Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia

Competency Crosswalk Based on Certification Level and Endorsement Type for:

All Teachers K-12 • Elementary Education PK-6 • Comprehensive Special Education PK-12
Remedial Reading and Remedial Language Arts Specialists 1-12

CONNECTICUT
Education



Contents

Acknowledgments ii

Introduction and Guiding Principles 1

From Research to Practice: Structured Literacy and the Path to Reading Success for All 4

Introduction to the Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia 6

How to Read the Educator Competencies Crosswalk 8

Applying the Connecticut Educator Competencies in Educator Preparation and K-12 Schools 9

Structured Literacy and Dyslexia Competencies by Certification Level and Endorsement Type

- Foundational Competencies 10
- Structured Literacy Competencies 18

Endnotes 25

References and Resources 26

Appendix 27

State of Connecticut

Ned Lamont, Governor
Susan Bysiewicz, Lt. Governor

Connecticut State Department of Education

Charlene M. Russell-Tucker, Commissioner
Dr. Charles Hewes, Deputy Commissioner
Sinthia Sone-Moyano, Deputy Commissioner

Connecticut State Board of Education

Erin D. Benham, Vice Chair
Sreenidi Bala, Student Member
Christine Benz, Ex Officio
Bonnie E. Burr
Terrence Cheng, Ex Officio
Donald F. Harris, Jr.
Paula S. Gilberto
Gladys B. Labas
Sophia Messina, Student Member
Kristen A. Record
Juan C. Salazar
Allan B. Taylor
Kelli-Marie Vallieres, Ex Officio
Seth D. Zimmerman

The Connecticut State Department of Education is committed to a policy of equal opportunity/affirmative action for all qualified persons. The Connecticut Department of Education does not discriminate in any employment practice, education program, or educational activity on the basis of race; color; religious creed; age; sex; pregnancy; sexual orientation; workplace hazards to reproductive systems, gender identity or expression; marital status; national origin; ancestry; retaliation for previously opposed discrimination or coercion, intellectual disability; genetic information; learning disability; physical disability (including, but not limited to, blindness); mental disability (past/present history thereof); military or veteran status; victims of domestic violence; or criminal record in state employment, unless there is a bona fide occupational qualification excluding persons in any of the aforementioned protected classes. Inquiries regarding the Connecticut State Department of Education's nondiscrimination policies should be directed to: Attorney Louis Todisco, Connecticut State Department of Education, by mail at 450 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, CT 06103-1841; by telephone at 860-713-6594; or by email louis.todisco@ct.gov.

Acknowledgments

A very special thank you to all the dedicated researchers, educators, education professionals, institutes of higher education faculty, and organizations who contributed to developing the competencies. These education professionals' collaborative and combined efforts were instrumental in creating the first structured literacy and dyslexia competencies in Connecticut's history. We would also like to recognize and thank Dr. Jule McCombes-Tolis, former Bureau Chief of the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities, for her contributions to this body of work. With the integration of these competencies in educator preparation and development for aspiring educators and professional learning for practicing educators, Connecticut recognizes the importance of early and effective literacy instruction for all students, particularly those at risk for and with dyslexia and/or other reading difficulties, reflecting the state's commitment to equitable educational access for all students, striving to prepare every student for success in learning, life, and work beyond school.

Structured Literacy and Dyslexia Competencies Development Team

Researchers and national organization consultants designated by the CSDE to guide the work of creating and developing the Structured Literacy and Dyslexia Competencies and lead the work of the advisory.

Lisa Gianni
Project Manager/Lead Consultant and Associate Education Consultant, Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Devin Kearns
Scientific Research and Practice Advisory Co-Chair and Goodnight Distinguished Professor of Early Literacy, North Carolina State University and Research Scientist: Haskins Global Literacy Hub at Yale University and University of Connecticut

Dr. Louisa Moats
Scientific Research and Practice Advisory Co-Chair and Author, IDA Knowledge and Practice Standards (KPS), Co-author LETRS and Educational Consultant, Speaker, and Researcher

Dr. Sarah Sayko
Technical Assistance Team Lead and National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL) Deputy Director

Scientific Research and Practice Advisory (advisory)

Researchers, higher education faculty, K-12 educators, school and district-level administrators, advocates, state and national organization consultants designated by the CSDE to guide the work of creating and developing the Structured Literacy and Dyslexia Competencies.

Cyndi Adams
Teaching and Learning Specialist, Cooperative Educational Services, Regional Education Service Center (RESC) Alliance

Kristin Allen
Associate Education Consultant, Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities, Liaison to the Bureau of Special Education, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Megan Alubicki-Flick
Multilingual Learner Consultant/Title III State Director, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Judith Carson
Program Manager, School, Family and Community Partnerships, Connecticut State Department of Education

Eric Elias
School Psychologist, Thomas Hooker Elementary School, Meriden, CT

Dr. Natasha Feinberg
Associate Professor, Rhode Island College
Feinstein School of Education and Human Development

continued ▶

Scientific Research and Practice Advisory (advisory), continued

Dr. Judith Fontana
Educational Consultant, National Center on Improving Literacy

Sharon Fuller
Education Consultant, Bureau of Educator Effectiveness, Connecticut State Department of Education

Cody Fusco
Associate Education Consultant, Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Margie Gillis
Founder and President, Literacy How
Member, Reading Implementation Council

Dr. Stephanie Gonzalez
Educational Consultant, National Center on Improving Literacy and Facilitator, HILL for Literacy

Dr. Melissa Hickey
Director, Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Fumiko Hoeft
Campus Director, UConn Waterbury, Lab Director, Laboratory for Learning Engineering and Neural Systems (brainLENS)

Candice LaConti
Associate Education Consultant, Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success, Connecticut State Department of Education

Sabrina Mancini
State Director of Adult Education, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Maribel Olivero
Director of Equity and Languages, Connecticut State Department of Education

Dr. Maryann Perry
Educational Consultant, National Center on Improving Literacy

Allison Quirion
Founder and President, Decoding Dyslexia CT

Amanda Rathbun
Educational Consultant, National Center on Improving Literacy and Facilitator, HILL for Literacy

Dr. Maureen Ruby
Associate Professor, Sacred Heart University, Educational and Literacy Leadership; Isabelle Farrington Endowed Chair of Social, Emotional and Academic Leadership

Dr. Evelyn Russo
Curriculum, Instruction and Personnel Director, Orange Public Schools Orange, CT

Kenneasha Sloley
Principal, Conte West Hills Magnet School, New Haven, CT

Vacianna Spaulding
Director of Pupil Services and Special Education, Middletown Public Schools, Middletown, CT

Patricia Wilson
Education Consultant, Bureau of Standards and Certification, Connecticut State Department of Education

Introduction and Guiding Principles

Connecticut Educator Competencies: Advancing Structured Literacy and Dyslexia Instruction for Reading Equity

Connecticut's first set of competencies for structured literacy and dyslexia have been prepared in accordance with Public Act 21-168, which called for the development of structured literacy competency targets that are to be achieved by an educator based on their certification level and endorsement type before the awarding of a Connecticut teaching credential. The legislation requires that the competencies are developed and updated as necessary, with consideration for the structured literacy targets presented in the *Final Report of Findings and Recommendations of the Task Force to Analyze the Implementation of Laws Governing Dyslexia Instruction and Training (Connecticut General Assembly [CGA], 2021)*, as prescribed in section 10-14z(d) of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Furthermore, the competencies have been prepared in accordance with section 10-145a(e) of the Connecticut General Statutes. This statute, referenced in section 10-14z(c) of the Connecticut General Statutes, requires that the *content of instruction for any teacher in a program of teacher preparation leading to professional certification must include as part of the curriculum, instruction in literacy skills and processes that reflects current research and best practices in the field of literacy training and that such content is integrated into the requirements of student major and concentration. It also stipulates that the curriculum includes "not fewer than twelve clock hours of instruction in the detection and recognition of, and evidence-based structured literacy interventions for, students with dyslexia."*

As of July 1, 2024, Section 10-14z(c) of the Connecticut General Statutes, as updated, also requires the verification of scientifically-based reading research and instruction, as defined in section 10-14u(3), structured literacy instruction and training provided to candidates applying for initial and professional certifications.

To meet these requirements, the *Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia* were drafted by a dedicated team of experts with input from educator preparation faculty, school and district education professionals, and other partners nationally and throughout the state. This team of experts was deeply committed, hardworking, and engaged collaboratively as members of a Scientific Research and Practice Advisory (advisory) in developing the state's first-ever set of competencies for structured literacy and dyslexia to be achieved by an educator based on their certification level and endorsement type. Established in January 2024, the advisory provided guidance and recommendations that ensured the competencies created and agreed upon align with the body of scientific reading research and evidence-based practices. Alignment with evidence-based practices ensures that the competencies provide educator preparation providers and local and regional boards of education meaningful applications in translating research to practice. With the integration of instruction in structured literacy and dyslexia into educator preparation programs for aspiring educators and professional learning for practicing educators, we are providing all students with equitable access to literacy instruction and intervention grounded in research.

In December 2023, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) established a technical assistance partnership with the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL). The NCIL technical assistance team, comprised of experts in the field of literacy, contributed significantly to the development of the competencies. They facilitated advisory and workgroup meetings, developed decision protocols, and provided consultation in articulating and analyzing refinement recommendations. Their expertise and collaborative approach ensured a smooth process, including the ideation and creation of supplemental resources to support implementation.

To ensure the development of a robust and evidence-based set of structured literacy and dyslexia educator competencies, the development and advisory team utilized a comprehensive and collaborative process that included extensive engagement over several months. This structured approach provided the advisory team with an iterative, open, and transparent method for reaching agreement through the joint refinement of ideas and recommendations. This process was designed to answer the following question, which served as a keystone throughout the development:

What are the essential teacher competencies for structured literacy and dyslexia that all educators should know and be able to do to effectively teach students at risk for and with dyslexia or other reading difficulties?

Over several months, spanning from February 2024 through August 2024, the development team met monthly to plan the work of the advisory and review recommendations, and the advisory met monthly and held additional supplemental workgroup meetings to continue the work of refining, drafting, and writing. Throughout the process, the team used a research-based approach to reach agreement as refinements and recommendations were discussed. The advisory first began by identifying the essential teacher competencies for remedial reading and remedial language arts specialists, as this is the most advanced certification level and endorsement type. Once developed, the advisory used these competencies to identify those for elementary and special educator certifications, taking into consideration the preparation needs of beginning and experienced educators.

A structured decision-making method was utilized to foster an open and transparent process in reaching consensus. This method involved the advisory openly sharing their insights or judgments through independently completed surveys or discussions. After each survey and discussion round, the NCIL facilitator provided a summary of the advisory team's input, allowing advisory members to adjust their responses in subsequent rounds based on this transparent feedback. The advisory met in person in July 2024 to vote on the essential competencies developed for remedial reading and remedial language arts specialists. From these competencies, the essential competencies that elementary educators and special educators should know and be able to do were identified. These competencies were also voted on by the advisory during our July 2024 meeting. Our NCIL technical assistance team led the voting procedure, which resulted in a consensus for each certification level and endorsement type. This approach ensured all stakeholders were included and informed throughout the development, refinement, and agreement process.

The structured literacy and dyslexia competencies for Elementary Educators, Special Educators, and Remedial Reading and Remedial Language Arts Specialists were informed by the *International Dyslexia Association's Knowledge and Practices Standards for Teachers of Reading (2018),* the *Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides,* CSDE-endorsed guidance documents including *Connecticut's Framework for RTI 2008; SRBI-ELL Handbook; Evidence-Based Practice Guide: Multilingual Learners; 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities; Connecticut's K-3 Literacy Strategy; Full, Equal, and Equitable Partnerships with Families* and recommendations and guidance provided by NCIL and the advisory. Additionally, the Foundations of Reading (890) and the Reading Specialist (802) Connecticut Teacher Examination study guides indicate that the competencies are represented and assessed, although to varying degrees, on each exam. This rigorous approach to the development process ensured that the competencies were evidence-based, aligned with guidance provided by the Connecticut State Department of Education and reflected scientifically based reading research and instruction in literacy education

Guiding Principles

The primary goal in developing structured literacy and dyslexia competencies by certification level and endorsement type is to ensure that all teachers enter the profession with a shared baseline of literacy knowledge and skill grounded in scientific reading research and best practices. This shared understanding will assist educators in collaborating constructively within school-based teams to effectively to teach all students, especially those at risk for and with dyslexia and those who find learning to read difficult. The development team and advisory agreed that the competencies should follow these four guiding principles to achieve this goal.

1. **Identify the structured literacy and dyslexia-specific competencies teachers must possess to effectively teach K-12 students to master grade-level state achievement standards (CT Core Standards)**

2. **Specify practice competencies separate from knowledge competencies. (Because effective practice is what results if our goal has been met, the competencies are structured to lead with practice indicators. The knowledge indicators follow, as they underpin the practice.)**

3. **Verify that the competencies are supported by evidence, as cited in practice and guidance documents developed or endorsed by the ED and/or the CSDE.**

4. **Consider meaningful applications (EPP, K-12) for the competencies as Implementation Guidance and Resource documents are developed and supported.**

Principle 1: The Connecticut Core Standards emphasize essential literacy skills central to structured literacy instruction, including phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary development. Identifying these competencies helps ensure students receive evidence-based literacy instruction aligned with state benchmarks, promoting more equitable literacy outcomes for all learners.

Principle 2: The advisory considered the outcome of effective teacher practice and the knowledge teachers require as the competencies were crafted and edited. The competencies are structured to lead with teacher practice indicators because effective practice is the result of meeting our goal. Teacher knowledge indicators follow the practice indicators as they underpin and inform teacher application of knowledge.

Principle 3: The competencies are not just rooted but deeply embedded in scientific reading research and best practices. The advisory consulted practice and guidance documents throughout the drafting and editing process to ensure alignment with scientific reading research reflected in guidance documents issued and endorsed by the United States Department of Education (ED) and the CSDE.

Principle 4: As guidance and resources are developed and supported, purposeful applications of the competencies in institutes of higher education and local and regional boards of education will be considered. This provides a great opportunity to develop guidance and resources that support the implementation of the competencies meaningful ways that reflect the needs of various users.

From Research to Practice: Structured Literacy and the Path to Reading Success for All

Structured literacy follows an explicit, systematic, diagnostic, and sequential method. It is highly effective in teaching all students to read and is essential for students at risk for and with dyslexia and students who experience difficulty learning to read. This instructional methodology, supported by scientific, evidence-based research, also known as the "science of reading", aligns with how students best learn to read and write. It integrates listening, speaking, reading and writing and emphasizes the structure of language across the speech sound system (phonology), the writing system (orthography), the structure of sentences (syntax), the meaningful parts of words (morphology), the relationship among words (semantics), and the organization of spoken and written discourse (IDA 2019b, 6).

Understanding these elements is crucial for effectively implementing structured literacy. However, just as important as what is taught is how it is taught—through explicit, systematic, and diagnostic instruction.

Connecticut's definition of structured literacy, as described in Connecticut's Frequently Asked Questions: Specific Learning Disability/SLD Dyslexia, aligns with nationally recognized frameworks and emphasizes the essential elements necessary for effective reading instruction. These principles and elements include:

Elements of Structured Literacy instruction

- **Phonological and Phonemic Awareness**: Manipulating sounds in spoken words, including rhyming, segmenting, blending, and substituting phonemes. The most important aspect of phonological awareness is manipulating the smallest unit of sound at the phoneme level.
- **Sound-Symbol Association/Phonics**: Understanding how phonemes map to printed symbols, enabling decoding and spelling. As decoding and encoding are mutually supportive, it is important to provide instruction in both directions – speech to print and print to speech.
- **Orthography**: Recognizing syllable patterns, division rules, and common spelling conventions to support reading and spelling.
- **Morphology:** Identifying base words, roots, prefixes, and suffixes to support reading, spelling, and vocabulary development.
- **Syntax**: Understanding grammar, sentence structure, and word order to support reading comprehension and written expression.
- **Semantics:** Developing vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and awareness of discourse structures.

Principles Guiding Structured Literacy instruction

- **Systematic and Cumulative**: Skills are taught in a logical sequence, with continuous review and practice.
- **Explicit Instruction**: Concepts are deliberately taught with ample teacher-student interaction, including opportunities for practice with teacher provided corrective feedback.
- **Diagnostic and Prescriptive Teaching**: Instruction is tailored to individual student needs through ongoing assessment.
- **Hands-on, engaging, and multimodal**: Includes hands-on learning such as moving tiles into sound boxes as words are segmented and spelled, using hand gestures to support memory for associations, building patterned words with letter tiles, assembling sentences with words on cards, color-coding sentences in paragraphs, and so forth.

Because structured literacy is essential for students with dyslexia and reading difficulties, it is important to understand the nature of dyslexia and related reading difficulties. The following understandings underscore the importance of evidence-based instruction and interventions, and are reflected in Connecticut's working definition of dyslexia, developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education, and in the *Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers of Reading (2018)*.

Understanding Dyslexia and Reading Difficulties

- Dyslexia is a language-based learning disability of learning to read and write that affects phonological processing, word recognition, spelling, and reading fluency. Slow processing speed (reading fluency) can also impact comprehension and written expression.
- Dyslexia often coexists with other developmental challenges, such as attention, memory and executive function difficulties.
- Reading difficulty involves inaccurate and/or slow recognition of printed words and can also include difficulties with spelling.
- Reading skills exist on a continuum, and many students with milder presentations of dyslexia may never be formally diagnosed or receive special education services. Mild and some moderate difficulties will most likely be addressed through intervention in general education.
- Early identification and intervention are essential to preventing long-term academic challenges.
- Addressing dyslexia is the responsibility of all educators, not just reading specialists or special education teachers.
- Reading difficulties benefit from tailored instructional approaches.
- Dyslexia and reading difficulties often exist in students with aptitudes, talents, and abilities that enable them to be successful in many domains.

Supporting Systems Coherence

Integrating structured literacy into the curriculum in a clear and practical way supports all students' literacy development while ensuring that those with dyslexia and related reading difficulties receive the access and support they need, whether in prevention, intervention, or remediation. This integration promotes coherence in the following ways:

- **Consistency and Quality:** When all aspiring educators possess the necessary knowledge and skills to implement structured literacy instruction and intervention, consistent, high-quality reading instruction across schools is evident. Once in the field, educators can deepen and extend their knowledge and skills, with reflective practice playing a key role in enhancing their effectiveness. Connecticut's Guidelines for Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support (2023) emphasizes a continuous growth model promoting ongoing professional learning and using data to refine instructional practices over time.
- **Prevention and Intervention:** Competencies specifically related to dyslexia enable educators to identify and address reading difficulties early, preventing long-term academic challenges. They also support Connecticut's goals for early literacy achievement and promote the sustainability of *Connecticut's K-3 Literacy Strategy (K-3 Strategy)*. This comprehensive framework prioritizes culturally responsive, scientifically based, evidence-based practices in reading instruction, intervention, and assessment implemented within a coordinated schoolwide or districtwide system of supports and underscores the critical role of early identification in preventing reading difficulties from becoming persistent issues (Connecticut's K-3 Literacy Strategy). When integrated with a structured literacy approach, early identification and intervention reduces the need for more intensive remediation and improves long-term outcomes.
- **Enhanced Learning Environments:** When general and special educators have a shared language and knowledge about best practice, they can more efficiently and effectively collaborate to create learning environments that address the varied needs of students with dyslexia or who have other reading difficulties, so that instruction is responsive and individualized. *Connecticut's' 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities* and *Connecticut's Framework for RTI* highlight the significance of flexible service delivery models within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports framework to support students evolving needs at different stages of their learning.

Giving educators the right tools and knowledge they need to efficiently and effectively teach reading sets every student up for success and ensures no one falls through the cracks. The right kind of instruction can be life-changing for students with dyslexia and other reading challenges. When we use evidence-aligned practices, all students benefit, and we provide a solid foundation for all learning.

Connecticut's vision for effective education is designed to ensure that all students are prepared for learning, life, and work beyond the classroom. Every child deserves the opportunity to become a competent and confident reader and writer, and every teacher deserves evidence-based literacy preparation and ongoing training and support to help them meet this challenge. Collaboration, curiosity, and continuous learning help us all play a part in meeting the challenge of ensuring that all students are prepared for life, learning, and work beyond school. Literacy is the gateway to success and a doorway that every child has the opportunity to walk through.

Introduction to the Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia

The *Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia* are organized in two components: Core Foundational Knowledge and Structured Literacy Practices.

The **Core Foundational Knowledge** competencies address the foundational knowledge necessary for educators to understand both typical and atypical student literacy development and the assessment and instructional practices that promote student literacy development in general and special education contexts. This set of competencies supports educators in their ability to detect, diagnose and recognize students at-risk for and with dyslexia or other reading difficulties. There are six competency strands in this component addressing this foundational knowledge.

Core Foundational Knowledge	Competency Description
Competency 1 Literacy Scholarship	Teachers are knowledgeable about theoretical and conceptual reading and writing frameworks, the principles of scientific inquiry, and the critical examination of scientific research related to literacy.
Competency 2 Language Acquisition and Development	Teachers understand the language domains, units, and processes underpinning language acquisition and development, considerations for ELs/MLs, and the intrinsic differences between proficient and less proficient readers. Teachers are knowledgeable about the development of students' oral language and its role in supporting the attainment of proficient reading and writing, the common linguistic challenges for ELs/MLs, how to promote cross-linguistic transfer, and how to support students' acquisition and use of academic English.
Competency 3 Literacy Acquisition and Development	Teachers are knowledgeable about the stages of literacy acquisition, including word reading development and the cognitive and neurological processes underlying skilled reading and writing. Teachers can recognize the interplay between oral and written language, the impact of multilingualism, and the environmental and individual factors influencing literacy development and apply this knowledge to support students' development of proficient reading and writing skills. Teachers can identify differences between proficient and less proficient readers and apply research-based strategies, including code-emphasis instruction in early grades.
Competency 4 Principles of Explicit Instruction	Teachers can plan and deliver instruction that: proceeds in a step-by-step fashion following a gradual release model; utilizes unambiguous language; engages students in meaningful discourse around new concepts; provides multiple opportunities for student practice; limits corrective feedback language to the task at hand; promotes high levels of student engagement; and elicits a high percentage of accurate responses from students performing at all levels.
Competency 5 Dyslexia	Teachers are knowledgeable about diverse reading profiles, including dyslexia, and their varied presentations, and those related to difficulties with phonemic awareness, decoding, word recognition, spelling, and reading fluency. Teachers know the risk indicators for dyslexia and how to identify students at risk for dyslexia according to guidance provided by the CSDE.
Competency 6 Assessment, Concepts, Practices, and Applications	Teachers understand that assessment is an ongoing process and know how to administer, score, and interpret different types of literacy assessments for varied purposes, including risk identification, instructional planning and differentiation, student progress monitoring, and disability eligibility determination.

The **Structured Literacy Practice** competencies include additional knowledge necessary for educators to design and deliver literacy instruction that reflects the principles and practices of structured literacy. This competency strand supports educators in their ability to provide structured literacy instruction and intervention for all students, especially those at-risk for and with dyslexia or other reading difficulties. The learning needs of students who are ELs/MLs are also meaningfully addressed and represented in these competencies. The competencies also support educators in engaging in full, equal and equitable partnerships with families to promote student learning and development. There are six competency strands in this component addressing the principles and practices of structured literacy.

Structured Literacy Practices	Competency Description
Competency 7 Phonological Awareness	Teachers can apply the principles of explicit instruction to plan and deliver lessons to support the development of students' ability to recognize and manipulate the sounds of language at the word, syllable, and phoneme level, including how to adjust instruction to consider the needs of ELs/MLs. They are knowledgeable about core foundational knowledge related to phonological awareness, the role of phonemic awareness in the attainment of proficient reading and writing, and reasons why students may experience difficulty with developing phonological and phonemic awareness skills.
Competency 8 Phonics and Word Identification	Teachers can apply the principles of explicit instruction to plan and deliver phonics lessons that develop students' abilities to read and spell regular and irregular words accurately in isolation and in context using both decodable and authentic texts, with consideration for the needs of ELs/MLs. They are knowledgeable about core foundational knowledge related to the acquisition and development of decoding and encoding skills, the role of phonics and word identification in proficient reading and writing, and the common intrinsic differences (i.e., linguistic, cognitive, and neurobiological) between proficient and less proficient readers/spellers.
Competency 9 Reading Fluency	Teachers can apply the principles of explicit instruction to plan and deliver lessons that develop students' ability to read authentic grade-level text accurately, automatically, and with prosody. They are knowledgeable about core foundational knowledge related to reading fluency, the contribution of reading fluency to text comprehension, reasons (i.e., language, cognition, behavior) why students may struggle to meet grade-level reading fluency benchmarks.
Competency 10 Vocabulary	Teachers can apply the principles of explicit instruction to plan and deliver lessons to teach students direct and indirect vocabulary learning strategies, how to interpret words and phrases in context. They are knowledgeable about core foundational knowledge related to oral and written vocabulary, the role of vocabulary development in oral and written language comprehension, and the sources of wide differences in students' vocabularies.
Competency 11 Listening and Reading Comprehension	Teachers can apply the principles of explicit instruction to plan and deliver lessons that develop students' ability to understand and make meaning from spoken and written language. Teachers understand how to teach strategies and routines to support the development of students' listening and reading comprehension skills, with consideration for contextualized demands. They are knowledgeable about core foundational knowledge related to the development of listening and reading comprehension and factors that contribute to reading comprehension (reader, text, task-demand).
Competency 12 Written Expression	Teachers can apply the principles of explicit instruction to plan and deliver lessons that support the development of (1) the major skills (i.e., handwriting, spelling, sentence construction, typing and word processing) that contribute to written expression, (2) students' ability to generate varied types of written responses to text(s) read; and, (3) students' ability to write about real or imagined experiences.

How to Read the Educator Competencies Crosswalk

The Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia are comprehensive and are organized in two component areas: Core Foundational Knowledge and Structured Literacy Practices. These component areas each describe the knowledge and skills necessary to teach language, reading and writing effectively, especially to students experiencing difficulty. Within each component area, a wide range of competency-specific educator practice and knowledge indicators are identified for each certification level and endorsement type.

Competencies receive a checkmark (✓) in the appropriately labeled column for the endorsement for which they apply:

- **All Teachers** = Any teacher in a program of study leading to a professional certification, K-12
- **Elementary Educators** = Elementary Education PK-6, #305
- **Special Educators** = Comprehensive Special Education PK-12, #165
- **Remedial Reading** = Remedial Reading and Remedial Language Arts Specialists 1-12, #102

Each competency is assigned an identification number (ID), which is derived from the competency name and number, and is followed by a sub-identification number. This number is then followed by either the letter "P" (Practice) or "K" (Knowledge). For example, the competency identified as 5.1P means that it is a dyslexia (5) practice (P) competency and is the first one (5.1) in the sequence related to the application of knowledge to teacher practice. Additionally, several of the competencies have designations of (a) or (b). These designations indicate whether the competency should be met by beginning teachers (a) or by teachers with more experience and greater expertise (b).

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
5.1P	Identify students who are at risk for dyslexia according to the guidance provided by the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities (ODRD).		✓	✓	✓
5.2P	Plan for and provide instruction that addresses the student's unique strengths and needs, including but not limited to those related to word reading accuracy, word reading automaticity, oral reading fluency, reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and written expression.		✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
5.3K	a. Describe the characteristics of the four common reading difficulty profiles outlined in Connecticut's 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities and note how the three reading disability subtypes identified by the Simple View of Reading align with these profiles.			✓	✓
	b. Identify the characteristics of the four common reading difficulty profiles outlined in Connecticut's 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities and note how the three reading disability subtypes identified by the Simple View of Reading align with these profiles.		✓		
5.4K	Explain how and why symptoms of reading difficulty are likely to change over time in response to development and instruction.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Additionally, the Language Acquisition and Development Competency and all the Structured Literacy Practice competencies include the Connecticut Core Standard(s) that it supports. This is indicated the competency name. For example:

Structured Literacy Competency 10 — Explicit Instruction: Vocabulary

Advancing CCSS Anchor Standards for Reading Literature: RL4; Reading Informational Text: RI4; and Language: L4, L5, L6

Applying the Connecticut Educator Competencies in Educator Preparation and K-12 Schools

The *Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia* delineate the essential content knowledge and skills required for all educators to teach reading and writing effectively. These competencies are beneficial for guiding instruction and intervention for all students and are particularly beneficial for those at risk for or with dyslexia and those experiencing difficulty in learning to read.

These competencies are versatile tools for educator preparation providers, serving a range of purposes, including:

1. Support in conducting a program evaluation to identify strengths and needs
2. Guidance in the development of a program scope and sequence
3. Information for the development of course syllabi, assignments, and evaluation rubrics
4. Criteria for candidate evaluation
5. Identification of faculty professional learning needs
6. Criteria for student teaching and practicum requirements in programs of study leading to professional certification in: Special Education (#165), Remedial Reading and Remedial Language Arts (#102), and Reading and Language Arts Consultant (#097)
7. Support in fostering the development of strong K-12 school-district partnership

School and District Administrators and Educators responsible for developing, delivering and supporting professional learning can use these competencies for several purposes, including but not limited to:

1. Identification of building-level and/or district-wide professional learning strengths and needs
2. Design and development of the content of professional learning based on educator strengths and needs
3. Criteria to inform learning walks and instructional rounds
4. Information for the evaluation and selection of instructional materials and resources
5. Support for beginning educators and mentors in completing TEAM requirements
6. Information for individualized professional learning goals as required in Guidelines for Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support 2023
7. Criteria to inform communication with stakeholders, parents and caregivers regarding professional learning initiatives
8. Support for the development of strong partnerships with colleges and universities

The *Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia* promotes an integrated approach to educator preparation, development, and program design because structured literacy practice and core foundational knowledge indicators are mutually supportive and reinforcing. As educator preparation providers identify strengths and needs in their current programs of study and complete syllabus analysis and refinement, there will be opportunities for professional learning and consultation support to assist faculty in integrating the competencies in meaningful ways. As schools and districts develop professional learning goals, there will be opportunities for consultation support to help educators and education professionals use the competencies to inform the content of professional learning and support district-identified goals.

Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia

Foundational Competencies

Foundational Competency 1: Literacy Scholarship

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
1.1K	a. Identify reliable and valid sources that translate scientific studies of reading and writing into usable information and recognize the evidence-aligned principles and practices of instruction supported by that research.		✓		
	b. Summarize the major findings of interdisciplinary, scientific studies of reading and writing and the evidence-aligned principles of instruction supported by that research.			✓	✓
1.2K	a. Distinguish between quantitative and qualitative research methods in terms of their general approach to data collection and analysis and use research study conclusions to help inform instructional decisions.		✓	✓	
	b. Distinguish between quantitative and qualitative research methods in terms of their general approach to data collection and analysis, the kinds of information they produce, the appropriate interpretation of the data, and their contribution to identifying the best practices for teaching literacy skills.				✓
1.3K	a. Explain common statistical concepts, such as reliability, validity, and effect size, as used in assessment and research.		✓		
	b. Explain common statistical concepts such as reliability, validity, significance, and effect size; accurately interpret common descriptive statistics used in assessment and research.			✓	✓
1.4K	Summarize the basic principles of the scientific method as outlined in the National Institute for Literacy's document titled: What is Scientifically Based Research? USING RESEARCH AND REASON IN EDUCATION A Guide for Teachers; National Institutes for Literacy	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.5K	Identify the major components of an effective and comprehensive literacy curriculum and explain their interrelationships, and how this knowledge informs integrated instructional design.				✓
1.6K	a. Explain some of the major theoretical models and heuristics of reading development and how these models inform pedagogy.[1]	✓	✓	✓	
	b. Explain the major theoretical models and heuristics of reading development and how these models inform pedagogy.[2]				✓
1.7K	a. Explain some of the major theoretical models of writing development and how these models inform pedagogy. [1]	✓	✓	✓	
	b. Explain the major theoretical models of writing development and how these models inform pedagogy. [2]				✓

Foundational Competency 2: Language Acquisition and Development

Advancing CCS Anchor Standards for Speaking and Listening: SL 1-6 and for Language: L1, L3

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
2.1P	Use an evidence-aligned strategy or routine to teach all students to engage in conversation and structured oral language activities with their peers, with consideration for ELs/MLs, students with limited oral language fluency and those who speak a variation that differs from GAE (General American English) (e.g., AAVE [African American Vernacular English]), and for ELs/MLs, incorporate opportunities to practice in L1 and L2 cross-linguistically when possible.	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.2P	Demonstrate an ability to identify and incorporate the language and literacy practices of your students' families and communities into your teaching.[3]		✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
2.3K	Identify and describe the various stages and developmental progression, across age and grade, of language acquisition and development for native speakers of English and for ELs/MLs.[4]	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.4K	Identify models of second language acquisition including the Five Stages of Second Language Acquisition (Krashen and Terrell, 1983), Cummins' Theory of Second Language Acquisition (Cummins, 1981) and how these models inform language acquisition and academic instruction for ELs/MLs.				✓
2.5K	Describe the characteristics of the overall organization (macrostructure) and details (microstructure—e.g., use of linguistic devices at the sentence level) of narrative language and their relationship to receptive and expressive language.			✓	✓
2.6K	a. Identify the characteristics of the domains of language (phonology, orthography, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse) and their relationship to the units of language (sounds, morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, discourse).	✓	✓		
	b. Identify the characteristics of the domains of language (phonology, orthography, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse), their relationship to the units of language (sounds, morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, discourse), and explain their role in designing instruction to support attainment of proficient reading and writing for native speakers of English and for ELs/MLs.			✓	✓
2.7K	Describe the three components of phonological processing (phonological awareness, phonological memory, rapid naming/phonological access) and explain their contribution to the development of skilled reading.		✓	✓	✓
2.8K	Explain how multilingualism enriches and influences students' thinking and learning during language acquisition and development and describe the most common linguistic differences for ELs/MLs in phonological and phonemic awareness, oral vocabulary, and comprehension (to include language structures).		✓	✓	✓
2.9K	Describe key environmental and individual factors that affect language acquisition and development, note their impact, and explain how difficulties associated with these factors might manifest in the learner's reading and writing performance.	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.10K	Explain how reading, writing, and spelling proficiency depend on language proficiency.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Foundational Competency 3: Literacy Acquisition and Development

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
3.1K	Identify and describe the phases of word reading development as presented by Ehri (1995) with consideration for native speakers of English and ELs/MLs.	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.2K	Identify and describe the interrelationships among the major component skills of written language.		✓	✓	✓
3.3K	Know the regions of the brain related to skilled reading and key findings from cognitive neuroscience that have implications for reading acquisition and development.			✓	✓
3.4K	Describe orthographic processing and explain its contribution to the development of skilled reading and writing.	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.5K	Explain how multilingualism enriches and influences students' thinking and learning during literacy acquisition and development.		✓	✓	✓
3.6K	Compare and contrast oral and written language acquisition and explain the developmental difference between learning to talk and learning to read.	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.7K	Describe key environmental and individual factors that affect literacy acquisition and development (e.g., primary home language, cognition, ability to attend, anxiety, SES, etc.), note their impact and explain how difficulties associated with these factors might manifest in the learner's reading and writing performance.	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.8K	Identify the common intrinsic differences between proficient and less proficient readers, with reference to cognitive, linguistic, neurobiological, and educational research, and distinguish the characteristics of major profiles of less proficient readers.	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.9K	Explain the importance of code-emphasis instruction in the early grades (K-3) and the role that language comprehension and meaning-making play in developing oral language and foundational skills for literacy.		✓	✓	✓
3.10K	Describe how students' language, literacy, and reading experiences are influenced and shaped by their families and communities.[5]		✓	✓	✓

Foundational Competency 4: Principles of Explicit Instruction

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
4.1P	Provide systematic literacy instruction by (1) referencing a logically ordered scope and sequence; (2) following a gradual release of responsibility model; (3) making connections to previously taught concepts, strategies, skills overt.		✓	✓	✓
4.2P	Provide explicit literacy instruction by (1) setting the purpose for instruction, (2) identifying the important details of the concept being taught, (3) providing instructions that have only one interpretation, (4) modeling instructional tasks (skills, strategies, routines), (5) using visuals and manipulatives to teach concepts and content, as necessary, (6) engaging students in discourse around new concepts; and, (7) providing timely and specific confirming and corrective feedback.	✓	✓	✓	✓
4.3P	During the provision of systematic and explicit literacy instruction, engage students in meaningful interactions with language by (1) providing and eliciting background information; (2) emphasizing the distinctive features of new concepts; (3) using visuals and manipulatives to teach concepts and content as necessary, and with consideration for ELs/MLs; (4) making relationships among concepts overt; (5) engaging students in discourse around new concepts; and (5) elaborating on students' responses.		✓	✓	✓
4.4P	During the provision of systematic and explicit literacy instruction, provide multiple opportunities for students to practice instructional tasks by (1) providing more than one opportunity to practice each new skill; (2) providing opportunities for practice after each instructional step; (3) eliciting group responses when feasible; and (4) providing extra practice based on the accuracy of student responses.		✓	✓	✓
4.5P	During the provision of systematic and explicit literacy instruction, encourage student effort by (1) providing timely and specific confirming and corrective feedback, (2) ensuring that most feedback provided is positive, and (3) celebrating and displaying examples of student progress in literacy.		✓	✓	✓
4.6P	During the provision of systematic and explicit literacy instruction, adjust the emphasis of lessons to accommodate learners' strengths and needs (e.g., support for chunking information, breaking down content, using visuals) to support proficient reading and writing.	✓	✓	✓	✓
4.7P	Implement systematic and explicit literacy instruction with integrity to the evidence-aligned guidance provided by the CSDE and the publisher, if utilizing a branded approach (e.g., scope/sequence, delivery, frequency, duration, group size, instructional language, routines and contexts, etc.).		✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
4.8K	Identify and describe the components of a structured literacy lesson for phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension, including the features and appropriate use of varied texts.	✓	✓	✓	✓
4.9K	Identify, describe, and explain the importance and appropriate use of various types of practice (e.g., deliberate, interleaved, retrieval, spaced, massed, etc.) in building automaticity.		✓	✓	✓
4.10K	Understand the importance of enhancing explicit instruction for ELs/MLs by activating and connecting to their fund of knowledge, using visuals, focusing on cross-linguistic features and transfer skills, employing wait time, using manipulatives, organizers, language supports, or total physical response.		✓	✓	✓

Foundational Competency 5: Dyslexia

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
5.1P	Identify students who are at risk for dyslexia according to the guidance provided by the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities (ODRD).		✓	✓	✓
5.2P	Plan for and provide instruction that addresses the student's unique strengths and needs, including but not limited to those related to word reading accuracy, word reading automaticity, oral reading fluency, reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and written expression.		✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
5.3K	a. Identify the characteristics of the four common reading difficulty profiles outlined in Connecticut's 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities and note how the three reading disability subtypes identified by the Simple View of Reading align with these profiles.		✓		
	b. Describe the characteristics of the four common reading difficulty profiles outlined in Connecticut's 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities and note how the three reading disability subtypes identified by the Simple View of Reading align with these profiles.			✓	✓
5.4K	Explain how and why symptoms of reading difficulty are likely to change over time in response to development and instruction.	✓	✓	✓	✓
5.5K	Identify the tenets of the (2003) IDA definition of dyslexia and CT's current definition of dyslexia, or any accepted revisions thereof.	✓	✓	✓	✓
5.6K	a. Identify the distinguishing characteristics of dyslexia.	✓	✓		
	b. Explain the neurobiological basis and characteristics of dyslexia.			✓	✓
5.7K	Identify risk indicators for dyslexia.	✓	✓	✓	✓
5.8K	Explain how dyslexia varies in presentation and degree.	✓	✓	✓	✓
5.9K	Explain the consequences of a lack of timely identification and appropriately intensive and adequately comprehensive interventions.	✓	✓	✓	✓
5.10K	Identify and describe federal laws and state guidelines concerning the identification of and special education eligibility determination for Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), including SLD: Dyslexia and identify parent-friendly language to communicate these guidelines to families and caregivers.			✓	✓
5.11K	Identify and describe Connecticut's approach to SLD: Dyslexia IDEA eligibility determination and identify parent-friendly language to communicate these approaches to families and caregivers.	✓	✓		✓

Foundational Competency 6: Assessment Concepts, Practices, and Applications

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
6.1P	Three times per year, accurately administer, score, and interpret the results of a state-approved universal K-3 reading screening benchmark assessment (all subtests) according to standardized administration guidelines to (1) identify students who are at risk for dyslexia (per guidance provided by the ODRD), (2) identify students' levels of instructional need.		✓	✓	✓
6.2P	Accurately administer, score, and interpret a range of criterion-referenced literacy assessments to inform (1) the focus of targeted supplemental instruction provided to students performing below Benchmark (composite or subtest) on a state-approved universal K-3 reading screening assessment; and (2) the development of instructional groups and schedules to address students' unique literacy strengths and needs.		✓	✓	✓
6.3P	a. For students receiving targeted supplemental instruction, utilize the progress-monitoring component of the state-approved universal K-3 reading screening assessment administered according to standardized administration guidelines or use a curriculum based measure for students beyond grade 3 to (1) determine if the student is responding adequately to the instruction provided (e.g., calculate students' learning slope, rate of improvement, etc.) and if not, to inform how instruction will be intensified in consultation and collaboration with school-based education professionals (e.g., classroom teacher, remedial reading specialist); and, (2) for students identified with SLD, determine if they meet criteria for a primary disability of SLD: Dyslexia.			✓	
	b. For students receiving targeted supplemental instruction, utilize the progress-monitoring component of the state-approved universal K-3 reading screening assessment, administered according to standardized administration guidelines, or use a curriculum based measure for students beyond grade 3 to (1) determine if the student is responding adequately to the instruction provided (e.g., calculate students' learning slope, rate of improvement, etc.) and if not, to inform how instruction will be intensified in consultation and collaboration with school-based education professionals (e.g., reading specialist, special educators); and, (2) determine if a referral for special education evaluation, per guidance provided by the CSDE, is warranted.		✓		✓
6.4P	Analyze school-wide universal reading screening assessment data to evaluate the efficacy of, and inform refinements to, general education reading instruction (curriculum, programs, practices) provided across the SRBI/MTSS continuum.				✓
6.5P	Accurately select, administer, score, and interpret a range of standardized norm-referenced tests to support identification of dyslexia and SLD: Dyslexia eligibility determination.			✓	✓
6.6P	Evaluate multiple sources of student assessment data, including information provided by families, to analyze students' literacy profiles, provide a recommendation for eligibility determination consideration, and propose specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) instructional goals and objectives.			✓	
6.7P	Effectively communicate, present and explain the results of various types of assessments to educational professionals and students' families and engage them in ongoing discussions of student learning and progress.	✓	✓	✓	✓

continued ▶

Foundational Competency 6: Assessment Concepts, Practices, and Applications, continued

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
6.8K	a. Explain the results of common diagnostic assessments/tests, both formal and informal, used by psychologists, speech and language pathologists, and other educational professionals.		✓		
	b. Interpret the results of common diagnostic assessments/tests, both formal and informal, used by psychologists, speech and language pathologists, and other educational professionals.			✓	✓
6.9K	Identify and describe the features and appropriate use of the following types of assessments: Curriculum Based Measure (CBM), Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA), criterion-referenced tests, and norm-referenced tests; and their relevance to universal screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, and summative assessment applications.		✓	✓	✓
6.10K	Identify the underlying principles and critical features of SRBI/RTI/MTSS as outlined by CT's Framework for RTI (2008) or any accepted revisions thereof (e.g., instructional tiers, universal screening with approved measures, diagnostic assessment, continuous progress monitoring to include the use of approved measures, collaborative problem-solving, research-based interventions, fidelity of instruction, etc.) and compare/contrast the essential features of each tier.	✓	✓	✓	✓
6.11K	Describe Connecticut's three-tiered model for implementing SRBI/RTI/MTSS for EL/MLs, as outlined by A Handbook to accompany Connecticut's Framework for RTI (2012) or any accepted revisions thereof and compare/contrast the essential features of each tier.		✓	✓	✓

Connecticut Educator Competencies for Structured Literacy and Dyslexia

Structured Literacy Competencies

Structured Literacy Competency 7 — Explicit Instruction: Phonological Awareness

Advancing CCS Foundational Skills Standard RF 2

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
7.1P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to detect, identify, and manipulate elements of spoken language, with an emphasis on phonemes as indicated by data on student instructional needs.		✓	✓	✓
7.2P	Make explicit comparisons between the phonological systems of English and the phonological systems of ELs/MLs home language and/or the phonological systems of dialects that differ from GAE (e.g., AAE), when possible, with special emphasis on those phonemes that are not present in L1.		✓	✓	✓
7.3P	Align phoneme awareness instruction to the content and goals of the reading and spelling lesson to support students' transfer of skills.		✓	✓	✓
7.4P	Identify reasons for students' challenges distinguishing, pronouncing, and associating phonemes with symbols and use evidence-aligned instructional strategies to target remediation.			✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
7.5K	Identify, pronounce, classify, and compare the consonant and vowel phonemes in English, to include co-articulation effects and language variations, and explain how this knowledge supports learning for native speakers of English and ELs/MLs.		✓	✓	✓
7.6K	Describe the common developmental progression of phonological and phoneme awareness skills across age and grade, including the common developmental progression for levels of phonological sensitivity.	✓	✓	✓	✓
7.7K	Identify and describe the components of phonological processing and how difficulty in one or more combinations of these components are likely to impact students' literacy acquisition and development.			✓	✓
7.8K	Identify factors that may cause students to experience difficulties with phonemic awareness tasks and for each: (1) explain their potential impact on a student's phonemic awareness proficiency; (2) identify instructional considerations to address these factors; and (3) identify other school-based education professionals who can be consulted for additional guidance and support.[6]			✓	✓

Structured Literacy Competency 8 — Explicit Instruction: Phonics and Word Identification

Advancing CCS Foundational Skills Standard RF 3

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
8.1P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students grapheme-phoneme correspondences.		✓	✓	✓
8.2P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines (e.g., blending routines, segmenting routines) to teach all students to decode and encode one-syllable words comprised of common syllable types (e.g., closed, open, silent-e, vowel-r, and vowel teams).		✓	✓	✓
8.3P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to decode and encode temporarily and permanently irregular words.		✓	✓	✓
8.4P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to decode and encode two-syllable and multisyllabic words (e.g., syllable patterns, common affixes, spelling patterns, pronunciation, word meanings, word relationships e.g., synonyms, antonyms, multiple meanings).		✓	✓	✓
8.5P	Use a decodable text reading routine to teach all students to accurately apply taught phonics skills to support the reading of decodable texts.		✓	✓	✓
8.6P	Use an evidence-aligned text reading routine to teach all students to accurately apply taught phonics skills to support the reading of less controlled texts (e.g., trade books).		✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
8.7K	Explain the alphabetic principle and its importance in learning to read and spell.		✓	✓	✓
8.8K	Describe the reciprocal relationships among phonemic awareness, decoding, word recognition, spelling and vocabulary knowledge and their role in literacy acquisition and development.	✓	✓	✓	✓
8.9K	Understand the broad outline of historical influences on English spelling patterns, especially Anglo-Saxon, Latin (Romance), and Greek.	✓	✓	✓	✓
8.10K	Identify and describe common practice considerations for adapting instruction for students with weaknesses in executive function (i.e., working memory, cognitive flexibility, self-regulation) and phonological processing.	✓	✓	✓	✓
8.11K	Identify and describe the appropriate purpose and instructional uses of varied texts (e.g., decodable texts, less controlled texts e.g., trade books).		✓	✓	✓

Structured Literacy Competency 9 — Explicit Instruction: Reading Fluency

Advancing CCS Foundational Skills Standard RF 3

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
9.1P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to support the development of students' word reading automaticity skills for irregular and regular words.		✓	✓	✓
9.2P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to automatically apply taught phonics skills to support the reading of decodable texts.		✓	✓	✓
9.3P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to automatically apply taught phonics skills to support the reading of less controlled texts (e.g., trade books).		✓	✓	✓
9.4P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to promote the development of students' oral reading fluency, with consideration for improving accuracy, rate, prosody, and combinations thereof.	✓	✓	✓	✓
9.5P	For students with limitations in reading fluency that warrant intervention, use assistive technology as needed and appropriate to support access to grade-level content.	✓	✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
9.6K	Explain the role of fluent word, phrase, and sentence level skills in oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, and motivation to read.			✓	✓
9.7K	Identify and describe the components of fluency (accuracy, rate, prosody) and explain how they develop to support the proficient reading of connected text.	✓	✓	✓	✓
9.8K	Explain how difficulty in one or more of the components of oral language may impact students' reading fluency, with consideration for ELs/MLs and those with limited oral language proficiency.			✓	✓
9.9K	Explain the appropriate use of assistive technology to enable students with limitations in reading fluency that warrant intervention to access grade-level content.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Structured Literacy Competency 10 — Explicit Instruction: Vocabulary

Advancing CCS Anchor Standards for Reading Literature: RL4; Reading Informational Text: RI4; and Language: L4, L5, L6

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
10.1P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to explicitly teach basic (common words used regularly in speaking and listening), general academic (high-utility words that appear in written text across multiple subjects), and content-specific vocabulary critical for understanding a lesson or reading.	✓	✓	✓	✓
10.2P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach meaningful relationships among words (i.e., antonyms, synonyms, multiple meanings, and shades of meaning).		✓	✓	✓
10.3P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach the pronunciation and meaning of the most common prefixes, roots, and suffixes.		✓	✓	✓
10.4P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings and analyzing how specific word choices shape the meaning or tone of a text.		✓	✓	✓
10.5P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines and create learning opportunities to indirectly expose all students to rich and varied vocabulary beyond the words that are explicitly taught.		✓		

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
10.6K	Describe the role of vocabulary development and vocabulary knowledge (breadth and depth) in oral and written language comprehension, with consideration for native speakers of English and ELs/MLs, including illustrating the contrast between receptive and expressive vocabulary.	✓	✓	✓	✓
10.7K	Identify and describe the individual and environmental factors that are causally related to students' vocabulary growth and how these factors impact vocabulary instruction.[7]		✓	✓	✓
10.8K	Explain the role and characteristics of indirect (contextual) methods of vocabulary instruction.		✓	✓	✓
10.9K	Explain the role and characteristics of direct, explicit, and authentic methods of vocabulary instruction and how to make decisions about which words to explicitly teach.		✓	✓	✓

Structured Literacy Competency 11 — Explicit Instruction: Listening and Reading Comprehension

Advancing CCS Anchor Standards for Reading Literature: RL1-9; Reading Informational Text RI1-9; and Language: L3-L6

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
11.1P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines that integrate oral and written English language instruction to support discipline-specific text comprehension.	✓	✓	✓	✓
11.2P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to identify and use the organizational structure of narrative, informational and opinion/argument texts to support comprehension, including using graphic organizers to illustrate text structure.		✓	✓	✓
11.3P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach text comprehension strategies before, during and after reading.[8]		✓	✓	✓
11.4P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to understand the literal and inferred meanings of words, phrases, and sentences, including the use of cohesive devices, to construct a mental model of the text.		✓	✓	✓
11.5P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to identify the basic parts of speech and to relate a words' meaning, spelling, and pronunciation to its grammatical role in a sentence.		✓	✓	✓
11.6P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to build students' ability to use syntax to comprehend (e.g., paraphrasing, identifying the function of words within a sentence, identifying anaphora e.g., pronoun referents).		✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
11.7K	Identify various sentence structures (e.g., sentence structures such as simple, compound, complex and compound-complex) and explain how the syntactic complexity of sentence structures contributes to students' listening and reading comprehension.		✓	✓	✓
11.8K	Identify and describe the characteristics, text features and text organizational structures of the major genres: narrative, informational and opinion/argumentation.		✓	✓	✓
11.9K	Identify and describe the major factors that contribute to deep comprehension of text (e.g., background knowledge, vocabulary, verbal reasoning ability, semantic knowledge, syntactic knowledge, knowledge of literacy structures and conventions, and skills and strategies for close reading).	✓	✓	✓	✓
11.10K	Compare and contrast the processes of text comprehension and those of written composition and explain the usefulness of writing in building text comprehension.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Structured Literacy Competency 12 — Explicit Instruction: Written Expression

Advancing CCS Anchor Standards for Writing W1-10 and Language: L1, L2

ID	Practice	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
12.1P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach letter formation, both manuscript and cursive.		✓	✓	✓
12.2P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach punctuation in the context of instruction related to phrase and sentence structure and sentence types.		✓	✓	✓
12.3P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach spelling concepts that match students' levels of spelling development and orthographic knowledge.		✓	✓	✓
12.4P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach all students to use the basic parts of speech and relate a words' meaning, spelling, and pronunciation to its grammatical role in a sentence.		✓	✓	✓
12.5P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach sentence composition (e.g., sentence frames, sentence combining, sentence expansion, sentence elaboration).		✓	✓	✓
12.6P	Use evidence-aligned instructional strategies or routines to teach students to plan, draft, edit, and revise their writing.	✓	✓	✓	✓
12.7P	For students with limitations in writing fluency that warrant intervention, use assistive technology as needed and appropriate to support written expression.	✓	✓	✓	✓

ID	Knowledge	All Teachers	Elementary Educators	Special Educators	Remedial Reading
12.8K	Identify and describe the demands of writing on executive function (i.e., working memory, cognitive flexibility, self-regulation) as described in the simple view of writing (Berninger et al., 2002), with considerations for adapting instruction when appropriate.	✓	✓	✓	✓
12.9K	Identify the basic parts of speech and describe the relationship between a words' meaning, spelling, and pronunciation to its grammatical role in a sentence.		✓	✓	✓
12.10K	Identify and describe the major skill domains that contribute to written expression (transcription, composition, ideation) as well as the motivation to write.		✓	✓	✓
12.11K	Explain the influences of three distinct language structures: phoneme-grapheme correspondence, syllabification, and morphology on spelling to support fluent writing.		✓	✓	✓
12.12K	Identify and describe the components of the writing process, including the subskills of each.	✓	✓	✓	✓
12.13K	Identify and describe options for the appropriate use of assistive technology to support written expression.	✓	✓	✓	✓

Endnotes

1. some of the theoretical models including: The Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986), the 4-Part Processor (Seidenberg & McClelland, 1989), Ehri's Phases of Word Reading Development (2014), and Scarborough's (2001) Reading Rope.

   e.g., the Simple View of Writing (Berninger et al., 2002), and the Not So Simple View of Writing (Graham & Harris, 2022).

2. including, but not limited to: The Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986), Cognitive Foundations of Learning to Read (Tunmer & Hoover, 2019), the 4-Part Processor (Seidenberg & McClelland, 1989), Ehri's Phases of Word Reading Development (2014), Perfetti's Lexical Quality Hypothesis (2002); and, the RAND Reading Study Group depiction of reading comprehension (2002), The National Reading Panel Report five-pillars framework (2002), and, Scarborough's (2001) Reading Rope.

   e.g., DIEW (Kim & Schatschneider, 2017), the Simple View of Writing (Berninger et al., 2002), the writers-with-community model (Graham, 2018), and the Not So Simple View of Writing (Graham & Harris, 2022).

3. Based on the National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement. (2022b). Family engagement core competencies: A body of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for family-facing professionals. https://nafsce.org/page/CoreCompetencies.

4. Including, but not limited to: Connecticut's English Language Proficiency Standards

5. Based on the National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement. (2022b). Family engagement core competencies: A body of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for family-facing professionals. https://nafsce.org/page/CoreCompetencies.

6. e.g., lack of exposure to the speech sounds of English, coarticulation effect, working memory deficits, etc.

7. for example: adult-child interaction patterns; school, socioeconomic and community contexts; root-word knowledge gap, first language other than English; and neurodevelopmental differences in language processing.

8. (e.g., comprehension monitoring, graphic organizers, generating and answering questions, retelling and summarizing).

References and Resources

Sources for Connecticut Structured Literacy and Dyslexia Competencies

Baker, S., Lesaux, N., Jayanthi, M., Dimino, J., Proctor, C. P., Morris, J., Gersten, R., Haymond, K., Kieffer, M. J., Linan-Thompson, S., & Newman-Gonchar, R. (2014). *Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school* (NCEE 2014-4012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx

Connecticut State Department of Education. 2010 Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities

Connecticut State Department of Education. Connecticut Assessment Resource Guide for Specific Learning Disabilities in Reading and Written Expression

Connecticut State Department of Education. Connecticut Guidelines for Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support (2023)

Connecticut State Department of Education. Connecticut's K-3 Literacy Strategy

Connecticut State Board of Education. (n.d.). Connecticut Professional Learning (ct.gov)

Connecticut State Department of Education. Evidence-Based Practice Guide for Multilingual Learners

Connecticut State Department of Education. Full, Equal and Equitable Partnerships with Families 2018

Connecticut State Department of Education, & RESC Alliance. (n.d.). *English Learners in Connecticut's public schools: Guidelines for administrators*. https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/sde/english-learners/el_adminguidelines.pdf

Connecticut State Department of Education. Scientific Researched Based Interventions for English Language Learners 2012

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2022). Specific Learning Disability and SLD/Dyslexia--FAQ (ct.gov)

Connecticut State Department of Education. (n.d.). Specific Learning Disability and SLD/Dyslexia: CSDE working definition of dyslexia. https://portal.ct.gov/sde/special-education/specific-learning-disability-and-sld---dyslexia

Connecticut State Department of Education. SRBI - Scientific Research Based Interventions (ct.gov)

Council of the Great City Schools. (2023). *A framework for foundational literacy skills instruction for English Learners.* https://www.cgcs.org/Page/631

Escamilla, K., Olsen, L., & Slavick, J. (2022). *Toward comprehensive literacy policy and instruction for English Learner/Emergent Bilingual students*. https://multilingualliteracy.org/resources/

Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). *Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade* (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://whatworks.ed.gov

Gersten, R., Baker, S.K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., Collins, P., & Scarcella, R. (2007). *Effective literacy and English language instruction for English Learners in the elementary grades: A practice guide* (NCEE 2007-4011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://whatworks.ed.gov

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). *Decoding, Reading, and Reading Disability*. Remedial and Special Education, 7(1), 6-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193258600700104 (Original)

Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). *Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide* (NCEE 2012- 4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx

Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C.B., & Smither Wulsin, C. (2016). *Teaching secondary students to write effectively* (NCEE 2017-4002). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://whatworks.ed.gov

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://whatworks.ed.gov

International Dyslexia Association. (2018, March). *Knowledge and practice standards for teachers of reading*. https://dyslexiaida.org/knowledge-and-practices/

International Dyslexia Association (IDA), Structured Literacy: An Introductory Guide (Baltimore, MD: Author, 2019) https://app.box.com/s/mvuvhel6qaj8tghvu1nl75i0ndnlp0yz

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., and Torgesen, J. (2008). Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A practice guide (NCEE #2008-4027). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc

National Association for Family, School, and Community Engagement. (2022). Family engagement core competencies: A body of knowledge, skills, and dispositions for family-facing professionals. https://nafsce.org/page/corecompetencies

Office of English Acquisition. (2023, June). *Newcomer toolkit.* U.S. Department of Education. https://ncela.ed.gov/educator-support/toolkits/newcomer-toolkit

Olsen, L. (n.d.). *Comprehensive literacy instruction for English Language Learners*. https://multilingualliteracy.org/resources/

Pearson Education, Inc. (2021). *Foundations of reading test design and framework*. https://www.ct.nesinc.com/Content/StudyGuide/SA_SG_OBJ_190.htm

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide* (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. http://whatworks.ed.gov/publications/practiceguides

Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., Dimino, J., Taylor, M. J., Newman-Gonchar, R., Krowka, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D., Sanchez, M., St. Martin, K., Wexler, J., Morgan, S., Yañez, A., & Jayanthi, M. (2022). *Providing reading interventions for students in Grades 4–9* (WWC 2022007). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. https://whatworks.ed.gov

Appendix

Definitions

Competency is defined as the measurable and observable knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and mindsets that contribute to effective educator performance related to:

1. Utilizing evidence-aligned structured literacy methods to support teaching listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in an integrated manner.
2. Screening students for dyslexia risk.
3. Determining IDEA eligibility for Specific Learning Disability: Dyslexia; and
4. Providing intensive, individualized structured literacy interventions for students identified as at-risk for and/or with dyslexia and other reading disabilities.

Evidence-aligned instructional routines and strategies are defined as those informed by rigorous research and grounded in scientific evidence about how learning occurs. These practices reflect alignment with established theories and empirical studies that demonstrate their effectiveness in improving student outcomes. While every evidence-aligned routine and strategy may not have direct experimental validation in every context, they adhere to principles and methods widely supported by research and professional consensus, ensuring their potential to be effective in meeting varied learning needs.

CONNECTICUT
Education