Science of Reading Badge Rubric

Contents

Scoring Notes:

1. In order to receive a Science of Reading Badge, applicants must achieve a score equivalent to at least 70% on the overarching indicators, ***and*** applicants must score a 2/2 on at least one grade-band indicator (K-2, 3-5, or 6-8).
2. Each item is scored on a 3-point scale. Scores are determined as follows (unless otherwise indicated within the indicator):
    - Score of 2: The evidence provided meets the indicator and is high quality.
    - Score of 1: All full-point criteria are present, but the quality is low, OR all criteria are partially present but with high quality, OR one of the full-point criteria is present and high quality, but the other(s) are not.
    - Score of 0: None of the criteria are present, OR all examples that are present are not high quality.

Part 1 - High-Level View

Overarching Indicators for Science of Reading Professional Learning		
Total Indicators: 8 Minimum Passing Score: 12 out of 16 points		
SOR.1	Applicant demonstrates deep **expertise** in the science of reading research.	0 1 2
SOR.2	Applicant has **prior experience** and a thorough process for hiring qualified personnel to deliver high-quality professional learning for teachers in the science of reading that is connected to HQIM.	0 1 2
SOR.3	Applicant demonstrates an understanding that science of reading research informs and supports **equitable instruction** for all students, including those with linguistic, cognitive, and/or sociocultural learning differences.	0 1 2
SOR.4	Professional learning **builds an understanding** of the science of reading research, including the principles of effective instruction and the essential skills for reading and writing.	0 1 2
SOR.5	Professional learning **bridges research to practice** and demonstrates instructional practices that reflect the science of reading research.	0 1 2
SOR.6	Professional learning draws explicit connections to a **specific HQIM**, including how the curriculum is/is not designed in ways that reflect the science of reading research.	0 1 2
SOR.7	Professional learning supports teachers with **internalizing** and rehearsing units and lessons within the HQIM, with a focus on **student practice**; professional learning addresses gaps or areas of misalignment within the HQIM.	0 1 2
SOR.8	Professional learning addresses how teachers can leverage curriculum-embedded **assessments** within the HQIM and how those assessments fit within a larger assessment ecosystem used to understand students' literacy development.	0 1 2

Grade-Band Indicators for Science of Reading Professional Learning		
Total Indicators: 3 Minimum Passing Score: 2 out of 2 points on each applicable grade-band indicator		
SOR.9	Professional learning for Grades K-2 attends to the skills and components of beginning reading development.	0 1 2
SOR.10	Professional learning for Grades 3-5 attends to the skills and components of upper elementary literacy.	0 1 2
SOR.11	Professional learning for Grades 6-8 attends to the skills and components of secondary literacy and explores at least one critical area in depth (e.g., fluency).	0 1 2

Part 2 - Detailed View

Overarching Indicators for Science of Reading Professional Learning

Total Indicators: 8
Minimum Passing Score: 12 out of 16 points
Science of Reading Badge Application Template

Indicator SOR.1: Applicant demonstrates deep **expertise** in the science of reading research.

2 points: • Applicant describes an accurate definition of the science of reading as well as the principles of effective reading instruction and the essential skills necessary in the typical progression of reading and writing development, *and* • Applicant lists and accurately explains at least two seminal or prominent research models/frameworks that provide a foundation for the science of reading. *1 point*: Provider does one of the following: • Applicant provides a definition of the science of reading that may be vague, general, or unclear and lists most of the principles and skills for reading and writing development, *or* • Applicant lists one or more models/frameworks but lacks clear or adequate explanation of how these contribute to the research. *0 points*: • Applicant does not provide a definition of the science of reading or fails to include principles and skills for reading and writing development, *and* • Applicant does not list and describe at least one research model/framework.
Sample Evidence Collection Reviewers look for and record: • For question 1 in the application template, evidence of a clearly articulated definition of the science of reading (e.g., The Reading League's Science of Reading: Defining Guide). • For question 1 in the application template, evidence of principles of effective reading instruction (e.g., structured literacy) and a comprehensive list of the essential skills and components for reading and writing development (e.g., phonemic awareness, background knowledge). • For question 1 in the application template, evidence of two research models or frameworks prominent in science of reading research (e.g., Scarborough's Reading Rope) along with an explanation and citation for each.

Indicator SOR.2: Applicant has **prior experience** and a thorough process for hiring qualified personnel to deliver high-quality professional learning for teachers in the science of reading that is connected to HQIM.

2 points:

- Applicant describes at least one high-quality example of a prior professional learning engagement focused on the science of reading and its connections to a specific HQIM, *and*
- Applicant's hiring process ensures that staff who design and facilitate professional learning engagements are highly qualified and knowledgeable in the science of reading.

1 point:

Provider does one of the following:

- Applicant provides an example of a prior professional learning engagement; however, it is vague, general, or unclear whether the science of reading research is the predominant focus of the professional learning, and/or the professional learning is not connected to a specific HQIM, *or*
- Applicant describes a hiring process, but it is not clearly articulated or sufficiently thorough to ensure expertise in the science of reading.

0 points:

- Applicant does not include an example of prior experience delivering professional learning in the science of reading that is connected to HQIM, *and*
- Applicant does not articulate a process for hiring qualified staff.

Sample Evidence Collection

Reviewers look for and record:

- For question 2 in the application template, evidence of having delivered one or more professional learning engagements/series whose primary focus is the science of reading research and its connection to practice within HQIM.
- For question 3 in the application template, evidence of a process for recruitment, hiring, and training of professional learning designers and facilitators who have prior experience in structured literacy instruction, leadership, professional learning, and/or research.

Indicator SOR.3: Applicant demonstrates an understanding that science of reading research informs and supports **equitable instruction** for all students, including those with linguistic, cognitive, and/or sociocultural learning differences.

2 points:

- Applicant accurately describes and provides examples of how the science of reading research and evidence-based practices help ensure all students have an equal opportunity to learn and succeed in reading.

1 point:
- Applicant provides a vague or general explanation of the role science of reading research plays in informing instruction for students with learning differences but does not provide concrete details or examples.

0 points:
- Applicant does not describe the role science of reading research plays in evidence-based instruction for students with learning differences.

Sample Evidence Collection
Reviewers look for and record:
- For question 4 in the application template, descriptions of how using evidence-based practices to give every child the tools to decode and comprehend promotes equity, including that:
  - explicit, systematic, and diagnostic instruction has been shown to be beneficial for all students, including those with dyslexia and Multilingual Learners.
  - evidence-based practices support adaptive instruction to accommodate learning differences; provide scaffolds for diverse learners; address dialectical variations; and leverage students' existing knowledge, such as attention to the positive transference of letters and sounds from a student's home language.

Indicator SOR.4: Professional learning **builds an understanding** of the science of reading research, including the principles of effective instruction and the essential skills for reading and writing.

2 points:
- Professional learning builds teachers' understanding of the body of research that comprises the science of reading, including the skills students need and the principles that inform instruction, *and*
- Professional learning provides ***robust opportunities*** to develop deep understanding of one or more essential literacy components or skills through a variety of activities and artifacts (i.e., the majority of the professional learning experience is focused on building understanding through effective and varied adult engagement strategies).

1 point:
Provider does one of the following:
- Professional learning introduces the science of reading but does not fully cover the body of research, reading/writing skills, or principles of effective instruction, *or*
- Professional learning includes limited opportunities to develop a deep understanding of at least one of the essential skills (i.e., the engagement opportunities are infrequent, superficial, or do not employ a variety of adult learning

strategies for building understanding).

0 points:

- Professional learning does not clearly define the science of reading or fails to address many of the reading/writing skills or principles of effective instruction, *and*
- Professional learning does not include opportunities to develop a deep understanding of at least one of the essential literacy skills.

Sample Evidence Collection

Reviewers look for and record:

- Evidence in professional learning of a clearly articulated definition of the science of reading (e.g., The Reading League's Science of Reading: Defining Guide).
- Evidence in professional learning of multiple artifacts and activities (e.g., slides/visuals, research articles, case studies, videos) that:
    - illustrate research-based model(s) of reading and writing development (e.g., Scarborough's Reading Rope).
    - describe different approaches to word recognition instruction and why some are or are not supported by research (e.g., three-cueing).
    - define essential skills and components for reading and writing (e.g., phonological awareness, background knowledge).
    - clarify differences and relationships between skills, including which skills are prerequisite, reciprocal, or mutually reinforcing of others (e.g., how decoding/encoding are mutually reinforcing).
    - define principles of effective reading and writing instruction (e.g., explicit and diagnostic), with an understanding that there is no "one size fits all" approach .
- Evidence in professional learning of multiple and varied opportunities for participants to engage deeply with at least **one** of the essential skills or components for reading and writing development (e.g., vocabulary) that:
    - explores its relationship to and impact on literacy development.
    - defines and differentiates levels of development relevant to different grade level(s).

Indicator SOR.5: Professional learning **bridges research to practice** and demonstrates instructional practices that reflect the science of reading research.

2 points:

- Professional learning provides robust opportunities for teachers to deeply understand *and* practice effective instructional practices that support development of one or more essential literacy skills, according to the science of reading research.

1 point:

- Professional learning provides limited opportunities to understand and practice

effective instructional practices that support development of one or more essential literacy skills (i.e., the engagement opportunities are infrequent, superficial, or do not employ a variety of adult learning strategies for collaborative practice).

0 points:

- Professional learning provides few, if any, opportunities to understand effective instructional practices that support development of one or more essential literacy skills, *and* practice opportunities are absent.

Sample Evidence Collection
Reviewers look for and record:

- Evidence in professional learning of multiple artifacts and activities (e.g., slides/visuals, research articles, case studies, videos) that demonstrate how and why specific instructional practices (e.g., phoneme blending, segmenting, and manipulation) are designed to help students develop one or more of the essential skills for reading and writing development.
- Evidence in professional learning of activities that prompt teachers to role-play, practice, and/or internalize instructional practices or routines that support specific skill development (e.g., vocal prompts, letter cards, word cards, hand gestures, articulatory gestures). Instructional practices and routines may or may not be curriculum-specific.

Indicator SOR.6: Professional learning draws explicit connections to a **specific HQIM**, including how the curriculum is/is not designed in ways that reflect the science of reading research.

2 points:

- Professional learning demonstrates in detail how the HQIM instructional framework and lesson-level components are/are not designed in ways that reflect the science of reading research.

1 point:

- Professional learning suggests how the HQIM instructional framework or lesson-level components are/are not designed in ways that reflect the science of reading but does not provide a detailed, thorough explanation.

0 points:

- Professional learning does not demonstrate how the HQIM is/is not designed in ways that reflect the science of reading research.

Sample Evidence Collection
Reviewers look for and record:

- Evidence in professional learning of examining HQIM overview materials that help build understanding of how the instructional framework and overarching design of the HQIM reflects the science of reading research (e.g., research base and

underlying principles, scope and sequence and standards maps, text types/genres/complexity).
- Evidence in professional learning of how specific lesson activities within the HQIM are designed to develop skills necessary for reading and/or writing development (e.g., HQIM-specific instructional routines, unit/lesson flow/progression, checks for understanding).
- Evidence in professional learning that equips teachers to identify if/when HQIM lesson components are misaligned or absent based on science of reading research.

Indicator SOR.7: Professional learning supports teachers with **internalizing** and rehearsing units and lessons within the HQIM, with a focus on **student practice**; professional learning addresses gaps or areas of misalignment within the HQIM.

2 points:
- Professional learning supports teachers in internalizing units and lessons from the HQIM with the science of reading research in mind, including (when applicable) how to address potential gaps or misalignments within lessons, *and*
- Professional learning highlights the importance of student practice opportunities in the HQIM, attuning teachers to where these occur within lessons and how to leverage HQIM-embedded supports to ensure all students receive sufficient practice to develop automaticity leading to mastery.

1 point:
Provider does one of the following:
- Professional learning offers infrequent opportunities for teachers to internalize units and lessons with the science of reading research in mind, *or*
- Professional learning identifies student practice opportunities, but the emphasis is not on supporting teachers in ensuring sufficient practice for all students.

0 points:
- Professional learning does not offer teachers opportunities to internalize units and lessons with the science of reading research in mind, *and*
- Professional learning does not identify student practice opportunities within lessons.

Sample Evidence Collection
Reviewers look for and record:
- Evidence in professional learning of opportunities for teachers to internalize, plan, and/or rehearse lessons or portions of lessons with a focus on implementation that aligns with the science of reading research.
- Evidence in professional learning of opportunities for teachers to understand the importance of student practice, what sufficient student practice looks/sounds like, and where student practice occurs within HQIM units and lessons, as well as any

supplemental materials (e.g., letter-sound cards, word cards, white boards, student workbooks, decodable readers, fluency passages).
- Evidence in professional learning that provides suggestions for teachers for how to address potential gaps or misalignments within their HQIM (e.g., insufficient practice with decodable text).

Indicator SOR.8: Professional learning addresses how teachers can leverage curriculum-embedded **assessments** within the HQIM and how those assessments fit within a larger assessment ecosystem used to understand students' literacy development.

2 points:
- Professional learning examines how HQIM assessments (e.g., checks for understanding, unit tests) are designed to assess specific student learning and supports teachers in effectively using these assessments, *and*
- Professional learning describes additional types of assessments that can/should be used to understand students' reading risk and development (e.g., screeners, diagnostics, progress monitoring tools).

1 point:
Provider does one of the following:
- Professional learning provides an overview of HQIM assessments but provides limited support for using them, *or*
- Professional learning signals the potential need for additional assessments but does not define or describe them.

0 points:
- Professional learning does not examine HQIM assessments, *and*
- Professional learning does not reference additional assessments that can/should be used to understand students' reading risk and development.

Sample Evidence Collection
Reviewers look for and record:
- Evidence in professional learning of how HQIM-specific assessments are designed (i.e., how assessment components assess specific literacy skill development within lessons/units).
- Evidence in professional learning of supports for teachers in leveraging HQIM assessments, including, for example:
    - different types of formative and summative assessment opportunities.
    - how to identify students' specific learning needs.
    - how/when to leverage embedded supports.
    - how to plan for upcoming instruction based on individual/group/class data.
- Evidence in professional learning that builds teachers' awareness of additional assessments within the assessment ecosystem and how they are used to identify

students' risk, progress, and growth (e.g., screeners, diagnostics, progress monitoring, state summatives). Note: These assessments may or may not be state- or district-specific; it is not necessary that professional learning materials reference a specific state/district context.

Grade-Band Indicators for Science of Reading Professional Learning

Total Indicators: 3
Minimum Passing Score: 2 out of 2 points on each applicable grade-band indicator

Note: For grade-band-specific indicators, professional learning artifacts must identify/define all essential literacy skills within the grade band; however, there is not an expectation that the professional learning artifact submitted delves deeply into all skills, as this is unlikely to be observable within the scope of any single professional learning engagement.

Indicator SOR.9: Professional learning for Grades K-2 attends to the skills and components of beginning reading development.

2 points: • Professional learning thoroughly identifies and defines the skills and components of beginning reading development in both word recognition and language comprehension. *1 point*: • Professional learning identifies and defines some skills and components of beginning reading development. *0 points*: • Professional learning identifies and defines very few skills and components of beginning reading development.
Sample Evidence Collection Reviewers look for and record: • Evidence in professional learning of artifacts and activities (e.g., slides/visuals, research articles, case studies, videos) that clearly identify and define the critical skills and components for early reading development (e.g., oral language development, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding, encoding, handwriting, fluency, language comprehension, text comprehension, writing). • Evidence in professional learning of commonalities and distinctions between literacy development at different stages (i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8). For example, evidence that language and reading comprehension in K-2 are largely taught through complex, content-rich read-alouds. • Evidence in professional learning of activities that support teachers in diagnosing and addressing student learning needs at different grade levels.

Indicator SOR.10: Professional learning for Grades 3-5 attends to the skills and components of upper elementary literacy.

2 points:

- Professional learning thoroughly identifies and defines the skills and components of upper elementary literacy and describes student learning at this phase of development, *and*
- Professional learning includes explicit guidance about how to implement advanced practices in instruction that should be present within the HQIM.

1 point:

Provider does one of the following:

- Professional learning identifies some skills and components of upper elementary literacy, *or*
- Professional learning identifies what these skills look like in practice but does not draw explicit connections to the HQIM.

0 points:

- Professional learning identifies very few skills and components of upper elementary literacy, *and*
- Professional learning fails to identify or include guidance about how to implement advanced practices.

Sample Evidence Collection

Reviewers look for and record:

- Evidence in professional learning of artifacts and activities (e.g., slides/visuals, research articles, case studies, videos) that clearly identify and define the critical skills and components in Grades 3-5 (e.g., multisyllabic decoding, morphology, fluency, language comprehension, text comprehension, writing).
- Evidence in professional learning of commonalities and distinctions between literacy development at different stages (i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8). For example, evidence that language and reading comprehension in 3-5 require consistent engagement with complex, grade-level texts.
- Evidence in professional learning of the importance of continued decoding, fluency, comprehension, and writing instruction in addition to necessary interventions.
- Evidence in professional learning of activities that support teachers in diagnosing and supporting student learning needs at different grade levels.

Indicator SOR.11: Professional learning for Grades 6-8 attends to the skills and components of secondary literacy and explores at least one critical area in depth (e.g., fluency).

2 points:

- Professional learning thoroughly identifies and defines the skills and components of secondary literacy and focuses on a critical, research-based area to accelerate learning at the secondary level, *and*
- Professional learning includes practice with this critical area to support growth of secondary literacy skills, including connections to a specific HQIM and, if applicable, opportunities to extend application.

1 point:

Provider does one of the following:

- Professional learning identifies some skills and components of secondary literacy but does not thoroughly focus on a critical area to accelerate student learning, *or*
- Professional learning does not include the why/how of connecting this critical area to practice within and beyond the HQIM.

0 points:

- Professional learning identifies very few skills and components of secondary literacy and does not further explore a critical, research-based area to accelerate secondary literacy.

Sample Evidence Collection

Reviewers look for and record:

- Evidence in professional learning of artifacts and activities (e.g., slides/visuals, research articles, case studies, videos) that clearly identify and define the critical skills and components for secondary literacy in Grades 6-8 (e.g., fluency, language comprehension, text comprehension, and writing).
- Evidence in professional learning of commonalities and distinctions between literacy development at different stages (i.e., K-2, 3-5, 6-8).
- Evidence in professional learning of the importance of continued comprehension and writing instruction in addition to necessary interventions in decoding and/or fluency.
- Evidence in professional learning of a focus on a specific research-based area to accelerate learning at the secondary level (e.g., fluency) and practice opportunities both within and beyond the HQIM.
- Evidence in professional learning of how discipline-specific materials (e.g., science and social studies) can be leveraged to support students' literacy development.
- Evidence in professional learning of activities that support teachers in diagnosing and addressing student learning needs at different grade levels. For example, evidence of the importance of assessing and addressing specific factors that may affect comprehension (e.g., vocabulary, background knowledge, verbal reasoning, literacy structures, self-monitoring, etc.).