



# Science of Reading Badge Companion Guide

## Indicator Descriptions

Collectively, the Science of Reading Badge Rubric indicators evaluate a provider's ability to build educators' knowledge about the science of reading research and connections to one or more specific sets of ELA HQIM.

Indicator	Key Idea	Description	Evidence
<b>SOR.1</b> <b>SOR.2</b> <b>SOR.3</b>	Expertise and experience in the research	The provider self-reports its expertise in the science of reading and experience delivering science of reading professional learning.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the narrative responses to Questions 1–4 in the Application/Executive Summary.
<b>SOR.4</b> <b>SOR.5</b>	Building knowledge about the science of reading research	The submitted professional learning artifact builds educator knowledge about the science of reading research.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the pages of the submitted professional learning artifact listed in the rows for SOR.4 and SOR.5 in the Artifact Guide portion of the Application/Executive Summary.
<b>SOR.6</b> <b>SOR.7</b>	Connections between the research and HQIM	The submitted professional learning artifact builds educator knowledge about the connections between the research and one or more specific sets of HQIM.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the pages of the submitted professional learning artifact listed in the rows for SOR.6 and SOR.7 in the Artifact Guide portion of the Application/Executive Summary.
<b>SOR.8</b>	Connections between the research and assessments	The submitted professional learning artifact builds educator knowledge about both curriculum-embedded and curriculum-agnostic assessments that support teachers in understanding student learning in reading and writing.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the pages of the submitted professional learning artifact listed in the row for SOR.8 in the Artifact Guide portion of the Application/Executive Summary.

<b>SOR.9</b>	Literacy in Grades K–2	The submitted professional learning artifact builds educator knowledge about the specific considerations for student literacy in Grades K–2.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the pages of the submitted professional learning artifact listed in the row for SOR.9 in the Artifact Guide portion of the Application/Executive Summary.
<b>SOR.10</b>	Literacy in Grades 3–5	The submitted professional learning artifact builds educator knowledge about the specific considerations for students in Grades 3–5 along a continuum of literacy development.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the pages of the submitted professional learning artifact listed in the row for SOR.10 in the Artifact Guide portion of the Application/Executive Summary.
<b>SOR.11</b>	Literacy in Grades 6–8	The submitted professional learning artifact builds educator knowledge about the specific considerations for students in Grades 6–8 along a continuum of literacy development.	Reviewers will draw evidence from the pages of the submitted professional learning artifact listed in the row for SOR.11 in the Artifact Guide portion of the Application/Executive Summary.

**Evidence Collection:** Reviewers will review the entirety of the submitted professional learning artifact. All evidence for SOR.4–SOR.11 must be in the submitted professional learning artifact. Use the Artifact Guide portion of the Executive Summary to provide helpful information about the professional learning artifact and rationale for how each set of pages demonstrates evidence of the indicator. The background information and rationale/justification will not be used as evidence. These responses will be used to direct reviewers to and provide context for any evidence provided within the submitted professional learning artifact. Reviewers will prioritize evidence collection from within the specified pages of the artifact for each indicator but will also capture any additional evidence they find throughout the submitted artifact.

## Scoring Examples

The examples below offer a brief description of sample scores for 2, 1, and 0, respectively, for each of three indicators. These examples were selected as a representative sampling to illustrate expectations within the rubric and should not be considered prescriptive nor comprehensive of all the ways in which provider submissions may meet expectations.

**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.

The evidence for SOR.4 should be robust, including opportunities for both broad and deep knowledge building. In terms of breadth, SOR.4 requires that the professional learning include a clearly articulated definition of the science of reading; substantive study of seminal frameworks, models, studies, and researchers whose work informs our current understanding of the principles of effective literacy instruction; and a comprehensive description of the skills/components that students need to be skilled readers and writers. There is far more research within the science of reading than can be analyzed within a single professional learning engagement (or even within a limited series), and there is not an expectation that the submitted professional learning artifact will cover every aspect of the research, which spans multiple disciplines, decades, and countries. Rather, the professional learning should ground participants in a shared understanding of what the research is and how it informs evidence-based literacy instruction. In terms of depth, SOR.4 requires that the professional learning artifact dive deeply into at least one specific area of instruction in order to demonstrate the importance of that area of instruction and how it derives from the research. Evidence for SOR.4 will often dovetail organically with evidence of SOR.5 by exploring what that area of instruction looks like in practice.

**Example Score of 2:** A professional learning artifact pulls together session slides and materials from several different professional learning engagements. These professional learning materials collectively define the body of research known as the “science of reading” and describe how it is situated in long-running debates and deeply held beliefs about reading. The materials introduce and leverage three research models that demonstrate how skilled reading and writing develop (e.g., Scarborough’s Rope, Active View of Reading, Sedita’s Writing Rope). The materials also dive into the work of several researchers whose studies have yielded deep understanding about the importance of vocabulary (e.g., Stanovich, Beck and McKeown) and the role it plays in language comprehension, reading comprehension, and writing throughout different grade levels. Throughout the excerpted materials in the professional learning artifact, there are opportunities to watch interview clips, read case studies, analyze reader profiles, and internalize guidance from research-based reports and practice guides. This evidence would likely score a 2 on the rubric because it demonstrates potential pathways to building 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 provides robust opportunities to develop deep understanding of one or more essential literacy components (in this case, vocabulary).

**Example Score of 1:** A professional learning artifact introduces a definition of the science of reading and includes one slide on Scarborough’s Reading Rope. The professional learning artifact gives participants the opportunity to read a case study of one district that used HQIM to shift to evidence-based literacy practices. The artifact includes a definition of text complexity and gives multiple opportunities for

participants to understand and practice analyzing what makes a text complex. The professional learning explores cognitive science research articles about how comprehension works in the brain and provides several reader profiles to illustrate how challenges with comprehension can impact students at different grade levels. The artifact draws participants to a specific section of the HQIM Implementation Guide that focuses on comprehension strategies. In this section of the guide, participants read about six research-based comprehension strategies and how these routines are intended to support students in analyzing and making sense of complex text in Grades K–2 and 3–5. This evidence would likely score a 1 on the rubric because the professional learning quickly zooms in on one area of instruction and only partially addresses the body of research, the principles of effective instruction, and the comprehensive set of reading/writing skills needed for skilled reading.

**Example Score of 0:** A professional learning artifact introduces and defines phonics and discusses the importance of explicit phonics instruction. The professional learning includes one researcher’s work on explicit teaching, with opportunities to watch clips of interviews and read excerpts of the researcher’s work. This evidence would likely score a 0 on the rubric because there is neither a clear definition of the science of reading nor a deep exploration of multiple research models and frameworks; there is no knowledge-building around the set of skills and components necessary for skilled reading, nor a deep enough exploration of how phonics instruction (decoding/encoding skills) impacts literacy development at different grade levels.

**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’ learning strengths and needs.

The evidence for SOR.8 must be more than a cursory look at the types of assessments included within the HQIM. The professional learning artifact should provide opportunities to understand the different types of assessments within the HQIM, which essential skills/components they assess, and how to use the data from these assessments to inform instruction. There should also be evidence of types of assessments beyond the HQIM that can/should be used to provide additional information about student learning. The use of curriculum-agnostic assessments varies by state and district. As such, there is no need to reference a specific district context for SOR.8; rather, the professional learning should reference types of assessments beyond the HQIM that can be used to help identify students’ risk, progress, and growth and thereby paint a fuller picture of students’ learning and needs. There is no need to reference actual student data to meet the criteria for this indicator.

**Example Score of 2:** A professional learning artifact addresses the importance of using assessments to understand student learning as part of diagnostic and responsive instruction and draws participants to the “Assessment” section of the HQIM Implementation Guide. Participants read and discuss the different types of

assessments and then explore connections between the assessments and the skills and components they assess, using Scarborough's Rope as a grounding mechanism to analyze how different skills are assessed in different ways throughout the curriculum-embedded assessment opportunities. The professional learning zooms in on one unit, unpacking the end-of-unit and mid-unit assessments, exit tickets, writing tasks, and informal checks for understanding. The artifact provides an overview of how to access each of these assessments within the materials and offers suggestions about how to capture the student data. The artifact provides an in-depth look at one mid-unit assessment to illustrate how that assesses student learning, what kinds of data analysis tools may be helpful, and how those tools can inform follow-up reteach opportunities within the materials. The artifact includes multiple slides describing various screening and diagnostic assessments, with an explanation of the skills assessed within each and how the data can be situated within a school and district context to provide information about potential reading difficulties students may be experiencing. This evidence would likely score a 2 because it meets all requirements regarding both curriculum-specific and curriculum-agnostic assessments.

**Example Score of 1:** A professional learning artifact includes slides and corresponding speaker notes that direct participants on how to access HQIM assessments using the digital platform. Participants are given time to review and discuss a table that lists the type and overarching purpose of each assessment (e.g., formative vs. summative), where they can be found within the materials, how often they should be administered, and where to input student data. The professional learning artifact also includes multiple slides on different types of curriculum-agnostic assessments, with clear definitions and purposes for each. The artifact situates the use of assessments as a critical tenet of diagnostic and responsive instruction. This evidence would likely score a 1 because although the artifact provides an overview of HQIM assessments, it does not demonstrate how the HQIM assessments are designed to assess specific literacy skills, nor does it provide supports for teachers to effectively use data from these assessments to understand student learning.

**Example Score of 0:** A professional learning artifact offers participants the opportunity to unpack and internalize how to administer and use data from an oral reading fluency assessment provided as an additional supplemental resource to the HQIM. There is no other discussion of assessments within the submitted artifact. This evidence would likely score a 0 because it does not examine the suite of curriculum-specific assessments within the HQIM, nor does it explicitly reference curriculum-agnostic assessments that can be used to understand students' reading risk and development.

**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.

The expectations for SOR.11 differ from those of SOR.9 and SOR.10. Much of the evidence for

SOR.9, for example, may be present within the same slides/pages of the artifact that are used for evidence of the overarching indicators (i.e., SOR.4, SOR.5, SOR.6, SOR.7). This is likely due to a few occurrences: (1) districts using strong Tier 1 materials often have many of the required components for core instruction in Grades K–2 embedded within their HQIM; (2) professional learning in the science of reading often includes a strong focus on word recognition, which is a priority for aligned instruction in Grades K–2; and (3) professional learning for early literacy has been a focus of much of the recent state guidance and legislation. These occurrences are not yet as common in the upper elementary and middle grades. In the middle grades, in particular, there is additional research specific to adolescent literacy (including critical areas for continued literacy development, student motivation and engagement, content area literacy and disciplinary literacy, etc.) that must be addressed. In order to meet the expectations for SOR.11, the professional learning artifact must build educator knowledge about students' acquisition of skills and knowledge along a continuum and the additional research-based guidance specific to students at those points along the continuum. The professional learning must also draw connections to a specific set of secondary HQIM (including if/when there are gaps within the HQIM).

**Example Score of 2:** A provider includes a comprehensive definition of the skills and components of secondary literacy and what teachers might expect in students' progression of reading and writing along the continuum of literacy development. The professional learning includes opportunities to engage with multiple research articles, case studies, and practice guides specific to adolescent literacy. The professional learning zooms in on the critical area of text-based discussion, examining the importance of and design considerations within the HQIM for extended discussion on text meaning and interpretation. The professional learning then creates opportunities for teachers to internalize and practice facilitating a text-based discussion in an upcoming lesson. The professional learning supports educators in planning for scaffolds to support all students in participating in text-based whole class discussions. This evidence would likely score a 2 on the rubric because it meets all four required criteria.

**Example Score of 1:** A provider includes a curriculum-agnostic module that focuses on the research around the importance of fluency in Grades 6–8. The module clearly identifies and defines the skills and components of secondary literacy and situates fluency within that continuum. The module then introduces and gives educators opportunities to practice multiple evidence-based fluency routines that can be used with students in middle grades. This evidence would likely score a 1 on the rubric because there is no explicit connection to HQIM.

**Example Score of 0:** A provider includes an overview of a Grade 6 unit within a set of HQIM, including opportunities for teachers to unpack and practice specific lesson components that focus on vocabulary instruction in middle grades. This evidence would likely score a 0 on the rubric because there is not a comprehensive identification/definition of the skills and components of secondary literacy on the continuum of literacy development. Additionally, it is unclear whether any research is being explored specific to adolescent literacy.