

Members of the Committee. Thank you for allowing me to speak with you today. My name is Dr. Kristi Tamte. I am an Assistant Professor of Teacher Development at Saint Cloud State University. I teach literacy courses to future elementary teachers. I would like to share my grave concerns about the Read Act and the Science of Reading. The Science of Reading comes from the field of Special Education and was designed to support children with a specific learning disability. Requiring a Science of Reading approach for all children in our schools will **harm** children who do not need such a **remedial** program and narrow view of reading. The Science of Reading is not new. It has been in our schools since the 1950s. In 2010, the US Department of Education reviewed 50 years of research on the Science of Reading through Orton Gillingham and found there was NO evidence of effectiveness. In 2021, England published their report on their implementation of the Science of Reading and found that this approach failed. Follow this link to read about this: (<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2022/jan/19/focus-on-phonics-to-teach-reading-is-failing-children-says-landmark-study>). All the major literacy organizations oppose this type of implementation of the Science of Reading. This includes the International Literacy Association, The Literacy Research Association, and The National Council of Teachers of English. The media, SoR, and journalists have **misinformed** the public with **false** attacks on higher education. Please correct the false attacks on higher education and know that:

1. Literacy professors **DO** support explicit teaching of phonics and foundational skills. We **DO NOT** teach children to simply guess words to read (as SoR has falsely accused).
2. The programs vilified by Emily Hanford and SoR, [Reading Recovery](#) and [LLI](#) , **DO** have evidence of effectiveness, as reviewed by the **National Assessment for Education Evaluation** (an organization within the US Dept of Education to review high quality research and determine

which instruction/programs work), and the approach and program promoted by the science of reading and Emily Hanford does **NOT** have evidence of effectiveness [Science of Reading-Orton Gillingham](#) . Follow this link <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Resources/Evidence>, and search for Reading Recovery and LLI (the approaches attacked by SoR) and see the reading achievement evidence for yourself. Then search for Orton Gillingham (SoR) to see the lack of evidence across 50 years of research in our schools with this instructional approach.

There are many different profiles of reading difficulties and barriers to learning for our children. Science of Reading only addresses one of these profiles. This funding for the Science of Reading is **unethical** considering the wide variety of needs we have in our schools today that will go unmet because of this bill. I urge you to vote 'no' to this bill and research the negative impact of requiring SoR (a Dyslexia intervention) for ALL children in schools. Please call on literacy researchers and literacy professors who can provide perspective to this bill and draw on the wealth of information we know (through the International Literacy Association, Literacy Research Association, National Council of Teacher Education) about how to teach children to read. Here are some more helpful links that address concerns with this SoR takeover:

<https://literacyresearchassociation.org/tag/science-of-reading/>

<https://ncte.org/blog/2022/12/science-reading-state-policies/>

<https://ncte.org/blog/2020/10/critical-story-science-reading-narrow-plotline-putting-children-schools-risk/>

<https://ncte.org/blog/2022/09/the-never-ending-debate-and-the-need-for-a-different-approach-to-reading-instruction/>

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/23813377211024625>

<https://www.literacyworldwide.org/docs/default-source/resource-documents/rrq-sor-executive-summary.pdf#:~:text=The%20International%20Literacy%20Association%20%28ILA%29%20defi>

[nes%20SOR%20as,approach%20that%20prioritizes%20basic%20science%20and%20experimental%20work.](#)

<https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/publications/REVISED%20FYI%20Ed%20Deans%20Reading%20copy.pdf>

<https://plthomasedd.medium.com/the-science-of-reading-movement-fails-implementation-science-75cb320fea3b>

<https://radicalscholarship.com/2022/08/29/beware-the-reading-league/>

<https://ila.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/rrq.353>

[Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/@DrAndyJohnson>

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/01614681231155688>

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2022/jan/19/focus-on-phonics-to-teach-reading-is-failing-children-says-landmark-study>