Grades K–6

Magnetic Literacy™

RESEARCH BASE

A Comprehensive Approach to Core Literacy

by i-Ready

Overview

Magnetic Literacy is a comprehensive Grades K–6 literacy program grounded in reading and learning sciences, designed to empower students as critical thinkers, readers, writers, and speakers all while fitting seamlessly into the school day. *Magnetic Literacy* offers a research-based structured literacy approach that introduces, interweaves, and synergizes domain instruction toward skilled reading and writing. It also embeds essential knowledge building, encouraging students to apply their learning in authentic ways that create cohesive, enriched experiences that deepen understanding and foster critical thinking.

Magnetic Literacy brings all aspects of literacy together in a unified approach. Instruction begins with foundational skills and progressively extends to higher-level tasks that challenge students to read, write, speak, and think like historians, critics, scientists, and other disciplinary experts. Guided by data-driven insights, the program supports teachers in differentiating instruction across literacy domains to meet the needs of diverse learners. This ensures that classroom time is used efficiently while supporting student learning.

Input from program authors and advisors has shaped a rigorous, foundational literacy framework that allows students to practice and apply new learning while also being manageable for teachers to implement effectively.

Contents

Program Authors

Dr. Devin Kearns

Kearns is the Goodnight Distinguished Professor in Early Literacy at North Carolina State University. His research focuses on the cognitive and neurological foundations of reading, particularly early literacy and reading disabilities such as dyslexia. Kearns has developed evidence-based interventions used nationwide and has published extensively in leading educational journals.

Dr. Heidi Anne Mesmer

Mesmer is a professor of literacy education at Virginia Tech. She is the author of *Letter Lessons and First Words: Phonics Foundations That Work,* and *Big Words for Young Readers: Teaching Kids in Grades K to 5 to Decode—and Understand—Words with Multiple Syllables and Morphemes*. Her research, which focuses on methods and materials for beginning readers, has appeared in leading educational journals.

Program Advisors

- **Dr. Courtney Hattan** is an assistant professor specializing in the Science of Reading at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her research and consulting work focus on vocabulary instruction, knowledge building, and reading comprehension, with particular attention to conceptually coherent vocabulary and the integration of reading and writing across grade levels.
- **Dr. D. Ray Reutzel** is a Distinguished Senior Research Fellow at the Center for the School of the Future at Utah State University and former dean of the College of Education at the University of Wyoming. He is a renowned literacy scholar, inducted into the Reading Hall of Fame and recipient of the 2019 William S. Gray Citation of Merit from the International Literacy Association. His research and advisory work have shaped foundational reading instruction and educational policy nationwide.
- **Dr. Kelly Cartwright** is the Spangler Distinguished Professor of Early Child Literacy at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, where she directs the Reading, Executive function, And Development Lab (READ Lab) and conducts research on neurocognitive and affective factors influencing reading. Widely recognized for her work on executive function and reading comprehension, she collaborates with educators nationwide and has authored influential publications, including *Executive Skills and Reading Comprehension: A Guide for Educators*.
- **Dr. Deborah Reed** is the director of the Tennessee Reading Research Center and a professor at the University of Tennessee, where she leads research and development in literacy instruction and assessment. Her work spans foundational reading skills, comprehension strategies, fluency interventions, and vocabulary instruction. Widely recognized as a leading literacy expert, Reed collaborates with educators and organizations nationwide to improve reading outcomes for students from elementary through high school.
- **Linda Diamond**, M.Ed., is the executive director of the Evidence Advocacy Center and the author of the widely respected *Teaching Reading Sourcebook*, a foundational text in literacy education. She is a nationally recognized expert in curriculum design and reading instruction, frequently advising educational organizations and contributing to initiatives focused on foundational skills and the Science of Reading.
- **Dr. Doris Luft Baker** is an associate professor at the University of Texas at Austin, jointly appointed in the Departments of Special Education and Curriculum & Instruction, where she specializes in developing instructional tools and assessments for English learners with and without learning difficulties. Her research, funded by agencies such as the US Department of Education, IES, and NSF, integrates technology and bilingual education to improve literacy outcomes and includes projects like MITOS and MELVA-S.
- **Dr. Sharroky Hollie** is the executive director of the Center for Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning and a nationally recognized educator specializing in cultural responsiveness. He has trained more than 150,000 educators and worked in nearly 2,000 classrooms. He has authored several influential texts, including *Strategies for Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning* and *Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching and Learning: Classroom Practices for Student Success*.
- **Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST)** is a nonprofit education research and development organization internationally recognized for pioneering the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework. UDL is a scientifically grounded approach that optimizes teaching and learning by anticipating learner variability and removing barriers to education, empowering all students to become purposeful, motivated, and resourceful learners.
- **Vermont Writers' Collaborative** serves as a key advisory group for writing instruction, particularly in the early grades, offering expert feedback on process writing design and implementation. Its guidance emphasizes oral processing, shared writing experiences, and scaffolded support to ensure developmentally appropriate writing practices.
- **English Learners Success Forum (ELSF)** is a national collaboration of researchers, educators, curriculum developers, and funders committed to improving the quality and accessibility of instructional materials for English learners. ELSF provides expert guidance to ensure that full-year core curricula in English language arts and mathematics address the linguistic and cultural needs of multilingual learners, enabling equitable access to grade-level content.

Program Components

Teacher Resources

- Teacher's Guides: Easy-to-follow guidance, one volume per unit
- Anchor Charts: Posters to support student learning and recall
- Read Aloud Trade Books* (Grades K and 1): Print books of reading selections
- Vocabulary Card Set: Tools to reinforce key words and academic language
- Session Slides: Customizable decks to facilitate instruction
- Digital Teacher Resources: e.g., Family Letters, small group supports, printable assessments

Student Resources

- Student Worktexts: Perforated consumable books, one volume per unit
- Student Assessment Book*: Perforated consumable volume with weekly, module, and unit assessments
- *i-Ready Personalized Instruction**: Adaptive lessons tailored to each student

Foundational Skills Texts and Cards

- Magnetic Readers*: Topically aligned decodable readers
- Program Card Sets: Word Building, Sound Spelling, Articulation, Super Words

Sample of Grade 1 program components.

*Requires additional purchase

Building Grade-Level Literacy Skills Aligned with Essential Standards

Developing students' literacy skills is widely recognized as one of the most essential responsibilities of education. Through literacy, learners gain access to the knowledge, perspectives, and opportunities that shape their understanding of the world and empower them to chart their own paths within it. Effective literacy instruction not only builds students' abilities to listen, speak, read, and write but also equips them to think critically, question thoughtfully, and apply their learning across disciplines—skills that will serve them throughout their academic and professional journeys.

Decades of research on effective literacy instruction demonstrate that there is a well-established science behind both the teaching and application of literacy skills (Anderson et al., 1985; Adams, 1990; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [NICHD], 2000; Shanahan & Lonigan, 2010; Moats, 2020), including neurobiological evidence that a reading circuit develops as a result of high-quality learning experiences (Kearns et al., 2019). Grounded in this robust body of evidence, *Magnetic Literacy* was developed to provide educators with the tools they need to plan efficiently and teach effectively. Its thoughtfully designed instructional framework and manageable content make high-quality literacy instruction both rigorous and attainable, ensuring that every teacher has the support to help every student succeed.

Magnetic Literacy uses backward design to position reading and writing as interconnected skills tied to high-leverage standards. Backward design is a planning process that starts with desired learning outcomes and works backward to build instruction and assessments (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). This approach strengthens literacy instruction by focusing on essential skills and aligning teaching with specific goals, which research has shown leads to improved student achievement (Seif & McTighe, 2021).

In the earlier grades, *Magnetic Literacy* is designed to ensure that all Grades K–2 students learn to decode through explicit, systematic foundational instruction and numerous practice opportunities. Research highlights the importance of explicit, systematic instruction, particularly in phonemic awareness and phonics, which are highly impactful on early reading outcomes (Vaughn et al., 2000; Archer & Hughes, 2011; NICHD, 2000; Reutzel, 2022). Recognizing that literacy instruction should integrate skills rather than isolate them, the program utilizes an integrated literacy approach that unites multiple literacy skills—phonemic awareness, phonics, high-frequency words, and fluency, along with vocabulary, comprehension, and writing—into a cohesive whole (Duke et al., 2011). This approach ensures that students can transfer and apply skills across various literacy tasks, reinforcing deeper understanding and retention.

Foundational Skills

Written language is a human invention, unlike oral language, which is inherent and hardwired inside the brain. Humans begin to learn oral language patterns almost from birth, and many of the earliest patterns of language development between babies and parents are universal across languages (Hilton et al., 2022). While learning to speak develops naturally, reading and writing are acquired skills that must be directly taught (Liberman et al., 1989). Learning to read and write requires repeated exposure and practice through systematic, explicit instruction in the sounds and their orthographic representations in our alphabetic language (NICHD, 2000). This is an enormously complex journey in which students learn and apply hundreds of foundational skills in the domains of concepts of print, phonological awareness, phonics, high-frequency words, and fluency to reach the goal of comprehending text.

Magnetic Literacy provides comprehensive foundational skills instruction by guiding students on that journey with research-based, explicit, systematic instruction and rich, engaging decodable texts. The *Magnetic Literacy* phonics scope and sequence is the roadmap of the program, and the scope and sequence of every domain systematically complements and reinforces that roadmap. Foundational skills instruction is made achievable for teachers and students with a predictable, strategic flow incorporating scripted routines that include explicit instruction, teacher modeling, and student application (Carnine, 2006). Students practice foundational skills with colorful, high-interest decodable Magnetic Readers on connected topics and themes that align with other unit texts, which gives them authentic reading experiences and promotes knowledge building. In *Magnetic Literacy*, students learn the foundational skills they need to begin reading and gain the motivation to continue reading on their own.

Concepts of Print

Concepts of print includes an awareness that print surrounds us and is a way to communicate meaning. Concepts of print represents a child's basic understanding of environmental print, book handling, letters, words, and sentences (Reutzel, 2015). The understanding that printed words contain and communicate meaning is important because it is a bridge between speech and reading (Honig et al., 2018).

In *Magnetic Literacy*, concepts of print is taught in Grade K and reviewed in Grade 1. The sequence begins with the easy-to-acquire skills, such as names and distinguishing print from pictures, and progresses through book handling, print directionality, and parts of a sentence. Concept of word skills begin early and are reinforced throughout the sequence, ensuring students have the concepts of print they need to begin blending words. This sequence is systematic across domains.

Phonological and Phonemic Awareness

Phonological awareness is the ability to focus on and manipulate component parts in spoken words. This includes syllables, onset-rime, and phonemes (i.e., single sound units). Phonological awareness, and phonemic awareness specifically, is important because English writing is alphabetic and spoken language is fluid (NICHD, 2000). Students have no inherent reason to think about where one phoneme ends and another begins—in speech, it is natural to listen for units of meaning, not units of sound (Moats & Tolman, 2019; Willingham, 2017). Learning to separate, blend, and manipulate phonemes teaches students that words are composed of individual sounds (Muter et al., 1998). This way, when students learn graphemes (i.e., spellings), they can connect the graphemes to the phonemes (Hulme et al., 2002). It is only possible for a student to orthographically map a phoneme they can hear (Lindsey, 2022), which makes the importance of phonological awareness fundamental to learning phonics.

In *Magnetic Literacy*, phonological awareness whole class instruction is oral so that students can focus on the least intuitive part of the skill (the sound) without the distraction of graphemes (Mesmer & Kambach, 2022). Additionally, if a student struggles with a phonological awareness skill while using letters, it can be difficult to assess whether the problem is auditory or graphemic in nature (Kilpatrick, 2015).

Phonological awareness instruction is oral in *Magnetic Literacy* but connected to phonics instruction in two ways: 1) phonological awareness immediately precedes phonics, and 2) phonological awareness lessons always include words with the phonics skill. Each session (i.e., day) begins with phonological awareness instruction, followed immediately by phonics instruction. In this way, students hear, identify, and manipulate the phonemes in words immediately before they learn or review the corresponding graphemes (Wagner & Torgesen, 1987). This order of instruction not only helps students connect the graphemes to phonemes, but also gives them a better understanding of how to decode those words by aligning phonological awareness words with the phonics skill, rather than if they were hearing unrelated words in phonological awareness instruction (Muter et al., 1998). This sequencing is consistent with evidence that awareness of phonemes supports orthographic mapping and

subsequent decoding (Brady, 2020).

Phonics

Phonics is the method of instruction that teaches students the connection between phonemes and graphemes so that students can decode words. When students first begin to decode, blending graphemes together to make words is a slow process and requires a lot of concentration. With practice, students map sounds to spellings in words and reading becomes automatic (Ehri, 2014; Mesmer, 2019). Research shows that isolated word reading helps recall of orthographic patterns and spellings and builds automaticity, while reading decodable text helps students make better connections to the meanings of words as they apply phonics, high-frequency word, and word analysis skills (Ehri, 2020; Ehri & Roberts, 1979; Goldenberg, 2020). Because each type of practice has important benefits for learning to decode, both word reading and reading decodable text is prioritized in *Magnetic Literacy*.

Word building and encoding are important elements of phonics. Word building shows students how changing a grapheme can turn one word into another (e.g., *shin* to *thin*), which reinforces sound-spelling knowledge (Williams et al., 2009). Encoding, another word for spelling, is when students hear the sounds in a word and must map those sounds to letters. Spelling involves distinguishing and remembering phoneme–grapheme relations specified in written words (Ehri, 2022).

The *Magnetic Literacy* phonics scope and sequence contains 139 unique skills and is the basis upon which the foundational skills instruction is built. The foundational skills in the other domains correspond to and support the phonics scope and sequence to maximize student learning (Muter et al., 1998; Ehri, 1995; Ehri et al., 2006). For example, during phonemic awareness lessons, students focus on sounds that they will then learn in that day's phonics lesson.

The phonics scope and sequence in *Magnetic Literacy* is systematic and based on four principles (NICHD, 2000):

1. Begin with simple concepts and skills and build to more complex concepts and skills.
2. Order concepts and introduce new skills at a cadence that allows students time for enough application and practice to master the skills.
3. Build the scope and sequence as a three-year roadmap so that concepts and skills are taught systematically and spiral within and across years.
4. Introduce high-utility sound spellings strategically to give students access to more words.

In addition to being systematic, phonics instruction in *Magnetic Literacy* is synthetic (Johnston et al., 2009) and explicit (Hughes et al., 2022). Synthetic phonics is the system in which students are taught specific graphemes that correspond to sounds and then blend them to form words. This system includes practice with decodable text and was found to be an effective method of phonics instruction for young students (NICHD, 2000). Synthetic phonics in *Magnetic Literacy* is delivered with explicit instruction in a consistent, proven, "teach, model, apply" format (Honig et al., 2018) wherein the teacher introduces a new grapheme in isolation and then writes and underlines it in a word. The teacher models blending a word with the new grapheme while doing a think aloud with the grapheme, and then students apply the new graphemic knowledge by blending a set of words together that contain the grapheme.

Multisyllabic Word Reading

Word-reading instruction for older students (i.e., Grades 3–5) continues with instruction and support with multisyllabic words. Students learn all syllable types and practice reading multisyllabic words in Grade 2 so that by Grade 3, students can review syllable types and apply a new Word Reading Routine that incorporates morphemes with syllables (Mesmer, 2024; Vaughn et al., 2022). Across Grades 3–5, word-reading and spelling instruction are based primarily on morphemes. This helps students focus on the word parts they know and use them to make meaning, which facilitates word reading (Kearns, 2015; Mesmer, 2024).

High-Frequency Words

Magnetic Literacy high-frequency word instruction uses a research-based partial-decoding approach because research shows that decoding the known graphemes in irregular words and hearing the irregular sounds supports retention of new words and leads to automaticity (Duke & Mesmer, 2016; Kearns et al., 2016; Steacy et al., 2017). Students are taught to sound out the words and have many opportunities to identify, read, and write high-frequency words throughout the lesson both in isolation and context, building automaticity (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974). The *Magnetic Literacy* high-frequency word scope and sequence was developed with consideration for both the utility of each word based on Dolch, Fry, and Zeno et al. (1995) word lists and grouping words by shared spelling patterns to support orthographic mapping. Sometimes the words complement the week's phonics skill, sometimes they preview the following week's skill, and sometimes they review a phonics skill from a prior week. In this way, students are learning the highest-utility words while also getting the benefits of learning words that are grouped together by pattern (Ehri, 1995; Ehri et al., 2006).

Fluency

In order for students to read with fluency and to comprehend content in higher grades, a strong foundation in phonics is key (Toste et al., 2019; Vaughn et al., 2019; Wanzek & Roberts, 2012). Fluency, which is defined as the ability to read text with ease, accuracy, and prosody, is a critical component of reading comprehension (Rasinski et al., 2011; Kim, 2015). Accuracy means reading each word correctly, while rate means reading each word automatically, or at a rate that frees up enough working memory that allows a reader to comprehend text (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974). Expression, or reading with a voice that reflects emotions or actions, consists of both the ability to group words together into meaning phrases, or phrasing, and the pitch and volume of the voice while reading, or intonation/inflection. Some degree of text comprehension is required to read with expression but learning prosody skills also facilitates comprehension (Duke & Cartwright, 2021; Rasinski et al., 2005). Learning to group words into phrases, for example, makes text easier to comprehend than reading them one by one.

In Grades K–5, *Magnetic Literacy* includes fluency instruction and regular practice with connected texts, increasing accuracy and fluency so students become proficient readers (Foorman et al., 2016; Shanahan, 2019; Miller, 2012). In Grades K–2, *Magnetic Literacy* features a variety of literary and informational decodable texts (i.e., Magnetic Readers), as well as short, decodable connected texts. These texts begin to build background knowledge and give students opportunities to practice decoding and fluency skills. In Grades 3–5, fluency practice also includes isolated word reading and passage reading. Students practice using the Read Words Routine and read isolated words and phrases in passages with a partner. Students also practice fluency with selected rereads of unit texts, which helps improve comprehension and retention (Gorsuch & Taguchi, 2010; Pikulski & Chard, 2005). In all grades, additional instructional resources and texts are available for students who need continued practice.

In addition to explicit fluency instruction, *Magnetic Literacy* promotes sustained reading volume. Decades of research associate print exposure with growth in fluency, comprehension, and reading stamina (Hiebert, 2014), so text volume carefully increases over time. In Grades 3–6, text volume is based on national reading fluency norms, oral and silent, so that students are reading progressively longer text sets across the school year (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2017; Spichtig et al., 2016).

Integrated Literacy

The Connection between Word Recognition and Language Comprehension

An essential focus of reading instruction at every age is the acquisition of increasing sophisticated skill in decoding unfamiliar words (Ehri, 2014, describes a *phase* model). Students must have foundational decoding skills, but students who have acquired these skills require far less word recognition support over time. The emphasis in reading instruction shifts over time. In the early grades, students receive extensive instruction recognizing words. In the later grades, students learn advanced strategies for reading longer words (described earlier) but spend most of their time acquiring new knowledge from experiences focused on text comprehension.

An essential idea is that students build their knowledge from the first day of school. It is a common misconception that students learn to decode before they read for meaning. Reading comprehension improves simultaneously through experiences building knowledge and processing the meaning of texts (Hogan et al., 2014; Hoover & Gough, 1990; Kieffer et al., 2016). *Magnetic Literacy* includes experiences that address both skills simultaneously. This is an important feature of the program: true integration of word recognition and reading comprehension.

Knowledge Building

Reading comprehension is strongly associated with the reader's prior knowledge about a text (Malkus, 2019; Smith et al., 2021). Researchers have shown that knowledge may have the greater impact on reading comprehension than any other reading comprehension skill (Catts, 2022; RAND Reading Study Group, 2002). *Magnetic Literacy* was built on the premise that the more knowledge students have, the better they will be at comprehending what they read and write. Readers and writers who have developed content and discipline-specific knowledge are better equipped to make inferences, learn new vocabulary, comprehend text, and effectively convey messages in writing (Duke & Cartwright, 2021; Hall et al., 2005; Graham et al., 2012; Kamil et al., 2008). Additionally, because reading comprehension, critical thinking, inference making (Elbro & Buch-Iversen, 2013), and composition rely heavily on varied content knowledge, a solid grounding in diverse topics is essential for developing highly effective readers and writers (Knowledge Matters Campaign, 2021).

Magnetic Literacy fosters intentional opportunities for students to build knowledge and scaffold their understanding through thoughtfully curated, engaging, information-rich text sets (Steiner et al., 2018; Shanahan, 2019). Students extract essential ideas, analyze the texts, synthesize knowledge across texts, and then communicate their understanding to a broader audience (Lupo et al., 2018; Mesmer et al., 2012). The texts are authentic, multi-genre sets that connect to a topic in domains like science, social studies, the arts, and literature for well-rounded knowledge building. Grades K–6 topic alignment expands knowledge and builds connections across grade levels.

Magnetic Literacy uses a quad text set format with four types of texts across 10–12 specific texts in a unit (Lupo et al., 2018). Each text set has a challenging anchor text that serves as the foundational text for the central ideas students engage with during the unit (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012). The other texts—visual, conceptual, and connection—prepare students for reading the anchor text by providing visual cues that activate prior knowledge, building necessary background knowledge, and helping students make connections with their lives. For example, as Grade 3 students learn about deep-sea exploration, the anchor text, *Deep, Deep Down* by Lydia Lukidis (2023), includes literal and nonliteral language, complex vocabulary, and sophisticated verbal reasoning.
To prepare students to engage with the content, they explore informational texts about deep-sea exploration and how animals and humans survive. Comprehension routines are built into the instruction of the text sets so students have equitable access to all texts while building background knowledge and practicing foundational reading skills.

Comprehension

While rich text sets that build students' world knowledge lead to gains in comprehension over time, students must also be taught strategies for how to comprehend texts (NICHD, 2000; Vaughn et al., 2022). No matter how effective efforts may be to enrich students' world knowledge, students need strategies for comprehending new texts on topics unfamiliar to them (Peng et al., 2024; Pressley & Afflerbach, 2012). Research shows that teaching a small set of high-impact reading strategies is a highly effective way to build comprehension (Peng et al., 2024), with summary strategies showing the most significant outcomes. Reading strategies should be simple and replicable (Fuchs et al., 1997; Kearns et al., 2021) and they should be taught with explicit instruction and teacher scaffolding (Peng et al., 2024). *Magnetic Literacy* primarily focuses on strategies for summarizing a section of text using a gist or retell routine, unpacking complex sentences, and determining meaning of vocabulary words (Peng et al., 2024; Pressley et al., 1992; Reutzel et al., 2005).

Focusing on these three types of strategies has two primary purposes:

1. These strategies have a strong research base for building comprehension and retention.
2. They provide tools if students get stuck and comprehension breaks down.

Just like foundational skills, reading comprehension requires explicit instruction (Duke et al., 2021). Without it, students often rush through reading, missing important language and information. And while it is important to have pause points during reading to check students' understanding, asking students questions is not comprehension instruction (Fordham, 2006). In other words, answering questions does not help students understand what they've read or learn how to find the answers if they don't know them. Research, however, has shown that summarizing sections of text during reading has a high impact on comprehension (Duke et al., 2021; Peng et al., 2024). Comprehension is cumulative: Comprehension of page 10 likely requires comprehension of page 2 (van den Broek & Kendeou, 2022; McNamara & Magliano, 2009)—and stopping to build mental models with a gist or retell (Wexler et al., 2020) along the way ensures that students' comprehension is accumulating as they go (Vaughn et al., 2022). Because of differences in text type, a gist routine is used with informational text and a retell routine is used with literary text; both routines achieve the same goal (Kearns et al., 2016). The gist provides a critical foundation for higher-order thinking: If students cannot get the gist, they cannot engage in the analysis, synthesis, and application to writing that are essential to increasing comprehension skill. In short, if students are able to briefly summarize a section of text by determining the main idea and key detail that support it, they are ready to do everything else.

Across Grades K–6, students dig more deeply into text after reading by examining skills like text structure (Hudson et al., 2021), figurative language, or author's purpose. This skill work expands students' academic vocabulary and knowledge about how different texts work. The additional experience using their newly acquired vocabulary reinforces vocabulary learning and long-term retention (Biemiller & Boote, 2006).

Comprehension in Grades K–2

During the early years of literacy development, students must receive enough decoding instruction to assure they can read any unfamiliar grade-level text. As a result, instructional time in early-grade *Magnetic Literacy* includes extensive experience learning word recognition skills. Reading comprehension improves simultaneously through experiences building knowledge and processing the meaning of texts (Hogan et al., 2014; Hoover & Gough, 1990; Kieffer et al., 2016).

Comprehensive reading instruction balances multiple types of reading so that young students experience different types of texts and language (Strachan, 2014). In *Magnetic Literacy*, these reading experiences include practice with decodable texts (mentioned earlier), teacher read alouds (Greene Brabham & Lynch-Brown, 2002), and shared reading with hybrid texts designed to allow additional experience using and generalizing decoding skills and building their funds of knowledge, jointly supporting comprehension for every text they read after.

Teacher read-aloud texts provide opportunities for students to engage with ideas in texts beyond their independent reading levels. These texts include new ideas that build on prior knowledge acquired from texts they have already read in a given unit, rich vocabulary essential for comprehending the given text and expanding their academic vocabulary (Beck et al., 2013), and varied syntactic structures—all of which enrich students' oral language skills and world knowledge.

These texts also provide opportunities to learn and practice comprehension strategies with teacher support. Students learn how to retell a text they have just read and then how to summarize the text, which research shows are effective strategies to build comprehension and retention for early readers (Filderman et al., 2021; Gersten et al., 2007; Shanahan & Lonigan, 2010). Students also learn a strategy for question–answer relationships, which is helpful in two ways: students learn how to find answers in the text and when to make an inference (Raphael et al., 2001). In addition, students use graphic organizers such as story maps and main topic charts, which help students visualize information and how ideas connect (Reutzel et al., 2016).

Comprehension in Grades 3–6

In Grades 3–6, most instructional time is devoted to reading comprehension, particularly analysis of essential ideas, using academic vocabulary in varied contexts, and integration of information across texts. The ability to comprehend in this way reflects the most sophisticated application of literacy skills, that is, a complete understanding of the situation model embedded within the text. This is the critical idea in the most widely tested and validated model of reading comprehension—the construction-integration model, originally theorized by Kintsch (1988) and extensively tested and validated (Kintsch & Welsch, 2013; McCarthy & McNamara, 2021).

This model is grounded in the idea that the reader's task is to create the situation model, the mental representation of the text as originally intended by the author. This representation is constructed sentence by sentence and changes with every new idea encountered (McNamara & Magliano, 2009). The model changes as the reader combines the knowledge from previous sentences (i.e., associative inferences) and outside the text (i.e., elaborative inferences). The reader builds this model sentence by sentence and paragraph by paragraph. These foundational elements represent the microstructure, a coherent and accurate understanding of the chunks of meaning acquired in each sentence. Understanding of the microstructure leads to the construction of the full situation model, a whole that includes the narrative elements and critical expository ideas in that text and connections to related texts and ideas that create an ever-expanding network of ideas (i.e., the *macrostructure*; Kintsch, 1988).

The critical role of the microstructure and macrostructure explains why *Magnetic Literacy* includes a gist strategy used to comprehend each paragraph. The critical idea is to assure that paragraph-level comprehension is intact. In other words, an accurate representation of the microstructure allows for acquisition of the macrostructure. The gist strategy is grounded in more than 25 years of empirical research (Klingner & Vaughn, 1999). Studies of instructional strategies, including paragraph summary, continue to show the effects on student reading comprehension skills even in very large studies with diverse students (Vardy et al., 2022; Vaughn et al., 2022).

In some cases, problems with paragraph summary reveal challenges at an even more foundational level: the sentence itself (Barnes et al., 2015). In these instances, students require a strategy that helps them unpack sentences as well (Fillmore & Snow, 2018). There are many reasons a complex sentence may block comprehension. One way to improve sentence comprehension is to help students break a sentence into individual meaningful chunks. The other is to help the reader connect words (especially nouns and mostly pronouns) to their *referents*, the original words used to describe the noun—for example, *they* in one sentence might refer back to *wolves* in one of the *Magnetic Literacy* Grade 4 units. A third way to facilitate comprehension is to use their combined knowledge of word decoding and word meaning in words with multiple *morphemes*. Morphemes are letter groups within words that each provide their own meaning and combine to create a unique whole that differs from each of its parts. For example, *unhelpful* combines the morphemes *un-* (a *bound morpheme* that must be connected to other word parts—it is not a word on its own), *help* (a root word, or base word), and *-ful* (another bound morpheme).

Each part conveys different information. Readers can use morphemes in two ways: They support advanced decoding because students learn to recognize these letter combinations and their pronunciations (Colenbrander et al., 2024), and they support vocabulary acquisition based on instruction that highlights the meaning and use of the morphemes (Crosson et al., 2021).

Showing students how to break a sentence into chunks and to connect ideas and referents enables them to continue reading without missing critical information or giving up. Sometimes a single unknown word can cause a student to get stuck, and learning how to use word parts, context clues, and reference materials to determine word meaning also removes obstacles and adds to students' overall word knowledge (Beck et al., 2013).

Vocabulary

Developing strong vocabulary skills supports reading comprehension and knowledge building as well as academic success across content areas (Hiebert, 2020). This includes the teaching and practice of conceptual vocabulary, academic vocabulary, and skills that promote metalinguistic awareness. Conceptual vocabulary supports students in knowledge building by aligning generally useful academic words (i.e., Tier 2 words) and text-specific useful words (i.e., Tier 3 words; Kearns et al., 2021), words with conceptual knowledge in texts. These words repeat across conceptually coherent texts, which helps students make connections between ideas (Cervetti et al., 2016; Hiebert & Cervetti, 2012). Academic vocabulary instruction supports students when engaging in written and spoken academic discourse and reading, particularly informational texts (Zucker et al., 2021; Baker et al., 2014). Metalinguistic awareness supports student understanding of the structure of language, which leads to improved comprehension, and is fostered through instruction of morphemes and word relationships (Cervetti et al., 2023; Hiebert, 2020).

Effective vocabulary instruction is composed of three main elements (Biemiller & Boote, 2006; Elleman et al., 2009; Gibbs & Reed, 2021; Stahl, 1986):

1. Explicit definition of the word using student-friendly language
2. Context sentence that provides additional meaning
3. Active processing in which students use the word in multiple ways (e.g., discussion and writing)

Magnetic Literacy systematically and explicitly incorporates these elements of effective vocabulary instruction. This includes the pre-teaching of concept words to support access to complex texts, explicit instruction in affixes and Greek and Latin roots, and embedding word-learning routines during reading (Duke & Cartwright, 2021; Shanahan et al., 2010; Kamil et al., 2008). At the beginning of a *Magnetic Literacy* unit, vocabulary words that a) are deeply important for understanding the unit topic, and b) repeat across texts, are introduced. This introduction begins the knowledge build of the unit and helps to set the purpose of learning about the topic. Before each reading session, additional conceptual and academic vocabulary words necessary for the day's reading are taught strategically (Kearns et al., 2021; Wexler et al., 2022). In Grades 4–6, students learn the high-utility Greek and Latin roots that may appear in these words (Mesmer, 2024). After reading, students learn affixes according to a scope and sequence that is independent of the texts (Baumann et al., 2013; Manyak et al., 2018; Fitt, 2000). These high-utility word parts are grouped by meaning and are followed by spelling practice. The combination of affix and spelling instruction helps students learn patterns and retain information (Bryant & Nunes, 2004). Throughout the unit, students have multiple and varied opportunities to practice vocabulary words, including writing, games, concept maps, and discussions.

Writing

Writing development has a close reciprocal relationship with reading comprehension (Graham et al., 2018). That is, not only does proficient reading comprehension lead to improved writing, but writing practice improves reading comprehension (Graham et al., 2018). Learning to write for different purposes, writing about text, and learning a systematic process for writing are some of the ways to maximize these reciprocal benefits, and forms of this instruction can begin in the earliest grades (Graham et al., 2012). As students gain foundational literacy skills, they also begin to acquire knowledge and can begin applying knowledge in supported writing tasks (Cervetti & Hiebert, 2018; Graham et al., 2018).

In *Magnetic Literacy*, writing instruction is frequent and interwoven with reading, which allows students to practice writing skills in short and long formats. This takes the form of "Write to Respond" tasks that apply newly learned writing and skills and culminates in the end-of-unit writing assignment that requires comprehension of key, or throughline, reading standards from across the unit. In Grades 3–6, students preview this task at the beginning of the unit, which gives them a framework for reading and synthesizing texts, while in Grades K–2, students learn the task at the end of the unit to save cognitive load. These writing tasks, which occur after reading the anchor text, are a culmination of reading and learning. Throughout the unit, students learn components of writing—how to write specific sentence types, how to write an opinion—that are related to the end-of-unit task. There are daily opportunities to write in response to text and frequent Targeted Instruction (Grades K–2) or Writer's Craft (Grades 3–6) sessions where students learn—and then apply—syntax lessons in authentic responses. There is explicit instruction on the writing process at the end of each unit where students learn to plan, draft, revise, and publish their work in different genres (Graham et al., 2012; Graham et al., 2019). Writing-process sessions include extensive instruction and teacher modeling, written models for students to analyze, and opportunities for teacher conferencing and peer review (MacArthur, 2019). *Magnetic Literacy* is designed for students to not only acquire knowledge through reading but also to apply knowledge in writing, which in turn improves reading comprehension (Cervetti & Hiebert, 2018; Graham et al., 2018).

In Grades K and 1, when students are still learning letter formation, there is more scaffolding of process writing in the forms of shared writing and shared evidence gathering. This helps students learn the steps in process writing and develop habits of mind even before they are able to draft paragraphs or essays (Roth & Dabrowski, 2014; Williams, 2018). There is also drawing in early Grades K and 1 with an onramp in Grade K to writing words and sentences as part of their end-of-unit tasks.

Oral Language and Academic Discourse

Guided classroom talk accelerates comprehension and writing by giving students repeated practice with the syntax and vocabulary of the unit's concepts. These discussions also promote knowledge building by allowing students to synthesize new ideas. *Magnetic Literacy* embeds structured routines (e.g., Collect and Display; Stronger and Clearer Each Time) so every learner rehearses precise language, negotiates meaning with peers, and makes ideas public (Zwiers, 2006). These routines are part of daily lessons for all learners, with intensified scaffolds for English learners as needed. Additionally, teachers have a menu of response and volunteer protocols that allows students to participate in ways that accommodate their cultural and linguistic differences (Hollie, 2017).

Maximize Achievement with Responsive Guidance

Assessments

Using data to inform and guide teaching and learning is an evidence-based way to maximize student success (Slavin et al., 2013; Hamilton et al., 2009). Information from assessments empowers teachers to monitor student progress so they can make data-driven decisions that promote ongoing student mastery (Cai et al., 2018). Furthermore, the intentional use of data-informed instruction improves student achievement and increases motivation (Carol, 2019; Slavin et al., 2013; Swan & Mazur, 2011; Halverson et al., 2007).

According to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) handbook on using student data to inform instructional decision making, "Teachers should adopt a systematic process for using data in order to bring evidence to bear on their instructional decisions and improve their ability to meet students' learning needs" (Hamilton et al., 2009). This process is an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement that should include three parts:

1. Collect and prepare a variety of qualitative and quantitative data about student learning.
2. Interpret data and develop hypotheses about how to improve student learning.
3. Modify instruction to test hypotheses and increase student learning.

Magnetic Literacy works seamlessly with the *i-Ready Inform*™* online assessment to follow this ongoing cycle of instructional improvement. Across three implementations at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year, teachers get a complete picture of students' strengths and needs on one platform with reports from the *i-Ready Inform* assessment and insights from *i-Ready Literacy Tasks*. This includes an overall reading score as well as disaggregated reports in foundational skills, comprehension, and vocabulary.

Focusing on foundational literacy skills specifically, *i-Ready Literacy Tasks* provide information on how a student is performing in phonological awareness, decoding, encoding, and fluency-related reading skills. Used as a complement to *i-Ready Inform*, these assessments help provide a comprehensive snapshot of a student's overall reading performance for Grades K–6. *i-Ready Literacy Tasks* measure student performance in key foundational literacy skills with tools that support one-on-one assessment of literacy skills. With a flexible and modularized approach, educators can use the tasks they believe will best help identify their students' foundational literacy needs.

Magnetic Literacy also includes numerous assessments within the program that a) help teachers make decisions about differentiation and reteaching, and b) give cumulative information about student learning. A new meta-analysis examining the effects of formative assessment, sometimes called "assessment for learning," established the key elements that impact student motivation and academic achievement (Van Orman et al., 2024). These elements include:

- Planning instruction and assessment around goals and evidence of student learning
- Eliciting frequent, varied, and meaningful evidence of student learning so teachers and students understand what learning has taken place and to determine next steps
- Providing specific, descriptive, and actionable feedback and opportunities so students can put it to work
- Enabling ownership of learning through self-assessment so students understand, reflect on, and drive their own development
- Activating peers as resources

**i-Ready Inform*™ is the new name for the adaptive assessment currently named "*i-Ready Diagnostic*."

With its multiple formative assessment tools, *Magnetic Literacy* accomplishes each of these goals. Weekly foundational skill and interim integrated literacy assessments connect to instructional next steps for differentiation, connecting evidence with instruction. Daily Exit Tickets with scoring rubrics in domains like comprehension, syntax, and vocabulary provide frequent, varied, and meaningful evidence of student learning. Student-facing checklists aligned to rubrics provide specific, descriptive, and actionable feedback for students as well as ownership via self-assessment. Peer review is also included, with explicit instruction on how to give constructive feedback. And lessons in every domain (e.g., foundational skills, comprehension, vocabulary) offer point-of-use checkpoints throughout each session.

In *Magnetic Literacy*, writing plays an important role in assessment as well as instruction. End-of-unit writing tasks explicitly assess the key, targeted reading comprehension standards necessary to do the writing. Writing rubrics give teachers a tool for evaluating numerous writing, syntax, and language skills along with the comprehension standards. By directly integrating reading with writing in this way, teachers gain an additional data source for progress across domains. Unit assessments also offer summative data on students' progress in foundational skills, vocabulary, and comprehension.

The *Magnetic Literacy* Grade-Level Planning (Scaffolding) report helps teachers understand learning needs and identify resources before teaching specific skills so they can best support students during each session. Multiple sources of data continue to be collected before, during, and after teaching, allowing educators to continually incorporate data about student learning into their teaching. These include manageable embedded program assessments with clear guidance for responsive instruction (e.g., Exit Tickets, responsive instruction callouts, *Magnetic Literacy* report). They also include daily, on-the-spot assessments that help teachers quickly evaluate and support the skills and knowledge that students need, and responsive instruction tools embedded within the Teacher's Guide and *i-Ready Assessment* reports that make it easy to tailor instruction to each student.

Differentiated Instruction

With the information provided from these assessment and reporting tools, teachers can effectively choose from a variety of targeted instructional recommendations and resources that *Magnetic Literacy* provides to differentiate instruction for individual students. *Magnetic Literacy* provides Tier 1 core, Tier 2 Support & Extend small group sequences triggered by Exit Ticket and interim assessments, and interfaces with dedicated Tier 3 interventions when progress monitoring indicates need.

In Grades K–2, Support & Extend focuses on foundational skills so students who need additional support can practice blending and segmenting phonemes, and decoding with the teacher (Duke & Mesmer, 2018–2019). Resources are also available for fluency practice and comprehension, giving additional options as students move to the automatic and advanced phases of reading development (Ehri, 1995).

In Grades 3–6, the strategies that act as scaffolds during reading are reinforced during Support & Extend. Depending on need, students practice a gist, sentence, or word routine independently or with teacher support. Students may do additional gist work, if needed, to build clearer mental models of the day's reading. They may also dig into additional complex sentences, which helps them understand syntax that may have been an obstacle during reading. The teacher reinforces these supports with the students who need them most. Group sizes are not dependent on a set small number of students. Instead, reinforcement occurs with the students who need it, which allows a greater number of students to make progress (Lou et al., 1996). Students are guided to use the strategies in ways that maximize knowledge building and independence. Students extend their learning by using the day's text to write responses to the unit's essential question and working on concept maps that expand on the session's conceptual vocabulary.

Commitment to Learner Variability and Universal Access

Magnetic Literacy is grounded in a fundamental commitment to engaging all learners in rigorous grade-level learning. *Magnetic Literacy* embraces an asset-based pedagogical approach that fosters accessible learning experiences that empower students to develop agency, engage with diverse ways of knowing, and deepen their understanding (Fackler et al., 2024; Flint & Jaggers, 2021). *Magnetic Literacy* is designed to be mindful of learner variability, including through offering supports for multilingual learners and students with disabilities.

Learner Variability

Drawing from learning science research and cognitive neuroscience, the concept of learner variability emphasizes that there is no "average" learner—every student brings unique assets and challenges to their education (Dockterman, 2018; Rose et al., 2013). *Magnetic Literacy* was developed with the understanding that learner and teacher variability is the norm in today's classrooms, and that while all learners are unique, learner variability is predictable (CAST, 2024). Students and teachers possess diverse strengths, needs, and backgrounds, and this variability is an integral part of every learning environment. All learners thrive in classrooms that recognize and expect uniqueness from each individual learner.

The UDL is a well-established, research-based framework that anticipates variability so all learners can access and meaningfully participate in educational environments. Ultimately, the goal of UDL is to support learner agency, or the capacity to actively participate in making choices in service of learning goals (CAST, 2024). *Magnetic Literacy* supports educators to incorporate UDL-aligned practices and center learner agency in their planning and instruction to enhance the learning experiences and ongoing development of all students (Adair, 2014; Code, 2020; Spooner et al., 2007).

UDL is built around three powerful principles: design multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression. Engagement is the "why" of learning. Since learners differ in what sparks their motivation and enthusiasm for learning, *Magnetic Literacy* intentionally designs learning experiences that welcome diverse interests and embeds routines to help learners persist and sustain their efforts (CAST, 2024). Students engage with a variety of high-interest topics throughout the program. In Grades K–3, students explore units on social studies, art, science, history, and literature. In Grades 4–6, they delve deeper into these subjects with a focus on essential questions. Content is relevant and authentic, with activities that challenge all learners. According to the UDL framework, it is crucial for learners to understand the learning goal and its relevance to their lives and communities (CAST, 2024). *Magnetic Literacy* clarifies each lesson's purpose and criteria for success, helping students set and reflect on their goals throughout the unit.

Multiple means of representation is the "what" of learning. Since learners differ in how they perceive and make meaning of information, it is important that content be shared in multiple modalities, representing a broad spectrum of cultures and perspectives, clarifying vocabulary, and embedding options for students to build knowledge, such as highlighting big ideas and relationships and providing opportunities to transfer learning to new contexts (CAST, 2024). *Magnetic Literacy* supports multiple ways of perceiving information and helps students connect prior knowledge to new learning. Anchor charts, such as the "Rules for Discussion Anchor Chart" or the "Question and Answer Anchor Chart" include images and prompts to guide classroom discussion. Concept maps, pictures, and graphic organizers help students visually represent and explore connections between key concepts. Teachers pre-teach essential concepts with explicit instruction and modeling. Strategically organized text sets are paired with explicit vocabulary instruction to remove barriers by connecting new concepts and language with relevant prior knowledge.

Multiple means of action and expression is the "how" of learning. Learners differ in the ways they interact with learning materials, approach the learning process, and demonstrate what they know, so it is critical to design learning experiences that embrace these variances (CAST, 2024). *Magnetic Literacy* offers various ways for students to express their knowledge, including verbal, written, and visual formats like story webs and drawing pictures. Exit Tickets help learners review learning goals and communicate their new knowledge. *Magnetic Literacy*'s writing process engages students with planning, drafting, revising, publishing, and peer feedback. Students compare their work to models and use rubrics to reflect on their work and set goals. The program includes options to support and extend learning to differentiate instruction based on student strengths and needs. End-of-unit projects, such as murals, books, and visual presentations, allow students to synthesize information creatively. This responsive instruction helps develop resourceful, strategic learners who are equipped to tackle complex literacy tasks.

English Learners

English learners* represent a broad population of learners with a wide range of backgrounds, experiences, home languages, and academic proficiencies. *Magnetic Literacy* reflects the belief that students with developing levels of English proficiency can achieve academic success when they are provided with instruction and materials that carefully support their emerging understanding and use of language as they participate in content learning (Bunch et al., 2012; Council of the Great City Schools [CGCS], 2017; Zwiers et al., 2017).

Magnetic Literacy is designed around five research-based best practices for supporting the needs of English learners (ELSF, 2022). They are:

1. Integrate content and language learning.
2. Scaffold and amplify language.
3. Develop students' metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness.
4. Leverage students' assets.
5. Formatively assess language.

Integrate Content and Language Learning

In *Magnetic Literacy*, students listen, speak, read, and write every day, in every session. As research recommends, English learners have consistent opportunities to communicate and interact using language while building knowledge, content understanding, and grade-level literacy practices (IES, 2017).

To ensure an intentional, cohesive approach to language development, there is a Key Language Focus for each unit as well as unit language goals and related session-level language goals. These convey to educators and students the language skills they will work on in a sustained way across a unit while they simultaneously learn foundational literacy skills and strategies (CGCS, 2017; Shanahan & Beck, 2006). Regular collaborative discussions provide opportunities for all students to apply and practice their developing language skills to share ideas, explanations, and opinions.

*_Magnetic Literacy_ uses "English learner", a term used in the Grades K–12 school system for students with a home language other than English and who are not yet proficient enough to comprehend, access, and succeed in an English-taught schooling system without support. The term "multilingual learner" is an umbrella term that includes English learners, dual-language learners, and Emergent Bilinguals.

Scaffold and Amplify Language

Magnetic Literacy helps teachers attend to language demands, potential obstacles to comprehension or participation, and opportunities for language learning within texts and session activities. It also provides content-specific, as-needed supports and entry points for English learners (CGCS, 2017).

Strategic embedded supports throughout the Teacher's Guide help teachers "scaffold up" (rather than "water down") so students can access and fully engage with rigorous, grade-level content as they acquire and develop language. These content-specific supports include:

- **Language Routines**, such as Collect and Display and Stronger and Clearer Each Time, which provide familiar structures to support academic language development.
- **Scaffolded English Learner Support in the Session Preview**, which provide activity- and language-specific support that addresses the continuum of English language proficiency.
- **Word, Sentence, and Discourse** domain supports, which promote making meaning by offering definitions of vocabulary, sentence starters and frames, and scaffolds for longer responses.

Develop Metalinguistic and Metacognitive Awareness

Learning to read and write is a highly complex task. English learners benefit when they receive explicit instruction focused on metalinguistic awareness—noticing and appreciating the similarities and differences between the sounds, phonetic systems, words, and language structures of English and students' home languages (Fillmore & Snow, 2018; NICHD, 2000).

Magnetic Literacy offers resources to help students develop metalinguistic awareness.

For example:

- **Connect to Cognates** supports prompt Latin-based language speakers to recognize and compare related words, such as *revise/revisar* in Spanish, including root words they have in common.
- **Crosslinguistic Connections** guide teachers to help students compare grammar, syntax, punctuation, or sentence structure across languages.
- **Support Language Transfer** (Grades K–2) highlights similarities and differences in sound–symbol relationships in English and students' home languages.

Leverage Students' Assets

Students make natural connections and develop a greater sense of self-worth when their home languages and cultures are viewed by others as valuable resources (Bunch et al., 2012; Moll et al., 1992; Thomas & Collier, 1997). *Magnetic Literacy* guides teachers to recognize, acknowledge, and use the home language of students to empower them and enhance their language development through various supports in the Teacher's Guide.

For example:

- **Use Home Language** encourages teachers to have same-language peers brainstorm, discuss ideas, and explore meaning using their home language.
- **Value Student Assets** invites students to share cultural or linguistic connections to the content or a context, which reinforces that bilingualism and biliteracy are strengths.
- **Culturally Relevant Content** represents a rich variety of children, families, and communities. The goal is for students to see themselves reflected in the literature they read, not just so that they can bring their funds of knowledge to the text, but also to support positive identity development (Lopez, 2017; Gay, 2018).

  | 03/26 0K | 3509734

Formatively Assess Language

Instructional materials that support English learners need to include formative assessments of both language and content learning so students can get feedback on their progress and the teacher can adjust the instruction, as needed (ELSF, 2022).

Observe Language moments are embedded at key points in instruction to help teachers monitor progress toward the Unit Language Goals. These features let teachers know when to listen and look for relevant language, how to analyze language samples using "listen fors" and "look fors," and what specific feedback to give to students.

By focusing on research-based best practices, *Magnetic Literacy* is designed to address the strengths and needs of English learners. Teachers are guided to value students' home languages and lived experiences while promoting the development of academic English through connected, consistent, and specific strategies that enable students to access and engage in rigorous grade-level learning.

Conclusion

Magnetic Literacy is a comprehensive structured literacy curriculum for Grades K–6 that integrates all literacy domains into a cohesive learning experience. It provides clear instructional guidance, data-informed teaching, and award-winning professional learning to equip educators to meet diverse student needs. The program maximizes every minute of the literacy block, ensuring strong outcomes across reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Beyond foundational skills, *Magnetic Literacy* challenges students to apply their knowledge in authentic ways. It empowers them to think, read, and write like historians, critics, and scientists, building the confidence and discipline-specific skills needed to communicate and create knowledge effectively (Kamil et al., 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012).

References

Adair, J. (2014). Agency and expanding capacity in early grade classrooms: What it could mean for young children. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(2), 217–241.

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. MIT Press.

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading*. National Institute of Education.

Archer, A. L., & Hughes, C. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. Guilford.

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). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx

Barnes, M. A., Ahmed, Y., Barth, A., & Francis, D. J. (2015). The relation of knowledge-text integration processes and reading comprehension in 7th- to 12th-grade students. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 19*(4), 253–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2015.1022650

Baumann, J. F., Blachowicz, C. L. Z., Bates, A., Cieply, C., Manyak, P., Peterson, H., . . . Graves, M. F. (2013). The development of a comprehensive vocabulary instruction program for nine- to eleven-year-old children using a design experiment approach. In T. Plomp & N. Nieveen (Eds.), *Educational design research: Part B. Illustrative cases* (pp. 23–47). SLO.

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Biemiller, A., & Boote, C. (2006). An effective method for building meaning vocabulary in primary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), 44–62. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.44

Brady, S. (2020). *A 2020 perspective on research findings on alphabetics (phoneme awareness and phonics): Implications for instruction (expanded version)*. International Dyslexia Association. https://fl.dyslexiaida.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/33/2024/05/A-2020-Perspective-on-Research-Findings-on-Alphabetics-Phoneme-Awareness-and-Phonics-Implications-for-Instruction.pdf

Bryant, P., & Nunes, T. (2004). Morphology and spelling. In T. Nunes & P. Bryant (Eds.), *Handbook of children's literacy* (pp. 91–118). Springer.

Bunch, G., Kibler, A., & Pimentel, S. (2012). *Realizing opportunities for English learners in the Common Core English language arts and disciplinary literacy standards*. Paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford University. https://ul.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/resource/2021-12/01_Bunch_Kibler_Pimentel_RealizingOpp%20in%20ELA_FINAL_0.pdf

Cai, J., Morris, A., Hohensee, C., Hwang, S., Robison, V., & Hiebert, J. (2018). Using data to understand and improve students' learning: Empowering teachers and researchers through building and using a knowledge base. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 49*(4), 362–372.

Carol, M. (2019). Using technology and assessment to personalize instruction: Preventing reading problems. *Prevention Science, 20*(1), 89–99.

Carnine, D. (2006). *Teaching struggling and at-risk readers: A direct instruction approach*. Prentice Hall.

CAST. (2024). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0*. https://udlguidelines.cast.org

Catts, H. W. (2022). Rethinking how to promote reading comprehension. *American Educator, 45*(4), 26.

Cervetti, G. N., & Hiebert, E. H. (2018). Knowledge at the center of English language arts instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 72*(4), 499–507.

Cervetti, G. N., Wright, T. S., & Hwang, H. (2016). Conceptual coherence, comprehension, and vocabulary acquisition: A knowledge effect? *Reading and Writing, 29*, 761–779.

Cervetti, G. N., Fitzgerald, M. S., Hiebert, E. H., & Hebert, M. (2023). Meta-analysis examining the impact of vocabulary instruction on vocabulary knowledge and skill. *Reading Psychology, 44*(6), 672–709.

Code, J. (2020). Agency for learning: Intention, motivation, self-efficacy and self-regulation. *Frontiers in Education, 5*, Article 19. Frontiers Media SA.

Colenbrander, D., von Hagen, A., Kohnen, S., Wegener, S., Ko, K., Beyersmann, E., . . . Castles, A. (2024). The effects of morphological instruction on literacy outcomes for children in English-speaking countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 36*(4), Article 119. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10648-024-09953-3

Council of the Great City Schools. (2017). *Re-envisioning English language arts and English language development for English language learners* (Updated, 2nd ed.). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED588760.pdf

Crosson, A. C., McKeown, M. G., Lei, P., Zhao, H., Li, X., Patrick, K., . . . Shen, Y. (2021). Morphological analysis skill and academic vocabulary knowledge are malleable through intervention and may contribute to reading comprehension for multilingual adolescents. *Journal of Research in Reading, 44*(1), 154–174. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12323

Dockterman, D. (2018). Insights from 200+ years of personalized learning. *NPJ Science of Learning, 3*, Article 15.

Duke, N. K., & Mesmer, H. A. E. (2016). Teach "sight words" as you would other words. *Literacy Daily*.

Duke, N. K., & Mesmer, H. A. E. (2018–2019). Phonics faux pas: Avoiding instructional missteps in teaching letter-sound relationships. *American Educator*.

Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Strachan, S. L., & Billman, A. K. (2011). Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension. *What research has to say about reading instruction, 4*(1), 286–314.

Duke, N. K., Ward, A. E., & Pearson, P. D. (2021). The science of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 74*(6), 663–672.

Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly, 56*(1), S25–S44.

Ehri, L. C., & Roberts, K. T. (1979). Do beginners learn printed words better in contexts or in isolation? *Child Development*, 675–685.

Ehri, L. C. (1995). Phases of development in learning to read words by sight. *Journal of Research in Reading, 18*(2), 116–125.

Ehri, L. C. (2005). Learning to read words: Theory, findings, and issues. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 9*(2), 167–188.

Ehri, L. C., Roberts, K. T., Dickinson, D. K., & Neuman, S. B. (2006). The roots of learning to read and write: Acquisition of letters and phonemic awareness. In D. K. Dickinson & S. B. Neuman (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 2, pp. 113–134). Guilford Press.

Ehri, L. C. (2014). Orthographic mapping in the acquisition of sight word reading, spelling memory, and vocabulary learning. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 18*(1), 5–21.

Ehri, L. C. (2020). The science of learning to read words: A case for systematic phonics instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*, S45–S60.

Ehri, L. C. (2022). What teachers need to know and do to teach letter–sounds, phonemic awareness, word reading, and phonics. *The Reading Teacher, 76*, 53–61.

Elbro, C., & Buch-Iversen, I. (2013). Activation of background knowledge for inference making: Effects on reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 17*(6), 435–452. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2013.774005

Elleman, A. M., Lindo, E. J., Morphy, P., & Compton, D. L. (2009). The impact of vocabulary instruction on passage-level comprehension of school-age children: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2*(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345740802539200

English Learners Success Forum. (2022). *Guidelines for improving English language arts materials for English learners*. https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/67027f2f8647f3b8c72b5333/67eff85c801970682e754b29_elsf-ela-guidelines.pdf

Fackler, A. K., Miller, E. A., & Li, T. (2024). Promoting meaningful and equitable modeling practices: Developing agency, using diverse ways of knowing, and collaborating to build knowledge through modeling practices. *Science and Children, 61*(1), 25–31.

Filderman, M. J., Austin, C. R., Boucher, A. N., O'Donnell, K., & Swanson, E. A. (2021). A meta-analysis of the effects of reading comprehension interventions on the reading comprehension outcomes of struggling readers in third through 12th grades. *Exceptional Children, 88*(2), 163–184. https://doi.org/10.1177/00144029211050860

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2018). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Fitt, S. (2000). *UNISYN lexicon* (Version 1.0) [Computer software].

Flint, A. S., & Jaggers, W. (2021). You matter here: The impact of asset-based pedagogies on learning. *Theory Into Practice, 60*(3), 254–264.

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). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education.

Fordham, N. W. (2006). Crafting questions that address comprehension strategies in content reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(5), 390–396.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Simmons, D. C. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 174–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312034001

Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. Teachers College Press.

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*. (NCEE 2007-4011). What Works Clearinghouse, Institute of Education Sciences.

Gibbs, A. S., & Reed, D. K. (2021). Shared reading and guided play for vocabulary instruction with young children. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 53*(4), 280–288.

Goldenberg, C. (2020). Reading wars, reading science, and English learners. *Reading Research Quarterly, 55*, S131–S144.

Gorsuch, G., & Taguchi, E. (2010). Developing reading fluency and comprehension using repeated reading: Evidence from longitudinal student reports. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(1), 27–59.

Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Olson, C. B., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). *Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide*. (NCEE 2012-4058). What Works Clearinghouse, Institute of Education Sciences.

Graham, S., Liu, X., Aitken, A., Ng, C., Bartlett, B., Harris, K. R., & Holzapfel, J. (2018). Effectiveness of literacy programs balancing reading and writing instruction: A meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly, 53*(3), 279–304.

Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., & Hebert, M. J. (Eds.). (2019). *Best practices in writing instruction*. Guilford Press.

Greene Brabham, E., & Lynch-Brown, C. (2002). Effects of teachers' reading-aloud styles on vocabulary acquisition and comprehension of students in the early elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(3), 465–473. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.3.465

Hall, K. M., Sabey, B. L., & McClellan, M. (2005). Expository text comprehension: Helping primary-grade teachers use expository texts to full advantage. *Reading Psychology, 26*(3), 211–234.

Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R., & Thomas, C. (2007). The new instructional leadership: Creating data-driven instructional systems in schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*(2), 159–194.

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). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED506645.pdf

Hasbrouck, J., & Tindal, G. (2017). *An update to compiled ORF norms* (Technical Report No. 1702, pp. 1–17). Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon.

Hiebert, E. H. (2014). The forgotten reading proficiency: Stamina in silent reading. In E. H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Stamina, silent reading, & the Common Core State Standards* (pp. 1–26).

Hiebert, E. H. (2020). The core vocabulary: The foundation of proficient comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 73*(6), 757–768.

Hiebert, E. H., & Cervetti, G. N. (2012). What differences in narrative and informational texts mean for the learning and instruction of vocabulary. In E. J. Kame'enui & J. F. Baumann (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice* (2nd ed., pp. 322–344). Guilford Press.

Hilton, C. B., Moser, C. J., Bertolo, M., Lee-Rubin, H., Amir, D., Bainbridge, C. M., . . . Mehr, S. A. (2022). Acoustic regularities in infant-directed speech and song across cultures. *Nature Human Behaviour, 6*, 1545–1556.

Hogan, T. P., Adlof, S. M., & Alonzo, C. N. (2014). On the importance of listening comprehension. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 16*(3), 199–207. https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2014.904441

Hollie, S. (2017). *Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning: Classroom practices for student success*. Teacher Created Materials.

Honig, B., Diamond, L., & Gutlohn, L. (2018). *Teaching reading sourcebook* (3rd ed.). CORE.

Hudson, A. K., Owens, J., Moore, K. A., Lambright, K., & Wijekumar, K. (2021). "What's the main idea?": Using text structure to build comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 75*(1), 113–118.

Hughes, C. A., Riccomini, P. J., & Dexter, C. A. (2022). Use explicit instruction. In J. McLeskey, B. Billingsley, & T. J. Lewis (Eds.), *High-leverage practices for inclusive classrooms* (pp. 235–264). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003148609

Hulme, C., Hatcher, P. J., Nation, K., Brown, A., Adams, J., & Stuart, G. (2002). Phoneme awareness is a better predictor of early reading skill than onset-rime awareness. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 82*(1), 2–28.

Institute of Education Sciences. (2017). *Teaching academic content and literacy to English learners in elementary and middle school*. What Works Clearinghouse, US Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/Docs/PracticeGuide/50629_TeachingAcademicContentLiteracy_PG_Summary_final.pdf

Johnston, R. S., Watson, J. E., & Logan, S. (2009). Enhancing word reading, spelling and reading comprehension skills with synthetic phonics teaching: Studies in Scotland and England. In C. Wood & V. Connelly (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on reading and spelling* (pp. 233–250). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203877838

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices* (IES Practice Guide, NCEE 2008-4027). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

Kearns, D. M. (2015). How elementary-age children read polysyllabic polymorphemic words. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(2), 364–390. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037518

Kearns, D. M., Hancock, R. Hoeft, F., Pugh, K., & Frost, S. (2019). The neurobiology of dyslexia. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 51*(3), 175–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040059918820051

Kearns, D. M., Lyon, C., & Pollack, M. S. (2021). Teaching world and word knowledge to access content-area texts in co-taught classrooms. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 56*(4), 208–216. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451220944371

Kearns, D. M., Powell, S. R., Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2021). Peer-assisted learning strategies. In T. A. Collins & R. O. Hawkins (Eds.), *Peers as change agents: A guide to implementing peer-mediated interventions in schools* (pp. 61–75). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/med-psych/9780190068714.001.0001

Kearns, D. M., Rogers, H. J., Al Ghanem, R., & Koriakin, T. (2016). Semantic and phonological ability to adjust recoding: A unique correlate of word reading skill? *Scientific Studies of Reading, 20*(6), 455–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2016.1217865

Kieffer, M. J., Petscher, Y., Proctor, C. P., & Silverman, R. D. (2016). Is the whole greater than the sum of its parts? Modeling the contributions of language comprehension skills to reading comprehension in the upper elementary grades. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 20*(6), 436–454. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2016.1214591

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015). *Essentials of assessing, preventing, and overcoming reading difficulties*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kim, Y.-S. G. (2015). Developmental, component-based model of reading fluency: An investigation of word-reading fluency, text-reading fluency, and reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 50*(4), 459–481.

Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. *Psychological Review, 95*(2), 163–182.

Kintsch, W., & Welsch, D. M. (2013). The construction-integration model: A framework for studying memory for text. In S. Lewandowsky & B. B. Murdock (Eds.), *Relating theory and data* (pp. 381–400). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203772331

Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1999). Promoting reading comprehension, content learning, and English acquisition through Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). *The Reading Teacher, 52*(7), 738–747.

Knowledge Matters Campaign. (2021). *Knowledge Matters Campaign concept paper: Restoring wonder and excitement to the classroom*.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology, 6*(2), 293–323.

Liberman, I. Y., Shankweiler, D., & Liberman, A. M. (1989). The alphabetic principle and learning to read. In D. Shankweiler and I. Y. Liberman (Eds.), *Phonology and reading disability: Solving the reading puzzles* (IARLD Research Monograph Series). University of Michigan Press.

Lindsey, J. (2022). *Reading above the fray: Reliable, research-based routines for developing decoding skills*. Scholastic.

Lopez, F. (2017). Altering the trajectory of the self-fulfilling prophecy: Asset-based pedagogy and classroom dynamics. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(2), 193–212.

Lou, Y., Abrami, P. C., Spence, J. C., Poulsen, C., Chambers, B., & d'Apollonia, S. (1996). Within-class grouping: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 423–458.

Lukidis, L. (2023). *Deep, deep down: The secret underwater poetry of the Mariana Trench*. Capstone.

Lupo, S. M., Strong, J. Z., Lewis, W., Walpole, S., & McKenna, M. C. (2018). Building background knowledge through reading: Rethinking text sets. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 61*(4), 433–444.

MacArthur, C. A. (2019). Evaluation and revision. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & M. Hebert (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 240–260). Guilford Press.

Malkus, N. (Host). (2019, September 20). Is the achievement gap actually a knowledge gap [Audio podcast episode]. In *The Report Card with Nat Malkus*. American Enterprise Institute. https://www.aei.org/podcast/is-the-achievement-gap-actually-a-knowledge-gap-with-natalie-wexler-and-ashley-berner

Manyak, P. C., Baumann, J. F., & Manyak, A. M. (2018). Morphological analysis instruction in the elementary grades: Which morphemes to teach and how to teach them. *The Reading Teacher, 72*(3), 289–300.

McCarthy, K. S., & McNamara, D. S. (2021). The multidimensional knowledge in text comprehension framework. *Educational Psychologist, 56*(3), 196–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1872379

McNamara, D. S., & Magliano, J. (2009). Toward a comprehensive model of comprehension. In B. H. Ross (Ed.), *Psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 51, pp. 297–384). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-7421(09)51009-2

Mesmer, H. A. E. (2019). *Letter lessons and first words*. Heinemann.

Mesmer, H. A. E. (2024). *Big words for little kids*. Heinemann.

Mesmer, H. A. E., & Kambach, A. (2022). Beyond labels and agendas: Research teachers need to know about phonics and phonological awareness. *The Reading Teacher, 76*(1), 62–72.

Mesmer, H. A. E., Cunningham, J. W., & Hiebert, E. H. (2012). Toward a theoretical model of text complexity for the early grades: Learning from the past, anticipating the future. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(3), 235–258.

Miller, D. (2012). Creating a classroom where readers flourish. *The Reading Teacher, 66*(2), 88–92.

Moats, L. C. (2020). Teaching reading "is" rocket science: What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do. *American Educator, 44*(2), 4–9.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

Muter, V., Hulme, C., Snowling, M., & Taylor, S. (1998). Segmentation, not rhyming, predicts early progress in learning to read. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 71*(1), 3–27.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). US Government Printing Office.

Peng, P., Wang, W., Filderman, M. J., Zhang, W., & Lin, L. (2024). The active ingredient in reading comprehension strategy intervention for struggling readers: A Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 94*(2), 228–267.

Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(6), 510-519.

Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (2012). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Routledge.

Pressley, M., El-Dinary, P. B., Gaskins, I., Schuder, T., Bergman, J. L., Almasi, J., & Brown, R. (1992). Beyond direct explanation: Transactional instruction of reading comprehension strategies. *The Elementary School Journal, 92*(5), 513–555.

RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *A research agenda for improving reading comprehension*. RAND Corporation.

Raphael, T. E., Highfield, K., & Au, K. H. (2001). *QAR now: A powerful and practical framework that develops comprehension and high-level thinking in all students*. Scholastic.

Rasinski, T. V., Padak, N. D., McKeon, C. A., Wilfong, L. G., Friedauer, J. A., & Heim, P. (2005). Is reading fluency a key for successful high school reading? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(1), 22–27.

Rasinski, T. V., Reutzel, D. R., Chard, D., & Linan-Thompson, S. (2011). Reading fluency. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 4, pp. 286–319). Routledge.

Reutzel, D. R. (2015). Early literacy research: Findings primary-grade teachers will want to know. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(1), 14–24.

Reutzel, D. R. (2022). *Putting scientific evidence to work in reading instruction* [Whitepaper]. Curriculum Associates.

Reutzel, D. R., Clark, S. K., Jones, C. D., & Gillam, S. L. (2016). *Young meaning makers: Teaching comprehension, grades K–2*. Teachers College Press.

Reutzel, D. R., Smith, J. A., & Fawson, P. C. (2005). An evaluation of two approaches for teaching reading comprehension strategies in the primary years using science information texts. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20*(3), 276–305.

Rose, T., Rouhani, P., & Fischer, K. (2013). The science of the individual. *Mind, Brain, and Education, 7*(3), 152–158.

Roth, K., & Dabrowski, J. (2014). Extending interactive writing into grades 2–5. *The Reading Teacher, 68*(1), 33–44.

Shanahan, T. (2019). Why children should be taught to read with more challenging texts. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy, 45*(4), 17–24.

Shanahan, T., & Beck, I. L. (2006). Effective literacy teaching for English-language learners. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (pp. 415–488). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED512029.

Shanahan, T., & Lonigan, C. J. (2010). The National Early Literacy Panel: A summary of the process and the report. *Educational Researcher, 39*(4), 279–285.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in Language Disorders, 32*(1), 7–18.

Seif, E., & McTighe, J. (2021). *Teaching for lifelong learning: How to prepare students for a changing world*. Solution Tree Press.

Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Holmes, G. C., Madden, N. A., & Chamberlain, A. (2013). Effects of a data-driven district reform model on state assessment outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(2), 371–396.

Smith, R., Snow, P., Serry, T., & Hammond, L. (2021). The role of background knowledge in reading comprehension: A critical review. *Reading Psychology, 42*(3), 214–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2021.1888348

Spichtig, A. N., Hiebert, E. H., Vorstius, C., Pascoe, J. P., Pearson, P. D., & Radach, R. (2016). The decline of comprehension-based silent reading efficiency in the United States: A comparison of current data with performance in 1960. *Reading Research Quarterly, 51*(2), 239–259.

Spooner, F., Baker, J., Harris, A., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., & Browder, D. (2007). Effects of training in universal design for learning on lesson plan development. *Remedial and Special Education, 28*(2), 108–116.

Stahl, S. A. (1986). Three principles of effective vocabulary instruction. *Journal of Reading, 29*(7), 662–668.

Steacy, L. M., Kearns, D. M., Gilbert, J. K., Compton, D. L., Cho, E., Lindstrom, E. R., & Collins, A. A. (2017). Exploring individual differences in irregular word recognition among children with early-emerging and late-emerging word reading difficulty. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*(1), 51–65.

Steiner, D., Magee, J., & Jensen, B. (2018). *What we teach matters: How quality curriculum improves student outcomes*. Learning First.

Strachan, S. L. (2014). Expanding the range of text types used in the primary grades. *The Reading Teacher, 68*(4), 303–311.

Swan, G., & Mazur, J. (2011). Examining data-driven decision making via formative assessment: A confluence of technology, data interpretation heuristics, and curricular policy. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 11*(2), 205–222.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership, 55*(4), 23–26.

Toste, J. R., Capin, P., Williams, K. J., Cho, E., & Vaughn, S. (2019). Replication of an experimental study investigating the efficacy of a multisyllabic word reading intervention with and without motivational beliefs training for struggling readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 52*(1), 45–58.

van den Broek, P., & Kendeou, P. (2022). Reading comprehension I: Discourse. In M. J. Snowling, C. Hulme, & K. Nation (Eds.), *The science of reading: A handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 239–260). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119705116.ch11

Van Orman, D. S., Gotch, C. M., & Carbonneau, K. J. (2024). Preparing teacher candidates to assess for learning: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research, 95*(3), 427–463.

Vardy, E. J., Al Otaiba, S., Breadmore, H. L., Kung, S. H., Pétursdóttir, A. L., Zaru, M. W., & McMaster, K. L. (2022). Teacher–researcher partnership in the translation and implementing of PALS (Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies): An international perspective. *Journal of Research in Reading, 45*(3), 517–526. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12404

Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., & Chard, D. J. (2000). The underlying message in LD intervention research: Findings from research syntheses. *Exceptional Children, 67*(1), 99–114.

Vaughn, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D. K., Sanchez, M., St Martin, K., & Yañez, A. (2022). *Providing reading interventions for students in grades 4–9. Educator's practice guide* (WWC 2022007). What Works Clearinghouse.

Vaughn, S., Roberts, G., Capin, P., Miciak, J., Cho, E, & Fletcher, J. (2019). How initial word reading and language skills affect reading comprehension outcomes for students with reading difficulties. *Exceptional Children, 85*(2), 180–196.

Wagner, R. K., & Torgesen, J. K. (1987). The nature of phonological processing and its causal role in the acquisition of reading skills. *Psychological Bulletin, 101*(2), 192–212.

Wanzek, J., & Roberts, T. (2012). Reading interventions with varying instructional emphases for fourth graders with reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 35*(2), 90–101.

Wexler, J. A., Kearns, D. M., Hogan, E., Clancy, E. E., & Shelton, A. (2020). Preparing to implement evidence-based literacy practices in the co-taught classroom. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 56*(4), 200–207. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451220944369

Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. ASCD.

Williams, C. (2018). Learning to write with interactive writing instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 71*(5), 523–532.

Williams, C., Phillips-Birdsong, C., Hufnagel, K., Hungler, D., & Lundstrom, R. P. (2009). Word study instruction in the K–2 classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(7), 570–578.

Willingham, D. T. (2017). *The reading mind: A cognitive approach to understanding how the mind reads*. Jossey-Bass.

Zeno, S. M., Ivens, S. H., Millard, R. T., & Duvvuri, R. (1995). *The educator's word frequency guide*. Touchstone Applied Science Associates.

Zucker, T. A., Cabell, S. Q., & Pico, D. L. (2021). Going nuts for words: Recommendations for teaching young students academic vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher, 74*(5), 581–594.

Zwiers, J. (2006). Integrating academic language, thinking, and content: Learning scaffolds for non-native speakers in the middle grades. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*(4), 317–332.

Zwiers, J., Dieckmann, J., Rutherford-Quach, S., Daro, V., Skarin, R., Weiss, S., & Malamut, J. (2017). *Principles for the design of mathematics curricula: Promoting language and content development*. Stanford University. http://ell.stanford.edu/content/mathematics-resources-additional-resources

Magnetic Literacy™

Discover a Curriculum That Thinks Forward

Curriculum Associates