

# FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

**Date:** June 22, 2021

**Time:** 9:00-3:00

**Location:** District Office, Room 205

**Facilitators:** Stephanie Korn and Charisse Berner

## **In Attendance**

Charisse Berner, Director of Teaching and Learning, District Office

Stephanie Korn, Director of Teaching and Learning, District Office

Pam Pottle, Principal, Northern Heights

Melissa Peterson, Literacy Specialist, Roosevelt

Megan Cooley, Kindergarten, Birchwood

Kyla Stefani, Kindergarten Teacher, Northern Heights

Julie Johnson, 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher, Parkview

Stephanie Strachan, Parent/Community Member, Wade King

Jenny Lawrence, MTSS TOSA, District Office

Sharece Steinkamp, Principal, Geneva

Analisa Ficklin, Special Education Administrator, District Office

Sarah Snyder, 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Teacher, Lowell

## Topics

Purpose of decodable texts (read [The Role of Decodable Readers in Phonics Instruction](#) and discuss)

Ground ourselves in the standards and term definitions (read and discuss)

Request from the field to reconsider CKLA (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> editions)

Compare CKLA, *Foundations* and *Really Great Reading*

## Summary

We re-grounded ourselves in the foundational skills standards. We discussed the progression from K-2 and the specifics identified in each level.

We read an article called [The Role of Decodable Readers in Phonics Instruction](#) since questions and challenges continue to be raised about the purpose and role of decodables (and other types of texts). The article supported the idea that each type of text has a specific instructional purpose. We acknowledged that this is an area where the finalist programs are significantly different from each other, and it makes it hard to compare. Without a decision about the exact decodables (for *Foundations* and *Really Great Reading*), this feels like an unknown piece still. There wasn't time to address this today, but there are additional solutions from Fly Leaf, Benchmark, Geodes, Teacher Pay Teachers and others.

We developed a comparison chart that included our screening list of looks for's. We checked it against the foundational skills standards to make sure we had a common understanding of each skill and that all were included in the chart. We added columns and information to the chart as the day went by.

Next, we did a comparison of CKLA first (OER online, "free") and second editions (print samples from Amplify—purchase costs associated). Requests from schools to be sure to consider CKLA again (since it had been used and liked by some teachers this year). Some committee members also requested we do this comparison as CKLA was our first deep dive and we have learned a lot during this extended process.

**Conclusion of CKLA comparison:** The content in CKLA (both editions) is mostly the same, some headings and titles changed (making it easier to read/clearer). Differentiation is infused throughout in the second edition but separate in the first edition. Members present today found the readers from the second edition preferable to the readers from the first edition due to improvements in EDI/cultural sensitivity. Some members would like to have a print version of the workbooks for ease of making copies (and for students as needed) and some expressed the need for a print copy of the teacher manuals. At the same time, there is lots of print materials that come with CKLA second edition and concerns were expressed about overwhelming people with all the parts of CKLA. Also wonders about impact to printing budgets if we go with first edition CKLA. We agreed that looking at CKLA again was a good way to clear the air about what we saw and what the program includes. It also helped clear the air about how different the pandemic simplified version in the One Note is from the first and second editions.

After lunch we looked at *Foundations* and *Really Great Reading* and filled in the comparison chart for these programs. *Foundations* requires supplementation of phonemic awareness (Heggerty) and needs significant support for decodable texts. *Really Great Reading* is compact, has all the elements we are looking for in a program, requires little prep for teachers, but does not include handwriting instruction. *Handwriting without Tears* will be maintained if we recommend *Really Great Reading*. This program includes decodable passages, but committee members would like to see us be able to supplement with decodable books such as Fly Leaf or Geodes.

Our overall conclusion is that we have three strong programs to consider. Getting staff and community feedback is a helpful aspect to inform our final recommendation. It also makes sense to get clarity around budget before we move forward with a recommendation if any of these are beyond our budget capacity.

NOTE: Due to the timing of this meeting, several committee members were unable to attend. Charisse will invite any members that missed the meeting to come in and review these materials again over the summer.

Charisse Berner, Mike Copland, Trina Hall, Jenny Lawrence, and Stephanie Korn will meet as soon as we can to determine next steps with feasibility in mind (budget, implementation, professional learning and procurement) in this pandemic impacted process.

## **Next Meeting**

To be determined. Have a healthy and restful summer!