical comments regarding specific, identified weaknesses in some programs across the state, were the following:*

- "little evidence of systematic instruction that leads to application for many of the five components" of literacy instruction;
- "no evidence of instruction based on current national research in reading as made apparent through review of syllabi";
- "inadequate texts or texts that run counter to the research," "texts [that] appear to support whole-language approach, not scientifically based current research"; and "texts that are theoretical but lack support for teachers on how to teach";
- "nothing in the course syllabi/assignments or texts. . . address assessments to inform instruction, diagnosis and prevention of reading difficulties";
- "no attention given to comprehension strategies as explicit steps to understand fictional texts"; and
- "teachers will not be prepared to teach reading after taking these classes."

## **b. Recommendations**

Based on the Work Group's discussion of these findings and an analysis of the detailed findings by the reviewers for the eleven participating programs, the Work Group makes the following recommendations:

**1. *Rigorously assess candidate knowledge of how to teach reading based on the scientific research as a condition for elementary licensure, either through the New Mexico Teacher Content Knowledge Assessment in Elementary Education or through a separate exam.***

- **Rationale:** It was the consensus of the Work Group that the most effective way to ensure that reading coursework met the requirements of the law would be to require candidates to show command of the science of reading in order to be licensed. Eight years of attempting to regulate reading course content through law and rule has not been successful in ensuring rigorous curriculum of the science of reading across all elementary teacher preparation programs in New Mexico. It will then be the responsibility of each program to do whatever it deems most effective to ensure that its candidates succeed on the licensure exam.
- **Action required:**
  - ✓ Request that the LESC sponsor legislation to make the new assessment requirement explicit in statutory licensure requirements during the 2011 legislative session.
  - ✓ Deans and Directors and the LESC work with PED to ensure that an appropriate, rigorous assessment is put in place for new licensure or reading endorsement candidates by July 1, 2012.

**2. *Convene a statewide gathering of programs in early spring 2011 for faculty to review the issues raised in the report, to share texts, supplemental resources, syllabi, instructional activities and assessments, and other resources and approaches, for the purpose of strengthening reading instruction statewide.***

- **Rationale:** The reviewers' findings, comments and recommendations concerning existing courses indicate that, despite many deficiencies, programs have much to offer one another through an exchange of resources, practices, and ideas. The most efficient and effective way to accomplish such an exchange would be through live, face-to-face discussion and sharing of syllabi, texts and materials.
- **Action required:** Deans and Directors organize and convene the gathering during the 2011 spring semester at a mutually convenient location.

**3. *Develop a list of recommended texts that address the five essential elements of literacy instruction, among which programs would be encouraged but not required to select for coursework beginning in the 2011-2012 academic year.***

- **Rationale:** The Work Group agreed that, if designing courses that meet statutory requirements is left to programs, it would not be appropriate to dictate which texts they

should use. Nevertheless, the reviewers' comments and recommendations suggest that many programs would benefit in their efforts to improve from guidance regarding texts that are aligned with the research and that will most effectively support the instruction that candidates will need in order to pass the new examination.

- Action required: Deans and Directors convene a reading faculty subcommittee to assemble a list of recommendations based on the materials presented at the spring 2011 gathering and suggestions from other sources, to be disseminated to programs immediately after the gathering.

4. ***During the 2011 legislative interim, convene the Deans and Directors at an LESC meeting to present the approaches and solutions developed at the spring gathering.***

- Rationale: It was the consensus of the Work Group that scheduling an update to the LESC on specific actions that programs were taking to address the issues raised in the study would keep the attention of all programs focused on their improvement efforts, while offering the Legislature's some reassurance that its concerns regarding reading instruction were being actively addressed.
- Action required: LESC staff consult with Deans and Directors to schedule a presentation in summer or fall 2011.

5. ***Include review of required reading courses based on alignment with scientific research as part of the NCATE accreditation review process.***

- Rationale: Embedding a review of reading curricula in the NCATE accreditation review process provides for a sustainable and continuous review of the alignment of the reading courses to the requirements of the law.
- Action required: Deans and Directors will consult with PED about the *feasibility* of embedding this as part of the NCATE accreditation review process and provide recommendations with the LESC presentation scheduled for summer or fall 2011.

#### IV. Methodology for the Study

The working process and methodology for the HJM 16 study is set out in some detail in this report in the event such a study is ever replicated, in New Mexico or elsewhere.

The Work Group held three meetings in Albuquerque, on May 21, June 24, and November 15, 2010. Otherwise, the Work Group conducted much of its activity via email.

At its first meeting, the group established a methodology and timeline for the work requested in HJM 16. The timeline was subsequently modified to reflect the reality of the scope of the undertaking. As implemented, the study process was as follows:

- Participating programs:
  - All elementary teacher education programs at state publicly-funded institutions were required by the memorial to participate. These nine programs included:
    - ✓ Central New Mexico Community College (CNM);
    - ✓ Eastern New Mexico University (ENMU);
    - ✓ New Mexico Highlands University (NMHU);
    - ✓ New Mexico State University (NMSU);
    - ✓ Northern New Mexico College (NNMC);
    - ✓ San Juan Community College (SJCC);
    - ✓ Santa Fe Community College (SFCC);
    - ✓ The University of New Mexico (UNM); and
    - ✓ Western New Mexico University (WNMU).
  - Private non-profit or for-profit programs were not required to participate but were encouraged to do so. The two that chose to participate were:
    - ✓ College of the Southwest (CSW); and
    - ✓ Wayland Baptist University (WBU).
- Phases of the Study:
  - *First:* Review of syllabi and required materials:
    - ✓ One full copy of all materials was to be shipped directly to each reviewer.
    - ✓ Two reviewers were to rate the materials for each program, using a rubric agreed upon by the Work Group (see Attachment B, “HJM 16 Reading Program Materials Analysis Rubric”).
    - ✓ The rubric was created in a web-based format developed by UNM staff, whose services were an in-kind contribution from UNM.
    - ✓ Course materials that were required for review included:
      - Master or lead course syllabus;
      - Individual instructors’ course syllabi;
      - Assigned texts and all supplemental assigned reading;

- Assessments that candidates are taught to use to guide instruction; and
  - Assessments that candidates take to show what they have learned.
- *Second: Program interviews:*<sup>1</sup>
  - ✓ A protocol was developed by the Work Group to guide the interviews (see Attachment C, “HJM 16 Reading Review Questions”).
  - ✓ Teams of two reviewers who had reviewed each programs’ materials conducted one interview conference call with reading faculty at the program.
  - ✓ The teams subsequently consulted to summarize their points of agreement, as well as differences, regarding the two required courses for each program.
- Reviewers:
  - The Work Group selected six reviewers by consensus (see Section VII, Roster of Reviewers). They were chosen from among nominees suggested by Work Group members and Deans and Directors, based on their *vitae* and their responses to the following three questions:
    - ✓ Provide some measure of your understanding of the science of reading instruction. Make a statement of what you believe, what authors you have read, or professional development that has informed your understanding of this issue.
    - ✓ How have you implemented scientific reading instruction in your work? Give examples of how you have used it successfully, including specific programs have you used.
    - ✓ Speak to your ability to evaluate reading programs at the higher education level and make recommendations based on those evaluations.
  - Actual knowledge of the science of reading instruction was the most important criterion for selecting reviewers. They were expected to be able not only to respond to the rubric, but also to provide insightful recommendations for program improvement.
  - Each team of two reviewers was paid by the institutions that they reviewed, at the rate of \$1500 per reviewer for the four reviewers who each evaluated four programs, and \$1,125 for the two reviewers who each evaluated three programs. One institution in each group took the lead in receiving reviewer invoices and ensuring they were paid. Each program contributed \$750 toward the study, and the institutions serving as fiscal agents provided that service as an in-kind contribution.

<sup>1</sup> The study design initially contemplated site visits to each institution; however, the length of time required for the materials review precluded scheduling site visits. The Work Group judged that interviews with program reading faculty via conference call would provide adequate opportunities for reviewers to flesh out the information they had gleaned from syllabi and materials, and for institutions to clarify any questions the reviewers had about the content of program courses.

a. Final report:

- Reviewers submitted their course evaluations and summaries for each program.
- The Work Group itself completed the final report and takes responsibility for its findings and recommendations.
- All participants in the process were given an opportunity to provide feedback on the review process (see Section V).
- All institutions were given an opportunity to submit a response to the findings that addressed: 1) corrections to any factual information that the institution believed was in error in the reviews, and 2) how the programs can use the information contained in the reviews to improve reading instruction (see Section IX).

• Timeline:

- The original timeline called for the completion of most work during summer 2010, with writing and submission of the final report by the October 2010 LESC meeting. However, several factors required the timeline to be extended (see Section V).
- The actual timeline for completion of the study was as follows:

May 21	First Work Group meeting
May 26	Start of reviewer recruitment
June 18	Deadline to receive reviewer nominee material
June 21	Second Work Group meeting: four reviewers selected, and interview protocol established
July 27	Final two reviewers selected
Sept. 30	Approximate date of completion of course material reviews
Late Sept.-early Oct.	Telephone interviews conducted
Early Nov.	Submission of reviewers' final summaries and recommendations
Nov. 8	Reviewer material compiled and distributed to Work Group
Nov. 15	Final Work Group meeting to develop recommendations
Nov. 16	Reviewer material sent to each program for response
Dec. 6	Deadline for program responses to reviews
Dec. 13	Final Report presented to the LESC and provided to the Governor

## V. Lessons Learned

The HJM 16 study of reading courses in teacher preparation programs was proposed by the programs to the LESC in 2009 as a voluntary effort (see Section X). The memorial established the parameters of the study and left the development of a detailed framework to the Work Group, which established the methodology and conducted the study with support from LESC staff. This report includes reflections on how this first-time effort might be improved in the future.

### Strengths:

- Reviewers: The reviewers generally expressed positive opinions about their participation in the study despite its challenges, because, as one team said, they believed it was “an important and thorough process. . . .We acquired essential information that truly helped us determine the quality of the teacher preparation programs at these colleges and universities. We believe this was a very rewarding experience and allowed us to use our expertise to provide suggestions for improving our teacher preparation programs in the area of reading.”
- Work Group: The Work Group identified the following strengths:
  - collaboration of the Deans and Directors representatives with LESC members to develop the rubric, the process, and recommendations;
  - the process of identifying and selecting well-qualified reviewers;
  - the willingness of all eleven programs to support the study with funds and personnel resources;
  - the expertise, commitment, and time devoted by the reviewers; and
  - the rigor of the review.

### Suggestions for improvement:

- Work Group composition: Deans and Director representatives were selected to represent research, comprehensive, and community college institutions, not based upon expertise in reading. One dean suggested that deans and/or directors with expertise in reading should have been invited to represent the group.
- Time: It took longer than planned to recruit the six reviewers needed, and the course review process itself required much more time than estimated. Consequently, reviewers in effect volunteered many hours of their time, and, because of various delays, work scheduled to be done in the summer extended into the school year after reviewers had returned to their full-time jobs. Also, the Work Group members who managed the process contributed time greatly in excess of expectations – at times 20 hours per week or more. In a time of fiscal austerity for higher education and the Legislature, funds were not adequate to pay reviewers more appropriately or to dedicate much-needed administrative resources to manage the project. A Work Group member suggested that restructuring (see “Course Review,” below) would help make the process more fiscally sustainable in the future.
- Reviewer assignments: Deans and Directors were provided with the names and contact information (to schedule interviews) of the reviewers assigned to their institution. One reviewer suggested that the process needed to be structured so that the identity of the

reviewers assigned to each institution and contact information was not disclosed to the individual institutions.

- Materials reviewed: For clarity, institutions should only submit syllabi and materials for the six credit hours required for elementary licensure, and only materials that are required reading. Reviewers noted that in some cases they found syllabi and their link to the materials difficult to sort out, while some programs expressed disappointment that reviewers were unable to interpret their submittals. Sometimes, this confusion was cleared up in interviews. Generally, the clearer, more detailed the syllabi, the better the quality of the review.
- Course review: A Work Group member suggested greater efficiency would result from consolidating the review of each program's two required courses onto one form, to reflect the programs' strengths and weaknesses rather than that of individual courses. This method would eliminate the need for a final summary. For programs with multiple instructors using different syllabi for the same course, discrepancies in coverage could be documented in the "evidence" section of the rubric.
- Opportunity to consult: Two Work Group members and one reviewer suggested it would be beneficial to meet at the outset to discuss the process and develop a consensus about what rubric called for. Other reviewers stated that it would have been beneficial to have closer proximity to their fellows to meet in person, discuss findings and present a final review, as they spent hours on the telephone and on line, much of it at their own expense.
- Rubric: One member of the Deans and Directors was not satisfied with the rubric criteria that were developed. One reviewer suggested the inclusion of spelling in the criteria for review would be beneficial as many of the components of reading instruction, especially phonemic awareness, phonics, and morphology, can all be taught through spelling.
- Webform: Reviewers found the webform rubric tool difficult to use. Among other problems, at times it could not be accessed, and it did not allow for spell check. One course review was entirely lost after it was entered. One team found a way to reformat the document in Word, which again required additional time. A Work Group member stated that, despite the valiant volunteer effort by UNM to provide the web-based form, using a Word document or uploading materials to a Blackboard shell might be just as effective.
- Shipping: Issues related to shipping included neglect by programs to send reviewers the complete set of materials requested in a timely manner; unanticipated materials and shipping costs incurred by programs for full sets of materials for both reviewers; and, often, lack of a clear return shipping process, such a return shipping label or other prior arrangements. This inconvenienced reviewers and, where reviewers were examining materials in sequence instead of simultaneously to save institutional costs, slowed the process.
- Interviews: The Work Group member who scheduled the interviews suggested that a process be developed to do so more efficiently. A reviewer suggested that the interviews were a vital component of the process, and that a program unable to follow through on its scheduled interview, as one was, should be eliminated from the study. The reviewer also suggested that the interview protocol was too limiting, and that reviewers should be permitted more

flexibility for follow-up questions. One reviewer suggested there might be a benefit to having face-to-face interviews rather than the phone conference format used.

- **Final documents:** One team of reviewers stated that they would have benefited from having the final set of review rubrics ahead of time, since they spent significant time transferring information from one document to another. A Work Group member suggested that the final summary could be submitted on a template provided at the outset, simplified by requesting a consensus of the review team whether each criterion was “met,” “met with improvement,” or “not met,” along with comments on strengths and areas for improvement.
- **Future studies:** The Work Group did not make a recommendation regarding whether, or how often, the study should be replicated, but discussed the value of including reading course review in the NCATE program accreditation review. However, the Work Group did not reach consensus as to whether to do so would be practicable.

## **VI. Some Reviewer Suggestions for Improving Reading Courses in New Mexico Teacher Preparation Programs**

A matrix of reviewer findings for each of the eleven elementary teacher preparation programs in the HJM 16 study is included in this report (see Section VIII). Also, a complete electronic copy of all of the reviewers’ work product, including each course review, notes from telephone interviews with reading faculty, and program summaries, is available on CD.

The reviewers’ findings regarding whether the reading courses offered by the programs addressed the review criteria varied considerably among the programs. Reviewers noted strengths and weaknesses in almost every program. The Work Group asked reviewers for recommendations for ways programs could strengthen their reading courses; and while the Work Group did not adopt all of reviewers’ detailed recommendations as its own, it determined there was merit in providing a summary of the most frequent reviewer suggestions.

- **Course sequence:** Some reviewers suggested that the two required courses for elementary education licensure in New Mexico might most effectively be offered as a developmental sequence. That is, while both courses should address all five essential elements of literacy acquisition, the material could be usefully presented, first, in a course designed to address emerging readers in the early grades that focused more heavily on phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency; and second, in a course designed for later grades that focused more heavily on vocabulary development and comprehension.
- **History and Structure of Language course:** Some reviewers, and the Work Group, agreed that all programs could be strengthened by adding a course in the History and Structure of Language for Reading Teachers, perhaps in the General Education Core.
- **Additional reading courses:** Two reviewers opined that, to adequately prepare future reading teachers, at least two more required courses are needed. They suggested, for example, either a separate course on assessment and one in interventions for struggling readers, or two courses on diagnosing and planning instruction for struggling readers.

- Applied learning: Reviewers generally applauded programs that had found ways to include extensive field experience wherein candidates could learn to apply what they were learning in their reading courses, and recommended that other programs try to add more such opportunities. Some reviewers urged the creation of Professional Development Schools to achieve this end.
- Needs of at-risk readers: reviewers noted that all teachers need an in-depth understanding of how to work with special education and ESL/bilingual students in their classrooms, and that the needs of these students must be addressed in the required two-course reading sequence, not just in courses for special education teachers.
- Assessments: reviewers recommended that programs familiarize candidates with the standardized reading assessments used in New Mexico, and that candidates needed instruction in a range of assessment strategies linked to use of available research on how to differentiate instruction based on different assessment outcomes.
- Independent reading: reviewers reminded some programs that candidates need to be aware that independent reading is not a good use of time for students who are not yet reading.
- Texts:
  - Texts and materials specifically recommended by reviewers were:
    - ✓ Louisa Moat, *Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling* (LETRS) modules;
    - ✓ No author listed, *Multisensory Teaching for Basic Language Skills*;
    - ✓ Jodi Reiss, *ESOL Strategies for Teaching Content: Facilitating Instruction for English Language Learners*;
    - ✓ UNM's Lear and Fessinger Reading Packet; and
    - ✓ Juel, Graves, and Juel; Collins Block; and Cooper and Kiger; all with different strengths and shortcomings.
  - Texts and materials that reviewers specifically found to be deficient included:
    - ✓ Moustafa, *Beyond Traditional Phonics*;
    - ✓ Rubin text; and
    - ✓ Flint text.

## VII. Roster of Reviewers

Team 1      *University of New Mexico*  
*Central New Mexico Community College*  
*Wayland Baptist University*  
*Eastern New Mexico University*

*Reviewers:*

- Candace Head-Dylla, Grants, NM
  - M.A., Curriculum and Instruction, NMHU; Doctoral candidate, Penn State University
  - Reading coach, Bernalillo High School
  
- Mary Gilroy, San Cristobal, NM
  - M.Ed., Special Education, Emphasis on Learning Disabilities, University of Arizona
  - Academic Language Therapist, Taos Municipal Schools; Qualified Instructor, Multisensory Language Training Institute of NM, Albuquerque.

Team 2      *San Juan Community College*  
*Northern New Mexico College*  
*New Mexico Highlands University*  
*Santa Fe Community College*

*Reviewers:*

- Ladona K. Clayton, Clovis, NM
  - Ed.D., Educational Leadership, Oral Roberts University
  - Superintendent, Clovis Christian Schools
  
- Zoe Ann Alvarez, Albuquerque, NM
  - M.A., Education, UNM
  - District Reading Liaison Teacher, Albuquerque Public Schools

Team 3      *New Mexico State University*  
*Western New Mexico University*  
*University of the Southwest*

*Reviewers:*

- Christi Richards, Clovis, NM
  - Elementary Principal, Clovis Municipal Schools; Former Regional Reading First Coordinator, NM Public Education Department
  
- Heidi Shinaberger, Capitan, NM
  - M.A.T., Science, California State University at Fullerton
  - Region IX Reading First Specialist; Reading Interventionist, Ruidoso Municipal School District

Section VIII:  
Matrix of Reviewer Findings  
for Each Program

	CNM	ENMU	NMHU	NMSU
<b>Note</b>				
<b>Coverage</b>				
<i>Phonemic Awareness</i>	Reviewers differ; text, syllabus need more explicit coverage	Yes	Yes	Included in text; no evidence of systematic instruction that leads to application
<i>Phonics</i>	Text, syllabus & instruction need more explicit coverage	Yes	Yes	Theory addressed in text; lacks practical application
<i>Fluency</i>	Reviewers differ; text & syllabus need more explicit coverage	Yes	Yes	Included in text; no evidence of emphasis in syllabus
<i>Vocabulary</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; limited evidence of practical strategies for instruction
<i>Comprehension</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes; more depth needed
<i>Depth, duration of instruction</i>	More depth, duration needed for phonemic awareness, phonics & fluency	Yes	Yes	Yes; need to include scientifically-based research used in the syllabi
<i>Motivation</i>	Yes; but needs to be explicitly referenced in syllabus	Needs to be explicitly referenced in syllabi	No	Yes
<i>Bilingual, ESL</i>	Integrated throughout texts; might supplement with add'l resources; explicit identification needed in syllabi	Included in texts but needs to be explicitly referenced in syllabi	ESL but not bilingual	Relevant materials but no assignments
<i>Syllables, morphemes</i>	Covered in text; explicit identification needed in syllabi	Yes; syllables need to be referenced in syllabi	Yes	No evidence of adequate instruction to support teaching of syllabication in teachers' classrooms
<i>Phonics for teachers of reading</i>	More emphasis on phonics needed	Yes	Yes	Text provided; no evidence of instruction in syllabi

	CNM	ENMU	NMHU	NMSU
<b>Quality</b>				
<i>Relation of instruction to content</i>	Adequately addressed	Yes	Yes	Text lacks practical application, current national research; conflicts with commitment to, understanding of research expressed by faculty
<i>Elements of proficient readers</i>	Adequately addressed	Yes	Needs to include supplemental materials & instructional activities	Yes
<i>Academically diverse readers</i>	Both texts struggle to address	Yes	Yes	Included in text; syllabi unclear how supported by instruction
<i>Varied assessment to inform instruction</i>	Assessments included in texts; syllabi need to state how these are applied by students	Need to include how these are applied by students in courses	Yes; but include standardized reading assessments	Presented but not clear that students are using
<b>Comprehension</b>				
<i>Strategies- explicit steps to understand fiction</i>	Adequately addressed	Yes	Need to include reading materials explicitly to address	No
<i>Strategies- explicit steps to understand informational text</i>	Adequately addressed	Yes	Yes	Yes

	CNM	ENMU	NMHU	NMSU
<b>Assessment &amp; Screening Strategies integrated into ea. component</b>	Include assignment applying assessments	Include assignment applying assessments	Yes	Included in text and some assignments
<b>Access to add'l resources for students in least restrictive environment</b>	Annotate references & provide add'l resources on struggling readers	Yes; but could include outside resources for supporting students at-risk	Yes	Included in text; unclear how included in instruction
<b>Other recommendations</b>	Separate courses by early, intermediate reading instruction		Ensure that candidates are prepared to meet needs of students at risk of failure in least restrictive environment	Texts do not support reading research background that instructors have

	<b>NNMC</b>	<b>SFCC</b>	<b>SJC</b>	<b>UNM</b>
<b>Note</b>		No copies of texts provided; some available from another program	No interviews conducted	
<b>Coverage</b>				
<i>Phonemic Awareness</i>	Yes	Included in text; more depth and related assignments needed	No	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi
<i>Phonics</i>	Yes	Included in text; needs supplemental resources and assignments	No	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi
<i>Fluency</i>	Yes	Included in text	Yes	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi
<i>Vocabulary</i>	Yes	Included in text; not explicitly addressed in syllabi	Yes	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi
<i>Comprehension</i>	Yes	Yes; more depth needed	Supported in required reading; needs to be supplemented with assignments	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi
<i>Depth, duration of instruction</i>	Yes	Must be strengthened; supplemental materials and activities needed	Must be strengthened; supplemental materials and activities needed	Yes
<i>Motivation</i>	Included in text; needs to be explicitly addressed in syllabi	Covered in text & materials but not syllabi; +A1 not clear how used in instruction	Yes; needs to be explicitly referenced in syllabi	Included in text; needs to be explicitly addressed in syllabi
<i>Bilingual, ESL</i>	Covered in materials but not explicitly referenced in syllabi	Covered in text but not explicitly referenced in syllabi	Covered in text but not explicitly referenced in syllabi	Included in text/materials; not explicitly referenced in some syllabi
<i>Syllables, morphemes</i>	Yes; but could be in more depth	Needs supplemental materials	No	Needs supplemental materials & instruction
<i>Phonics for teachers of reading</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	No	Yes

	NNMC		SFCC	SJC	UNM
<b>Quality</b>					
<i>Relation of instruction to content</i>	Yes	Reflected in text; but may want to explicitly list add'l readings used in course on syllabi	Needs supplemental materials & activities	Yes	Yes
<i>Elements of proficient readers</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Academically diverse readers</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Covered in text; unclear how reflected in course instruction	Yes
<i>Varied assessment to inform instruction</i>	Needs supplemental materials, instructional activities	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Yes; but include standardized reading assessments
<b>Comprehension</b>					
<i>Strategies- explicit steps to understand fiction</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Need to explicitly address fictional text	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi	
<i>Strategies- explicit steps to understand informational text</i>	Yes	Included in text; unclear how explicitly addressed in instruction	Yes	Yes; a couple of variances among instructors' syllabi	

	UNMC	SFCC	SJC	UNM
<b>Assessment &amp; Screening</b>				
<i>Strategies integrated into ea. component</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	No	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities
<i>Access to add'l resources for students in least restrictive environment</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	No	Yes
<b>Other recommendations</b>				Reading packet compiled by Lear a valuable resource for all courses, programs

	USW	Wayland	WNMU
<b>Note</b>			
<b>Coverage</b>			
<i>Phonemic Awareness</i>	Included in text; more depth & related assignments needed	Yes	Unclear; text sent and that listed in syllabus did not match
<i>Phonics</i>	Included in text; more depth & related assignments needed	Yes	Assignments support; but required reading unclear as text sent and that listed did not match
<i>Fluency</i>	Included in text; more depth & related assignments needed	Yes	Assignments support; but unclear on specific learning requirements
<i>Vocabulary</i>	Yes	Yes	Assignments support; but unclear on specific learning requirements
<i>Comprehension</i>	Yes	Yes	Assignments support; but unclear on specific learning requirements
<i>Depth, duration of instruction</i>	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Motivation</i>	No	Limited	Referenced in syllabus; unclear with text contradictions
<i>Bilingual, ESL</i>	No	Limited	No
<i>Syllables, morphemes</i>	No	Yes; but could be supplemented	No
<i>Phonics for teachers of reading</i>	No	Yes	No

	USW	Wayland	WNMU
<b>Quality</b>			
<i>Relation of instruction to content</i>	No	Yes	Included in materials sent with syllabi, but not evident in syllabi
<i>Elements of proficient readers</i>	No	Yes	No
<i>Academically diverse readers</i>	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Included as topic in syllabi; unclear how addressed in readings & instruction
<i>Varied assessment to inform instruction</i>	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Yes	Assessment instruments sent; unclear from syllabi how these are used
<b>Comprehension</b>			
<i>Strategies- explicit steps to understand fiction</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	No
<i>Strategies- explicit steps to understand informational text</i>	Yes	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	No

	USW	Wayland	WNMU
<b>Assessment &amp; Screening</b>			
<i>Strategies integrated into ea. component</i>	Needs supplemental materials & instructional activities	Yes	Included in field component
<i>Access to add'l resources for students in least restrictive environment</i>	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Other recommendations</b>	Recommend review of Rubin text for validity in light of current research		Recommend review of Rubin text for validity in light of current research. Pub. in 2000, it lacks bibliographic/reference support of most current research. Particular concern re: philosophical position on several topics

## **Responses from the Programs**





---

Office of the Dean  
ENMU Station 25  
Portales, NM 88130

To: HJM#16 Work Group  
From: Jerry Harmon, Dean of Education and Technology, ENMU *JH*  
Re: Response to the ENMU Reading Review Report

This memo will be short and sweet. First, we at ENMU appreciate the extreme effort of the work group and program reviewers in accomplishing this effort. The results will have an immediate and long term effect on the improvement of reading instruction for elementary and in most cases special education teacher candidates. The specific comments in regard to ENMU's RED 350 and RED 375 courses are also greatly appreciated. There is only one factual error found in the report which we could like to correct in this response.

The report states that we will be adding one course, ELED 380 to manage the competencies of assessment and behavioral management to our new blended ELED/SPED licensure program. Actually it is the opposite. We are removing ELED 380 and replacing it with two ELED/SPED courses covering assessment and behavioral management. Both of these courses are aligned with the modified RED 350 and 375 content for ELED and SPED licensed teacher candidates. Thus we agree with the reviewer's recommendation and have implemented it previous to their review.

This is the extent of our response for factual corrections. Thank you again for the professional assistance.

*J Harmon*

**New Mexico State University  
College of Education  
Reading Review Response**

Outlined below is the NMSU College of Education response to the HJM 16 Reading Review as requested. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this feedback and we are happy to answer any questions you might have.

**(A). Corrections to any factual information that you believe is in error in the reviews.**

Both elementary literacy courses immerse candidates in the teaching of reading that includes the five components of scientifically-based reading instruction. As for phonemic awareness, the National Reading Panel (NRP) states that “It [phonemic awareness] is one necessary instructional component within a complete and integrated reading program” (2000a). As the NRP (2000a) recommends, our courses integrate phonemic awareness and phonics. The NRP found that phonemic awareness was best taught along with phonics, not prior to it (NRP, 2000a, p. 206; see also NRP, 2000b, p. 8). The detailed NRP report’s section on phonics states, “It is important to emphasize that systematic phonics instruction should be integrated with other reading instruction to create a balanced reading program” (NRP, 2000a, p. 97). As is suggested by the NRP (2000a), our courses examine and integrate the five reading components in context. To sum up, the courses cover essential issues regarding teaching and learning of literacy, including the items that are included in your rubric, *Reading Program Materials Analysis*. The table below indicates how the five components are addressed in our texts. Furthermore, the identified sections demonstrate the application of the five components present in our reading materials.

Components	Textbooks and Supplemental Material
Phonemic Awareness	Goodman—Chapter 1 (p. 7, 23 ); Chapter 5 (p. 190-193) Flint—Chapter 2 (p. 52-53), Chapter 6 (p. 158-160), Chapter 7 (186-188), and Chapter 9 (280-282 includes and explains the Yopp-Singer Test of Phonemic Awareness); Phonemic Awareness Inventory (394-Appendix); <b>Supplemental Material:</b> Cunningham (2007) What if They Can Say the Words But Don’t Know what they Mean Garan (2007) Chapter 3 (p. 84-88) Vacca Vacca et al (2005) Chapter 6 (179-183);
Phonics	Flint—Chapter 6 (p. 157-160), Chapter 7 (190-188), and Chapter 9 (267274-282); Miscue Analysis and Running Records; Goodman—Chapter 1 (p. 7, 23 ); Chapter 5 (190-193) <b>Supplemental Material:</b> Clymers Article: The Utility of Phonic Generalizations in the Primary Grades Garan (2007) Chapter 3 (p. 67-83); Vacca Vacca et al (2005) Chapter 6 (179-183);
Vocabulary	Atwell Chapter 5 and 7 Flint Chapter 8 (p. 233-234) and Chapter 11 (337-338) Goodman Chapter 2 (p. 37-43 );

	<p><b>Supplemental Material:</b>  Cunningham (2006) Article: What if They Can Say the Words But Don't Know what they Mean  Garan (2007) Chapter 3 (p. 84-88);  Vacca Vacca et al (2005) Chapter 6 (179-183);</p>
Fluency	<p>Goodman Chapter 4 (p. 92-98; 103-4);  Flint Chapter 8 (p. 227-229)  Atwell Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8  <b>Supplemental Material:</b>  Cunningham (2007) Article  Garan (2007) Chapter 5 (p. 101-110)</p>
Comprehension	<p>Atwell, Chapter 3, 5,6, 7, and 10  Flint Chapter 7 (p. 193-208); Chapter 8, Chapter 10-11  Goodman Chapter 4-6;</p>

As an integral part of our elementary literacy program, candidates complete two practicum experiences, one in a primary-grade and another in an upper-grade classroom over the course of an academic year. In both practicums, candidates have multiple and systematic opportunities to experience working with a reading program that is based on scientifically-based reading research (e.g., *Reading Street Reading Program* published by Pearson). Additionally, in our literacy courses candidates are expected to administer multiple assessments (e.g., DIBELS, phonemic awareness inventory, informal reading inventory, running record, DRA, miscue analysis). Candidates are required to demonstrate their knowledge of using assessment results to inform instruction with the goal of preventing reading difficulties.

**(B). How You Believe Your Programs Can Use the Information Contained in the Reviews to Improve Your Reading Instruction**

It was supportive and helpful of the reviewers to make the recommendation that “the wealth of research that was discussed is included on the syllabi.” We will be including the articles and materials we mentioned during the interview. We will more clearly state, as you also recommended, that the Miscue Analysis case study covers the five components.

Another way in which we will be using the feedback from the report is to increase our monitoring of how our candidates are implementing the five components of scientifically-based reading research in their practicum classrooms.

**References**

National Reading Panel (2000a). *Report of the National Reading Panel: An evidence-based assessment of the research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* [Book]. Washington DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

National Reading Pane (2000b). *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*. [Summary]. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Northern New Mexico College thanks the reviewers for the overall findings demonstrating NNMC meets the vast majority of the Reading Program Material Analysis (RPMA) criteria. NNMC further thanks the reviewers for the commendation of the NNMC Reading Courses and Instructor. NNMC strives to establish effective reading courses designed to provide pre-service teachers with the current and relevant foundational skills required to become expert reading teachers.

### **Part A – Corrections of Factual Errors**

In terms of errors in the stated facts, NNMC submits the following corrections in accordance with the request of the reviewers:

1. HJM 16 Reading Study Summary Report, Northern New Mexico College (Report), p.1, p.4, and throughout the Report: Replace “NMHU” with “NNMC.”
2. Report, p. 1, “Criteria Met,” 1.3, “NNMC does not meet this criterion in the areas of motivation and Bilingual/ESL Education:” While this is a conclusion, and not a fact, NNMC respectfully suggests “motivation” is a subjective criterion that is difficult to assess from the perspective of whether the course provides sufficient motivation because the term may be rarely referenced in the material. Nevertheless, motivation was an important factor in selecting the text books. For example, each text book employs highly motivational strategies in those chapters that address the theory to practice content. Moreover, NNMC met the **Coverage** criteria 1.1, 1.2, and most portions of 1.3 (Syllables/Morphemes and Phonics for the Teacher of Reading). In light of these findings, it necessarily follows that the courses are inherently satisfying the Bilingual/ESL Education since, as research continues to prove, ESL and bilingual learners learn through systematic and explicit reading instruction along with the language and multisensory teaching strategies provided in the reading courses offered at NNMC. Perhaps NNMC does not understand the definition of this criterion or how it is evaluated by the reviewers.

### **Part B – Improving NNMC Reading Instruction based on Reviewers Findings**

1. NNMC will use the findings to ensure the concept of motivation and bilingual/ESL reading instruction is explicitly addressed throughout the courses in the context of each concept taught.
2. NNMC will use The Elements of Program Analysis as a guide for selecting text books, and developing course material and assignments.

## San Juan College Response to the LESC Reading Course Study

On November 30, adjunct reading instructors and both the Teacher Education/ALP director and the director of the SJC Early Childhood program met to discuss the reading courses that had been reviewed by the LESC reviewers. We discussed all the issues brought out in the review and have decided to continue our dialogue regarding the reading courses offered by our respective programs to ensure that the reading courses that we are offering meet the materials analysis rubric that was used by the reviewers to conduct their review. We plan to look at the course syllabi, instructor course guides and all supplemental materials that are being used to ensure that all five components of scientifically-based research on reading and literacy are appropriately incorporated into all three courses. We will also ensure that syllabi outcomes, instructor course guides including activities, projects and other assignments tie to text reading assignments and use of supplemental materials.

The reading courses for the SJC/ALP; EDUC 262, 264 and 213 have been taught since the program began in 2003. No internal review has been conducted on our courses since that time and we learned through this review that at least one of the text books that we were using was obsolete. We will be interested to see the recommended text book list compiled by the LESC and we plan to look at all the recommended texts to make new selections for our courses during the summer of 2011. Both of the text books used in our EDUC 213 Reading for Special Learners course received favorable reviews.

Our instructors use many supplemental materials in their courses but these materials were not available at the time that the materials were sent out. Therefore none of the supplemental materials such as videos and supplemental articles were included for review. We plan to access the LETRS teaching modules suggested by the reviewers to supplement instruction and compile a complete list of course supplemental materials that are currently being utilized for each course.

We will archive electronic versions of the course syllabi and instructor course guides to ensure the availability when and if these materials are requested. We did not have the current course guides being used when these materials were requested by the LESC for the review last summer. We also did not have a complete set of text books on hand to send to the reviewers. We plan to establish a process for internal review of our reading courses to promote a stronger focus on explicit, systematic, cumulative instruction in an integrated manner with greater practice and application activities tied to the field.

We will plan to provide an update to the progress we make in improving the reading instruction in our alternative licensure program. We appreciate the efforts of the reviewers in their careful scrutiny of our reading courses and we are committed to improving our courses to meet the standards established in the reading program materials analysis rubric and the five components of a researched based reading program.

## Response to HJM16 Reading Study

There appears to be some inconsistencies in how the study was conducted and summary reports generated. The two reviewers for SFCC had very different findings but both were not reflected in the summary report. There was also a problem that the reviewers did not receive some of the materials. We are not sure how that happened.

Problems with the study aside, it is clear we can do a better job in teaching reading and in documenting what we do teach. Although instructors cover much of the required material, their syllabi, outlines and modules do not adequately reflect this. We are taking the following steps to improve:

- Master course syllabi have already been in the process of review and update – they will be revised to better reflect what is actually taught in these courses and include the science of teaching reading principles
- Instructor course outlines will be revised to include specific activities, assignments and assessments in phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary development, comprehension, and bilingual education
- Course modules will be revised to better align with textbook chapters, supplemental materials and topics
- Review texts and supplemental materials. It would be helpful to have a list of approved materials for the state from which individual instructors or institutions can choose
- Include additional instructional activities to reinforce and practice the concepts
- All online courses are currently undergoing Quality Matters review to improve organization of material and structural understanding that will align the concepts with modules and materials

Date: December 2, 2010

RE: UNM Response to HJM 16 Reading Study

The University of New Mexico, College of Education has carefully considered the findings of the House Joint Memorial 16 Reading Study and appreciates the opportunity to respond to the LESC. In addition to the Summary Report, the review process afforded our faculty the opportunity to conduct a self-assessment of the strengths and areas of need in our Reading Methods courses. The facts included in the Summary Report are accurate.

### Proposed Improvements

\*A matrix was created in the Fall of 2010 to align NM PED Competencies for Entry Level Elementary Teaching, K-8 with the two required Reading Methods courses (EDUC 330: Teaching of Reading and EDUC 331: Teaching of Reading in the Elementary School).

\*Master syllabi were established in the Fall of 2010 for EDUC 330 and EDUC 331. Master syllabi include all components of the science of reading.

\*All instructors of EDUC 330 and EDUC 331 will be required to cover applicable NM PED Competencies for Entry Level Elementary Teaching, K-8 and the specific content in the Master syllabi beginning Spring 2011.

\*Examination of Reading Methods coursework in the Dual License program was begun in September of 2010.

\*The EDUC 331 correspondence course did not meet the current requirements for Reading Methods course content. The course was terminated in September of 2010.

We appreciate the hard work and integrity of our reviewers, Candace Head-Dylla and Mary Poirier Gilroy. The assessment of our program is valuable information that will have a deep impact on the changes UNM is making to better meet the need for highly qualified teachers of reading.

December 6, 2010

Dear Dr. Howell, Ms. Volkers, and Ms. Herman,

The Dean of the School of Education and the two faculty members, who teach the two required reading courses at University of the Southwest (USW), participated in the HJM 16 Reading Course Analysis initiative.

As a *private* institution of higher learning, USW was not *required* to participate in the course analysis initiative. However, the administrators and faculty seek to continually improve USW's teacher preparation program, and participation in the HJM 16 initiative was a way to gain objective feedback, reflect on the reviewers' findings, and to take appropriate measures to improve content and practices in the required reading course offerings.

As requested, USW's dean and faculty offer the following corrections to perceived errors in the review that, we believe, should be noted:

- **ERROR**

"Phonemic Awareness Findings:

In text *Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading*, the five components were addressed to varying degrees. However, the five components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension) were not specifically listed on either syllabus" (p. 1, *Final Collaborative Reviewers Summary*).

**RESPONSE**

EDU 3503 Methods and Materials of Reading and Integrated Communication Arts & EDU 3513 Reading Instruction: Although each of the five elements were not explicitly identified in one specific section of the syllabus, the course description, entry-level competencies, and/or performance standards and benchmarks were covered.

- **ERROR**

"The philosophy of the program appears to be based in whole language, yet not adequately supported by research or practice" (p. 4, *Final Collaborative Reviewers Summary*)

**RESPONSE**

In the opinion of the dean and faculty, the required reading courses are *not* based on whole language, although it is mentioned in Rubin's text. USW's teacher preparation program has sought to guide students to use a *balanced* approach to the teaching of reading. This means that faculty not only inform students of the "...developmental theories and processes by which children acquire, understand and use language from infancy through childhood" (from competencies in both syllabi).

Furthermore, USW's dean and faculty believe our reading courses and teacher preparation program can use the information contained in the reviews to improve your reading instruction. For example, USW's dean, faculty, and school partners will collaborate to change textbooks as recommended and to provide more explicit instruction and student application of the five elements of scientific reading.

Although there were several areas in which the reviewers felt scientific reading was not addressed in the course syllabi, textbooks, and/or interviews, we at USW believe that further analysis, research, and revisions to USW's reading courses will result in the improvement of our instruction to students. Our students will then be better prepared to apply the components of scientific reading in the classrooms in which they teach.

Finally, we want to offer our appreciation of the reviewers' efforts to critique USW's reading courses and to describe what they believe are areas that need to be improved.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mary Harris".

Mary R. Harris, EdD

Dean, School of Education (SOE)  
Director, Office of Special Services  
Professor of Elementary Education and Special Education  
575-492-2162 (Dean's Office)  
575-392-6564 (SOE Office)  
575-392-6566 (FAX)



Dr. Richard Howell, Dean UNM College of Education

Ms. Pamela Herman, LESC Senior Research Analyst II

December 6, 2010

Dear Dr. Howell and Ms. Herman:

We want to thank you for the time and energy you spent on the HJM 16: Reading Study. The findings of the reading reviewers were puzzling. We submitted sufficient proof that we teach the five components of reading and it was not examined by the reviewers. Two syllabi were submitted with dates of assignments and chapters of texts. Lecture notes were presented to clarify each chapter's instructional content. Within the lecture notes, samples of assignments were presented. Yet, the reviewers consistently reported that no evidence was found. If the reviewers were unclear about which texts were used, they only needed to open the lecture notes and match them to the listing in the syllabus. Furthermore, WNMU never did receive a complete review. Ms. Christie Richards's review of RDG 410/510 was incomplete. Her review for RDG 411/511 was never included in either of the emails sent by Dr. Howell or Erica. Therefore, her findings were inconclusive.

The interview was conducted for two hours with ample time to ask for the title of the textbook(s) and the specific instances that were unclear. No mention was made of topics needing clarification. Also during the phone interview, the reviewers posed questions about scientific reading, yet they were not able to converse about the statistical analysis of data used in the effective schools research.

In addition, the rubric for the review appeared redundant (reading comprehension was repeated) and not well crafted. The rubric omitted the assessment of the teaching of writing using constructed responses. However, the state of New Mexico uses this as a measure for assessing reading for AYP. Certainly in this instance, the state assessment of reading and the state expectations for teaching pre-service reading teachers do not match.

We have resubmitted a two page rejoinder which lists the chapter topics for each reading class. We would hope that the easily apparent facts not be overlooked in haste. Much time and money has been spent to insure the completion of this project. We would suggest that qualified reviewers be used to review programs and that a revised rubric be circulated prior to the next review.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Patricia Manzanares-Gonzales, Dean

Dr. Ann Harvey, Associate Professor

Dr. Martha Alvarez-Martini, Assistant Professor

The syllabus for RDG 410/510: Teaching of Reading class, listed the chapters of Heilman's text without listing the topics of those chapters. The textbook and the lecture notes were offered, but the evaluators were not able to find the topics. Therefore, they are listed:

Chapter	Topic	Assignment	Answers this scientific reading component
Heilman Chapter 1	Define reading process	Visit 1: Reading beliefs, children lit. titles.	Motivation
Heilman Chapter 2	Effective reading classrooms: scientific results of classroom practices	Visit 2: Phonemic Awareness lesson.	Phonemic Awareness
Heilman Chapter 3	Language, background knowledge, dialect	Visit 3: Word Identification Lesson	Vocabulary Diversity of Readers
Heilman Chapter 4	Emergent Reading, Concept of Print, Big Books, motivation	Visit 4: Fluency. Students do choral reading of poetry	Phonemic Awareness Fluency
Heilman Chapter 5 <i>Chapter 1 Cunningham 4 Blocks</i>	Direct Instruction: Strategies	<i>Chapter 1 Cunningham 4 Blocks: Self Selected Reading Read, Summarize and Reflect.</i>	Motivation
Heilman Chapter 6	Word Recognition, Phonics, Vocabulary	Field Experience p. 242 Vocabulary Study	Phonics
Heilman Chapter 7 <i>Chapter 2 Cunningham 4 Blocks</i>	Comprehension Strategies: Comprehension posters explains: QAR (inference), Question the Author, Reciprocal Teaching, Anticipation Guides, Modeling	Visit 5: Explain Each strategy and write a lesson using it. <i>Chapter 2 Cunningham 4 Blocks: Words and Word Walls Read, Summarize and Reflect.</i>	Comprehension Fluency
Heilman Chapter 8	Basals, Language Experience, Computer Assisted, Motivation	Field Experience Evaluate a basal reader #2, p.374. Visit 6: Writing Instruction: Observe and reflect	Phonemic Awareness Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, Comprehension.
Heilman Chapter 9 <i>Chapter 3 Cunningham 4 Blocks</i>	Literature Based Instruction, Motivation	Visit 7. Observe a literature circle. Teach a lesson <i>Chapter 3 Cunningham 4 Blocks: Guided Reading Read, Summarize and Reflect.</i>	Motivation Comprehension
Heilman Chapter 10 <i>Chapter 4 Cunningham 4 Blocks</i>	Content Reading Strategies	<i>Chapter 4 Cunningham 4 Blocks: Writing Read, Summarize and Reflect.</i>	Comprehension Strategies, Study Skills
Heilman Chapter 11	Reading Assessment	Running Records	

The syllabus for RDG 411/511: Corrective Reading, listed the chapters of Rubin's text without listing the topics of those chapters. The textbook and the lecture notes were offered, but the evaluators were not able to find the topics. Therefore, they are listed along with the assignment and the reading component that was addressed:

Chapter	Topic	Assignment	Answers this scientific reading component
Rubin Chapter 1	Define reading process	<i>Listening assessment</i> and interpretation	Motivation
Rubin Chapter 2	Effective reading classrooms: scientific results of classroom practices		Phonemic Awareness Vocabulary
Rubin Chapter 3	Language, background knowledge, dialect	Word Identification Lesson	ELL students Diversity of dialects
Rubin Chapter 4	Visual and auditory factors, phonemic awareness, listening levels	Visual discrimination TVPS assessment and interpretation	Phonemic Awareness' assessment
Rubin Chapter 5	Elements of proficient readers.		Motivation
Rubin Chapter 6	Alternative Assessments, Interest inventory		Assessment, Motivation
Rubin Chapter 7	Emergent Literacy, Assessing pre readers	Emergent reading assessment: auditory and visual discrimination, vocabulary and language development, Letter and word recognition, environmental print, and eye movements	Phonemic awareness
Rubin Chapter 8	Informal Reading Inventory	Informal Reading Inventory, Miscue Analysis and interpretation	Phonemic Awareness Phonics, Vocabulary, Fluency, Comprehension.
Rubin Chapter 9	Phonics and Word Recognition strategies Phonics sequence: consonants, long and short vowels, syllabication, hard and soft c and g. Onsets and rhymes, diacritical marks, structural analysis and synthesis	<i>Corrective phonic lesson</i>	Phonics
Rubin Chapter 10	Vocabulary Strategies: context clues; word sorts, Frayer model, analogies	Corrective Vocabulary lesson hunter style	Vocabulary
Rubin Chapter 11	Comprehension: DRTA, Repeated Reading, Graphic organizers, QAR: inferences, Main Idea,	Corrective Comprehension lesson	Fluency, Comprehension

details.

## X. Background

In 2001, the New Mexico Legislature passed LESC-endorsed legislation that amended then-current law regarding educational requirements for teacher licensure. The new provisions required that:

- a person seeking standard or alternative elementary licensure have completed six hours of reading courses; and a person seeking standard or alternative secondary licensure have completed three hours of reading courses in subject matter content; and
- the Public Education Department (PED) withhold approval from a college of education or teacher preparation program that fails to offer a course on teaching reading that:
  - is based upon current research;<sup>1</sup>
  - aligns with department-adopted reading standards; and
  - includes strategies and assessment measures to ensure that beginning teachers are proficient in teaching reading.

In 2004, the LESC heard a presentation regarding implementation of this requirement by PED.

In 2009, the LESC heard testimony concerning a report by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) entitled *Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: Are New Mexico's Education School Graduates Ready to Teach Reading and Mathematics in Elementary Classrooms?* The report claimed, based on a review of the curricula and syllabi of reading courses in teacher preparation programs in the state, that most programs in New Mexico were not preparing candidates to teach the science of reading, and that the programs used a wide variety of reading textbooks most of which did not address the science of reading.

The New Mexico Deans and Directors of Colleges of Education presented a rebuttal to the report to the LESC at its December 2009 meeting, contesting the methodology of the study. Subsequently, they worked with the LESC and its staff to formulate HJM 16 for the 2010 legislative session, and volunteered to sponsor the HJM 16 in-state study of teacher education reading coursework.

<sup>1</sup> In 2003, the statute was amended to refer to “*scientifically-based reading* research.”

## **XI. List of Appendices Provided on CD**

### **CNM Folder**

Bulleterd CNM Interview HJM.doc  
cheaddylla\_cnm\_educ2260\_101.PDF  
cheaddylla\_cnm\_educ2262.PDF  
cheaddylla\_cnm\_educ2262\_190.PDF  
mgilroy\_cnm\_educ2260.PDF  
mgilroy\_cnm\_educ2260\_f09.PDF  
mgilroy\_cnm\_educ2262.PDF  
Summary Report-CNMR.doc

### **ENMU Folder**

Bulleterd ENMU interview.doc  
cheaddylla\_enmu\_read350\_318.PDF  
cheaddylla\_enmu\_red375.PDF  
mgilroy\_enmu\_red350.PDF  
mgilroy\_enmu\_red375.PDF  
Summary Report-ENMUR.doc

### **NMHU Folder**

HJM 16 Summary NMHU.doc  
lclayton\_nmhu\_rded315.pdf  
lclayton\_nmhu\_rded411.PDF  
NMHU Interview.doc  
zalvarez\_nmhu\_rded315.PDF  
zalvarez\_nmhu\_rded411.PDF

### **NMSU Folder**

crichards\_nmsu\_eslit.PDF  
crichards\_nmsu\_rdg360\_560.PDF  
hshinaberger\_nmsu\_read360.PDF  
hshinaberger\_nmsu\_read361.PDF  
NMSU Interview.pdf  
NMSU.docx

### **NNMC Folder**

HJM 16 Summary NNMC.doc  
lclayton\_nnmc\_ed410.PDF  
NNMC Interview.doc  
zalvarez\_nnmc\_ed460.PDF

### **SFCC Folder**

HJM 16 Summary SFCC.doc  
lclayton\_sfcc\_edu206e.PDF

lclayton\_sfcc\_educ205.PDF  
SFCC Interview.doc  
zalvarez\_sfcc\_educ205.PDF  
zalvarez\_sfcc\_educ206.PDF

### **SJC Folder**

HJM 16 Summary SJC.doc  
lclayton\_sjc\_educ213.PDF  
lclayton\_sjc\_educ262.PDF  
lclayton\_sjc\_educ264.PDF  
zalvarez\_sjc\_educ262.PDF  
zalvarez\_sjc\_educ262\_2.PDF  
zalvarez\_sjc\_educ264.PDF

### **UNM Folder**

Bulleted UNM Interview HJM.doc  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330\_1\_6.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330\_002.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330\_002\_fd.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330L.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330L\_2.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330L\_13.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ330L\_800.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ331.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ331\_007.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ331L.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ331L\_180.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ331L\_400.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_educ531.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_llss435.PDF  
cheaddylla\_unm\_red350\_318.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_cimte331c.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330\_2.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330\_rf.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330\_rf\_2.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330L.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330L\_bf.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330L\_cm.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ330L\_es.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ331.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ331\_bf.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ331\_ns.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ331L.PDF  
mgilroy\_unm\_educ331L\_wm.PDF

mgilroy\_unm\_llss435.PDF  
Summary Report -UNM R.doc

**USW Folder**

hshinaberger\_usw\_edu3503.PDF  
hshinaberger\_usw\_edu3513.PDF  
University of Southwest Interview.pdf  
USW.docx

**WBU Folder**

Bulleted Wayland BUinterview.doc  
cheaddylla\_wbu\_edli5306.PDF  
cheaddylla\_wbu\_edli5306\_w.PDF  
cheaddylla\_wbu\_edli5354.PDF  
cheaddylla\_wbu\_edli5354\_2.PDF  
mgilroy\_wbu\_edli5306.PDF  
mgilroy\_wbu\_edli5354.PDF  
Summary Report-WaylandR.doc

**WNMU Folder**

crichards\_wnmu\_read410\_510.PDF  
hshinaberger\_wnmu\_read410.PDF  
hshinaberger\_wnmu\_read411.PDF  
WNMU interviews.TIF  
WNMU.docx

A JOINT MEMORIAL

REQUESTING THE NEW MEXICO DEANS AND DIRECTORS OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION TO CREATE A WORK GROUP TO STUDY READING CURRICULA IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

WHEREAS, literacy is fundamental to achieving success in education, economic endeavors and civic life; and

WHEREAS, in 2007, New Mexico was fifth lowest among all states in the nation in fourth-grade reading, with only twenty-four percent of fourth-grade public school students proficient or advanced in reading on the national assessment of educational progress; and

WHEREAS, the performance of New Mexico fourth-grade students in reading on that assessment was no better in 2007 than it was in 1992; and

WHEREAS, in 2007, New Mexico was third lowest among all states in the nation in eighth-grade reading, with only eighteen percent of eighth-grade public school students proficient or advanced in reading on the national assessment of educational progress; and

WHEREAS, the performance of New Mexico eighth-grade students in reading on that assessment was poorer in 2007 than in 1998; and

WHEREAS, research has shown that the single most significant school-related factor in student achievement is

teacher quality; and

WHEREAS, New Mexico teacher preparation programs have traditionally prepared a major share of the new teachers for New Mexico classrooms; and

WHEREAS, in 2000, the national reading panel conducted a comprehensive survey of scientifically valid educational research on reading instruction for children and identified five essential components, which are phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary development and reading comprehension; and

WHEREAS, in 2001, legislation was enacted in New Mexico requiring the public education department to withhold program approval from a college of education or teacher education program that fails to offer a course on teaching reading that is based on current scientifically based reading research; that aligns with department-adopted reading standards; that includes strategies and assessment measures to ensure that beginning teachers are proficient in teaching reading; and that was designed after seeking input from experts in the education field; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, the national council on teacher quality published an evaluation of reading preparation in eight New Mexico undergraduate elementary teacher preparation programs that found that most programs in New Mexico do not prepare candidates to teach the science of reading and that

the programs use a variety of reading textbooks, most of which do not address the science of reading; and

WHEREAS, it is of paramount importance to every resident of New Mexico to have confidence that every graduate of a teacher preparation program in the state has received the best possible instruction in the teaching of reading and is well-prepared to teach students to be proficient readers, able to manage rigorous content in later grades;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO that the New Mexico deans and directors of colleges of education be requested to form a work group to examine the curricula and assigned text materials of all required reading courses in programs that prepare teachers for state licensure and to determine if those courses meet the statutory requirement that they be based on current scientifically based research; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the work group include not only three deans or directors of undergraduate teacher preparation programs and alternative teacher licensure programs and three members of the legislative education study committee, but also such other representatives as those six members designate; and that the work group establish the methodology for the study, including the qualifications of reading experts to review the curricula and materials, the process by which the reviews will be conducted, the scope of

work of the reading experts and the standards to be used to evaluate the curricula and materials, and the timetable for completion of the study; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the work group report the results of its study, with findings and recommendations, to the appropriate interim legislative committee and the governor by November 1, 2010; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the New Mexico deans and directors of colleges of education and the executive director of the legislative education study committee.

**HJM 16 READING PROGRAM MATERIALS ANALYSIS RUBRIC**

<b>ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS</b>	<b>EVIDENCE</b>	<b>FINDINGS</b>
<b><i>I. COVERAGE</i></b>		
1. Scientifically-based research on reading and literacy offered in the program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phonemic Awareness</li> <li>• Phonics (Basic and Complex Letter/Sound Correspondences)</li> <li>• Fluency</li> <li>• Vocabulary Development</li> <li>• Comprehension</li> </ul>		
2. The depth and duration of the instruction in scientifically-based research to prepare teachers		
3. Additional components of reading offered in the program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motivation</li> <li>• Bilingual/ESL Reading Instruction</li> <li>• Syllables/Morphemes</li> <li>• Phonics for the Teacher of Reading</li> </ul>		
<b><i>II. QUALITY</i></b>		
1. The relationship of the instruction to current national research in reading and literacy		
2. Elements of proficient readers		
3. Elements that address the design and delivery of instruction to academically diverse learners		
4. Elements that address varied assessments to inform instruction, diagnosis, and prevention of reading difficulties		
<b><i>III. TEXT COMPREHENSION</i></b>		
1. Comprehension strategies as explicit steps to understand fictional text (e.g., monitoring comprehension, graphic and semantic organizers, answering questions, generating questions, recognizing story structure, summarizing)		
2. Comprehension strategies as explicit steps to understand informational texts and textbook readings (e.g. semantic mapping, KWL, previewing, SQ3R, self monitoring, PReP)		
<b><i>IV. ASSESSMENT AND SCREENING</i></b>		
1. Assessment strategies integrated into each component of the reading course		
2. Ability to access additional and appropriate resources to further support students who are at risk of reading failure in the least restrictive environment		

## HJM 16 READING REVIEW QUESTIONS

Directions: We have 6 questions that were developed by the HJM 16 Workgroup that we will be asking you today. We will have about 15 minutes for responses to each question. When you respond to a question, it will be helpful if you first identify yourself by name and then share your response.

(Note: Have faculty introduce themselves, indicate full or adjunct, what reading course(s) they teach)

### Questions:

1. What do you consider to be the science of reading in elementary reading instruction?
2. What percent of your class time is taken up with each element of reading instruction, and what evidence do you have that your candidates are able to teach the five elements?
3. How do these five elements feed into the fieldwork your students complete, in terms of developing lesson plans, assessment, etc.?
4. Do you have any evidence of improved student reading, based on how your candidates are trained to teach reading?
5. Describe your program's field experiences for reading: length, number, frequency – how much “on the ground” contact time do your candidates experience in reading?
6. What is your opinion of the adequacy of the text materials you are given to use by your program?