

February 27, 2023

RE: HF 629, The Read Act

Dear Honorable Members of the Minnesota House Education Policy Committee:

My name is Michael Young. I am an assistant professor of education at the University of Minnesota Duluth. I am a former elementary teacher, instructional coach, district-level curriculum leader, and literacy consultant. I currently serve as a teacher educator and education researcher in Duluth. In my research, I examine language and discourse to examine implications of education policy on the local level. Through this work, I engage in dialogue with administrators, educators, students, and parents. It is based on my experience as an educator, curriculum leader, teacher educator, and education researcher that I request the committee to reconsider its commitment to the science of reading in HF629, The Read Act.

While I could testify to many considerations in this bill, it is the discourse of science that I find the most concerning. Proponents of the science of reading often assert 1.) systematic, explicit phonics instruction is the foundation for reading success; 2.) this foundation has been *proven* by science as *the effective way* for teaching *all children* to read; and that 3.) this science is *settled* (Hanford, 2018; Goldstein, 2020). Science discourse is used in this way to silence dissent, to mischaracterize alternate perspectives, and to establish a one-size-fits-all approach to reading instruction and learning. However, as Kumashiro (2001) highlights, science is bound by the parameters of the questions it asks, “what it finds (or chooses not to find) and publicizes (or chooses not to publicize), science can have different political and material consequences on different populations, justifying the privileging of certain groups and the marginalization of

others” (p. 4). Let us remember that science was also used to justify the enslavement of millions of African men, women, and children in this country. Science was also used to justify IQ testing to identify those who need special education services (Willis, 2019), building a special education environment in this country with overwhelmingly disproportionate placement of people of color in special education environments. In fact, as Milner (2020) puts it, when scientific knowledge is limited to quantitative inquiry, and constructed by a cadre of predominantly white researchers adopting similar theoretical orientations, questions, and methods, “what science is missed, ignored, overlooked, underexplored, misinterpreted, overgeneralized, and undernuanced about reading when knowledge construction is not diverse and representative of the varied racial identities of students under study?” (p. S250).

Yet, I agree that many of the core components of learning to read promoted by science of reading proponents are important for literacy teaching and learning. These components (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) are already included in the [Minnesota 2020 K-12 English Language Arts Standards](#). Further, the [Standards for Effective Practice](#) offer ways for thinking about literacy teaching and learning through culturally responsive and sustaining practices that don’t work to promote what Baker-Bell (2020) calls white language supremacy. Yet, education professionals in school districts have yet to fully implement these standards due to the interruptions to schooling and daily life that we have all experienced in the past few years.

I encourage the committee to leverage the Read Act to provide districts opportunities to develop robust literacy plans, including instruction, assessment, professional learning, and continuous improvement. However, rather than codifying the highly contested discourse of the

science of reading in statute, I encourage the committee to provide the tools through this act to implement standards that have already been developed but not fully implemented.

Thank you for your consideration,

*Michael J. Young*

Michael Young

1802 W. Arrowhead Road

Duluth, MN 55811

## References

- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Goldstein, D. (2020, February 15). An old and contested solution to boost reading scores: Phonics. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/15/us/reading-phonics.html>
- Hanford, E. (2018, September 10). Hard words: Why aren't kids being taught to read? *APM Reports*. <https://www.apmreports.org/story/2018/09/10/hard-words-why-american-kids-arent-being-taught-to-read>.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2001). "Posts" perspectives on anti-oppressive education in social studies, English, mathematics, and science classrooms. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), pp. 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003003>
- Milner, H. R. (2020). Disrupting racism and whiteness in researching a science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), S94-S293. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.347>
- Willis, A. I. (2019). Race, response to intervention, and reading research. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 51(4), 394-419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X19877463>



## Literacy Faculty Response to “the Science of Reading”

### Introduction

With this brief, we — Minnesota State University, Mankato’s (MNSU) Literacy Education faculty — offer a research-based response to current “Science of Reading” (SOR) lobbying and proposed legislation ([HF 629](#)) that threatens to de-professionalize Minnesota teachers and divert state public-education dollars to private, corporate-backed entities.

While we agree with some points made by SOR proponents, for example that phonemic awareness is a key element in early literacy acquisition, we strongly disagree with this lobby’s narrow and selective reliance on quantitative research and standardized test scores in making its recommendations. Moreover, we object to this lobby’s political alignment with privatized interests currently working to dismantle public education and undermine teaching for critical citizenship and strong democracy. We agree that the opportunity gap in literacy education must be addressed, yet we do not support initiatives that undermine fundamental aspects of equitable literacy instruction.

Our hope is that Minnesota state educators and legislators will look carefully into misleading SOR claims in order to avoid being persuaded to waste further resources, including taxpayer dollars, on expensive literacy materials and training regimens designed to benefit private interests, most prominently those represented by Lexia Learning and its parent company Cambium Learning Group Inc. which recently received a \$2.2 billion direct loan from Blackstone Group Inc. (Lee & Raimonde, 2021).

To that end, our brief focuses on three misleading claims currently driving the SOR narrative:

- 1) There is a crisis in K-12 Minnesota reading pedagogy and outcomes (test scores) that can only be rectified through the proliferation of SOR curricular materials and frameworks;
- 2) The SOR research base provides “proven” solutions to the alleged statewide reading crisis; and
- 3) SOR’s back-to-basics pedagogy provides the most “appropriate” approach to reading today for all Minnesota students (“The Science of Reading,” n.d.).

Below, we address each of these claims in turn:

# 1. There is a crisis in state reading outcomes that can only be rectified with SOR curriculum.

Example Claim: “When 60% of Minnesota students do not read at grade level, this problem is not just a dyslexia problem. During the 2021 Minnesota Legislative Session, the bill that we supported passed, allocating \$3 million toward providing LETRS training for Minnesota teachers. (LETRS training aligns with the science of reading, is scalable and cost effective for schools).” (“The Science of Reading,” n.d.).

Response: There is no statewide crisis in K-12 reading. Claims such as the one above by the Dyslexia Institute of Minnesota are often made without reference to the source of information or the methods by which a measure like 60% below grade level has been determined.

- The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) claims to release MCA “test results” every year; however, test scores are never actually reported. Because of changes in the MCA and MTAS test, the MDE advises that year-to-year comparisons not be made. Instead, students’ results are put into four arbitrarily defined categories: (a) exceeds the standards (proficient), (2) meets the standards (proficient), (3) partially meets the standards (not proficient), and (4) does not meet the standards (not proficient). Results are reported in terms of percentages in each category. Hence, they do not compare test scores; rather, they compare percentages in the four arbitrarily defined categories.
- By contrast, National Assessment of Educational Program (NAEP) results are comparable from year-to-year and from state-to-state (NCES, 2023). Minnesota reading scores have always been above the national average (see Figures 1 and 2). The drop in scores from 2019 to 2022 reflects the expected pandemic fluctuation.

**Figure 1. NAEP average 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading scores.**

	1998	2019	2022
Minnesota Average	222	222	216
National Average	215	219	215

**Figure 2. NAEP average 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading scores.**

	1998	2019	2022
Minnesota Average	265	264	260
National Average	261	262	259

- SOR’s recommended curriculum consists of prescribed approaches that focus on scripted, direct instruction of low-level skills. While these methods may be effective in producing higher test scores on low-level skills in the short term, they do not transfer to effectiveness supporting the higher-level skills involved in reading comprehension, nor do they inspire children to be lifelong readers (Epply & Dudley-Marling, 2018).

## 2. The SOR research base provides “proven” solutions to the alleged reading crisis.

Example Claim: “The body of research evidence known as the Science of Reading is comprised of more than 40 years of research into how we learn to read. Additionally, the body of research that provides the foundation for the Science of Reading consists of analyses of the instructional practices that have been repeated and validated consistently, over time, with proven results” (“The Science of Reading,” McGraw Hill).

Response: By privileging a singular methodology (i.e., controlled-experimental), SOR research overlooks significant social and cognitive complexities involved in reading and discounts countervailing findings derived from other valid and reliable research methodologies (Soler, 2017; Yaden, et al., 2021).

- SOR research asserts one exclusive way of determining causality and making claims as to what constitutes knowledge. SOR’s favored controlled-experimental approach reflects a mechanistic paradigm that, when applied to human behavior, erroneously reduces social phenomena to sets of controllable variables (Soler, 2017).
- SOR looks only to controlled-experimental studies that support using the phonological processing model, resulting in a body of research that merely affirms SOR advocates’ pre-existing assumptions.
- This narrow view of what counts as “the science” of reading disregards much of what is known about “how reading operates, develops, is taught, shapes academic and cognitive growth, affects motivation and emotion, interacts with context... [because] it includes genetic, biological, environmental, contextual, social, political, historical, and cultural factors that influence reading” (Graham as cited in Goodwin and Jimenez, 2020, p. 58).
- SOR’s favored instructional method — the phonological processing model — is sometimes referred to by researchers as “the simple view of reading” for its understanding of reading as merely the sounding out of words (Cervettie, et al., 2020; Duke & Cartwright, 2021; Hoffman, 2017). While sounding-out-words instruction has its place for setting a foundation for reading, it does not turn out to be equally beneficial for all learners, nor does it speak to the higher-order thinking learners need for reading complex texts and our complex world (Lipson & Wixson, 2009).
- Overemphasis on phonics has been demonstrated to create misunderstandings regarding the purpose of reading for young readers (Smith, 2006). While a singular focus on direct phonics instruction may promote knowledge of phonics, the imbalance in phonics

instruction over meaning-based approaches may simultaneously remove reading from the authentic contexts where children do not just learn to read words but read for meaning and keep reading central in their lives for authentic purposes.

- SOR’s privileging of phonics instruction can actually harm multilingual learners’ literacy acquisition by ignoring their native phonemic systems as it doubles down on methods presumed to be equally beneficial for all (Johnston & Scanlon, 2020; Luke, 1995).

### **3. SOR’s back-to-basics pedagogy – where “everything old is new again” – provides the most “appropriate” approach to reading today for all Minnesota students.**

Example Claim: “The phrase, ‘everything old is new again’ comes to mind when we talk about the Science of Reading (SOR). **SOR refers to the growing body of scientific research that describes how the human brain learns to read, the skills kids need to develop to become proficient readers, and the appropriate methods to use to teach those skills effectively**” (“The Science of Reading,” n.d.; emphasis Dyslexia Institute of MN).

Response: As literacy faculty committed to our College of Education’s vision to educate for “racial consciousness, social justice, and inclusion within a global context,” we are deeply skeptical of SOR advocates’ promotion of teaching methods developed by scientists, physicians, and educators during the Jim Crow era (e.g., the Orton-Gillingham approach).

- In the given historical moment, with our state still seeking racial reckoning in the wake of George Floyd’s murder, and as historic opportunity gaps continue to plague nearly every facet of life in Minnesota, the notion of everything old becoming new again strikes a dissonant chord.
- In this same historical moment, virtually [all of our professional organizations](#) are calling on us to leverage our work in the interest of racial equity and social justice in education. Most professional literacy organizations recognize that reading goes beyond neuro-scientific processes. It is a sociocultural activity where readers draw on their culture, identity, and personal experiences to make meaning from texts (Barton, 2007; Gutiérrez, 2008; Perry, 2012). Recognition of the integral nature of children’s culturally situated experiences in reading is a significant part of promoting justice in literacy education (Aukerman & Schuldt, 2021).
- Among these organizations, the [Literacy Research Association](#), the [International Literacy Association](#), and the [National Council of Teachers of English](#) are urging us to look with skepticism on SOR claims for the reasons outlined above. Importantly, the International



Literacy Association urges us to consider “the sciences of reading” beyond narrow SOR frameworks in the interest of meeting the needs of diverse multilingual learners.

- We note that many organizations currently leading either privatizing initiatives for public education or attacks on critical teaching in public schools (Kumashiro, 2020, 2021) also happen to be supporters of SOR. In Minnesota, this includes The Center of the American Experiment which promotes SOR (Wigfall, 2022) as it simultaneously leads charges against initiatives such as Minnesota State’s evidence-based Equity 2030 (Kersten, 2022).

## Analysis

Misleading SOR claims like those addressed above reflect what many in the educational-research community recognize as culture-war narratives designed to instill fear in the public about its allegedly failing education system (Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Kumashiro, 2008, 2015, 2020; MacPhee et al., 2021; Sleeter et al., 2018). With divisive storylines pitting whole-language vs. phonics, cueing vs. direct instruction, qualitative vs. quantitative research, and so on (Suskind, 2020), SOR lobbyists propagate the notion that public-school teachers are failing children by neglecting their duty to carry out scientifically “proven” best practices. In turn, they hope state representatives and other officials will invest in “solutions” developed and packaged by corporate-backed nonprofits and private for-profit ventures (Gabriel, 2020).

Educational policy expert Kevin Kumashiro (2008) notes the following about the economic interests served by these culture-war tactics in education:

The fear of a failing education system has helped to advance the standards-and-testing movement, which in turn creates opportunities for profit. Scripted curriculums require textbooks, worksheets, teacher guides, and other materials to be purchased by schools or districts. High-stakes tests require testing sheets, scoring services, tutoring services, study guides, and other materials, also to be purchased by schools or states. Defining only certain methods to be “scientifically proven” privileges certain kinds of research in competition for funding, publishing, and other forms of support (p. 47).

Kumashiro extends analysis to the end result of such fear mongering and opportunism in education: *compliance to authority* rather than the kind of independent thinking needed for sustaining a strong democracy.

As university literacy faculty concerned with the future of public education and its historic role sustaining democracy (Arnstine, 1995; Ayers et al., 2016; Dewey, 1923; Kumashiro, 2020), we reject SOR’s attempt to sensationalize a reading “crisis” for purposes of distributing curricular materials and frameworks investors like Veritas and Blackstone have clearly been looking for returns on (“Cambium Learning Group,” 2018; Lee & Raimonde, 2021). We reject notions that scripted or otherwise teacher-proof SOR curriculums are most “appropriate” for Minnesota’s

reading teachers who must also foster the critical-thinking skills needed for comprehending complex texts and their meaning in relation to the world beyond the classroom walls. Along these same lines, we reject the notion that SOR frameworks may lead Minnesota classrooms back to simpler times prior to the civil-rights movement when all students presumably benefited from their reading teachers' primary focus on phonemic awareness, decoding, and other narrowly prescribed close-reading strategies. We reject notions that SOR is the solution to a legacy of racial and socio-economic injustices in our state and that adoption of SOR curriculum and methodology will close opportunity gaps in Minnesota public schools.

Knowing how strict formalist approaches to reading have historically served to uphold existing relations of white power (Luke, 1995; Maxwell, 2014), we ask, *what will teachers and students be directed away from as they focus more on socially abstracted decoding skills?* While we recognize the desire to provide linguistically diverse students with equitable literacy instruction, we also question at what cost the exclusive use of SOR approaches will come, as the reading process for linguistically diverse students becomes solely about the adoption of standardized phonemic systems. While Minnesota students do indeed need basic skills for deciphering the printed word, they also need teachers who have the freedom to determine what's best for their own students, who can promote authentic inquiry and independent thinking in the reading process, who honor and value a diversity of linguistic identities, and who can above all teach for critical citizenship in a strong democracy.

## **Authors**

Rick Lybeck, PhD

Beth Beschorner, PhD

Rebekah Degener, PhD

Andy Johnson, PhD

Belle Nelson, MLIS

## **References**

Arnstine, D. (1995). *Democracy and the arts of schooling*. Suny Press.

Aukerman, M., & Schuldt, L., (2021). What matters most? Toward a robust and socially just science of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56, s85-s103.

Ayers, W., Kumashiro, K., Meiners, E., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (2016). *Teaching toward democracy: Educators as agents of change*. Routledge.

- Barton, D. (2007). *Literacy: An introduction to the ecology of written language* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Cambium Learning Group enters into definitive merger agreement with Veritas Capital. (2018, October 15). *Globe News Wire*. <https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2018/10/15/1621002/0/en/Cambium-Learning-Group-Enters-Into-Definitive-Merger-Agreement-with-Veritas-Capital.html>
- Cervettie, G.N., Pearson, P.D., Palincsar, A.S., Afflerbach, P., Kendeou, P., Biancarosa, G., Higgs, J., Fitzgerald, M., & Berman, A. (2020). How the reading for understanding initiative's research complicates the simple view of reading involved in the science of reading. *Reading Research Quarter*, 55, 161-172.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Carney, M. C., Keefe, E. S., Burton, S., Chang, W. C., Fernandez, M. B., ... & Baker, M. (2018). *Reclaiming accountability in teacher education*. Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1923). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Macmillan.
- Duke, N., & Cartwright, K., (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56, 25-44.
- Eppley, K., & Dudley-Marling, C. (2018). Does direct instruction work? A critical assessment of direct instruction research and its theoretical perspective. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 14, 1-20.
- Gabriel, R. E. (2020). Converting to privatization: A discourse analysis of dyslexia policy narratives. *American Educational Research Journal*, 57(1), 305-338.
- Goodwin, A. & Jimenez, R. (2020). The Science of Reading: Supports, critiques, and questions. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S1), 7-16.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148–164.
- ILA Board. (2020, June 3). ILA stands for justice and equality. International Literacy Association. <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/blog/literacy-now/2020/06/03/ila-stands-for-justice-and-equality>

- Hoffman, J. (2017). Comprehension is not simple: Considering the persistent dangers in the simple view of reading comprehension. In S. Israel & G. Duffy (Ed). *Handbook of Research on Reading Comprehension* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.57-69). Guilford.
- Johnston, P., and Scanlon, D. (2020, December 8). An examination of dyslexia research and instruction, with policy implications. *Literacy Research Association: Literacy Research Report*. <https://literacyresearchassociation.org/news/literacy-research-association-releases-dyslexia-research-report/>
- Kersten, K. (2022, August 28). At Minnesota State, equity's in, learning is out. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*. <https://www.startribune.com/at-minnesota-state-equitys-in-learning-is-out/600201895/>
- King, J. B., and Davis, J. (2022, November 16). *The 74*. <https://www.the74million.org/article/science-of-reading-john-king-close-literacy-gap/>
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2008). *The seduction of common sense: How the right has framed the debate on America's schools. Teaching for Social Justice*. Teachers College Press..
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2015). *Bad teacher! How blaming teachers distorts the bigger picture: How blaming teachers distorts the bigger picture*. Teachers College Press.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2020). *Surrendered: Why progressives are losing the biggest battles in education*. Teachers College Press.
- Kumashiro, K. (2021). Understanding the attacks on teaching: A background brief for educators and leaders. Retrieved from <https://www.kevinkumashiro.com/attacksonteaching>
- Lee, L., and Raimonde, O. (2021, July 28). Blackstone group gives \$2.2 billion loan as private debt sets records. *Bloomberg*. <https://www.bcred.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2021/09/Bloomberg-Blackstone-Gives-2.2B-Loan.pdf>
- Lipson, M.Y., & Wixon, K.K. (2009). *Assessment and instruction of reading and writing difficulties: An interactive approach*. Pearson.
- LRA (2021, March 25). Racial justice research report. *Literacy Research Association*. <https://literacyresearchassociation.org/news/racial-justice-research-report/>
- Luke, A. (1995). When basic skills and information processing just aren't enough: Rethinking reading in new times. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 95-115.
- MacPhee, D., Handsfield, L. J., & Paugh, P. (2021). Conflict or conversation? Media portrayals of the Science of Reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 145–155.

- Maxwell, A. (2014). *The indicted South: Public criticism, Southern inferiority, and the politics of whiteness*. UNC Press Books.
- NCES - National Center for Education Statistics (February 10, 2023). *National Assessment of Educational Progress – Reading*. US Department of Education.  
<https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/>
- Perry, K. (2012). What is literacy?—A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 8(1), 50–71.
- Smith, F. (2006). *Reading without nonsense* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Soler, J. (2017). The politics of the teaching of reading. *Prospects* 46, 423–433 (2016).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-017-9415-8>
- Suskind, D. (2020, November 17). The critical story of the “Science of Reading” and why its narrow plotline is putting our children and schools at risk. Retrieved October 27, 2022, from <https://ncte.org/blog/2020/10/critical-story-science-reading-narrow-plotline-putting-children-schools-risk/>
- The Science of Reading. (n.d.). The Reading Center. Dyslexia Institute of Minnesota.  
<https://www.thereadingcenter.org/science-of-reading>
- The Science of Reading. (n.d.). McGraw-Hill. <https://www.mheducation.com/prek-12/explore/science-of-reading.html>
- Wigfall, C. (2022, August 24). Of states with ‘science of reading’ policies, Minnesota doing the least. *Center of the American Experiment*. <https://www.americanexperiment.org/of-states-with-science-of-reading-policies-minnesota-doing-the-least/>
- Windle, J., & Batista, S. (2019). The global circulation of literacy policy: Phonics, inequality and neo-conservative political movements. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada*, 19(2), 385-406.
- Yaden, D. B., Reinking, D., & Smagorinsky, P. (2021). The trouble with binaries: A perspective on the Science of Reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 119–129.

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee:

I am writing as a classroom teacher of 18 years and current literacy coach in St. Paul Public Schools; the following written testimony for the READ act and are my own views. I care deeply about how reading and writing is supported for all students. While I am thankful you are taking the time to support our students' literacy development, I am concerned about some of language of the Read Act. While it mentions equity, the specific language around the curriculum and professional development does not address equity and will, therefore not support all of our students.

First, I've been following the evolution of the bill a bit and appreciate the updates that include a more expansive view of literacy; I notice that more curricular and professional development options are included in the bill and I believe there is more work to be done.

What I know is that students in our schools need responsive literacy instruction. I know this because our students speak 140+ languages and come to us with rich, every day and home literacies. This is not addressed in the bill because we cannot stop by including curricula that use culturally and linguistically diverse materials. Although representation matters, it does not mean pedagogy will be culturally and linguistically responsive and tailored to our students' needs. Instead, we need funding that supports teachers' capacity in culturally and linguistically responsive literacy instruction and adding more trained educators in this capacity. As this bill is now, it does not include this support.

Thank you for your consideration and your work in supporting our students' literacy development.

Anne Sawyer Beach  
Literacy Coach, SPPS

February 27, 2023

Dear Chair Pryor and Members of the House Education Policy Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on HF 629 - The Read Act.

I know that there is urgency related to this bill. However, I urge you to take more time with this bill to get it right. There is too much at stake.

There are three issues with The Read Act that I would like to highlight:

1. The language related to important aspects of reading must be consistent in HF 629

As the bill is written, there is a lack of consistent language related to assessment, curriculum, and professional development. For example, culturally relevant pedagogy is mentioned in some parts of the bill, but not in other parts. Also, the terms 'evidence-based', 'structured literacy', and 'science of reading' are used in a variety of ways throughout the bill. We need clarity and transparency with these terms and how they relate to implementation.

2. The language in the bill needs to align with MDE's 2020 K-12 ELA Standards

As the bill is written, there is a narrow focus on a few of the foundational standards. However, the standards include more depth and breadth related to literacy learning. There has been significant time spent on developing these standards and they are being implemented in K-12 schools across the state. This bill must include critical aspects related to these standards.

3. We need to identify who qualifies as experts in literacy when implementing this bill

As the bill is written, there is language related to cultural and linguistic diversity, but it is unclear if the experts, as identified in the bill, are trained and qualified to implement these important aspects. For example, if a literacy specialist is only trained in structured literacy, are they able to implement aspects of the bill related to culturally and linguistically diverse students?

Thank you for taking time to consider these aspects related to The Read Act. If you would like to connect and collaborate on anything related to HF 629, please contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

Catherine S. Cavanaugh, PhD  
Certified Reading Specialist  
Past President of The Minnesota Reading Association

February 27, 2023

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee,

I'm writing in response to the current version of "The Read Act", sponsored by Representative Edelson. The following statement is mine, alone.

First, I appreciate the updated language in the bill in relation to culturally relevant and sustaining pedagogies and multilingual learners. I appreciate the "ands" in relation to science of reading and evidence-based reading and structured literacy. Both of those improvements suggest that there is some concern for inclusion of multiple perspectives.

Second, I suggest that policymakers consider improving the definition of "comprehension". As the definition reads today, it does not include "making meaning". One reason we want all children and youth to learn to read well is to comprehend. Comprehension is mainly about making meaning. If "understanding" is the same as "making meaning" then I have misunderstood the writing in the bill.

Third, policymakers ought to consider how these ideas line up with MDE's 2020 K-12 ELA Standards. I am concerned that if the majority of our dollars flow to early reading knowledge and implementation and assessment, then we are missing out on developing teachers' capacity in—for example—the teaching of writing or the teaching of literary analysis or comparing non-fiction sources. It seems more attention can be paid through MDE and the enormous funding to these other aspects of supporting all children in learning to read and participate fully in our democracy.

Finally, I do hope that MDE and policymakers consider the different needs for recent immigrants and refugee children and youth. It takes about 7 years of high-quality instruction for multilinguals to become proficient in English. Is there room to add aspects/connect parts of the LEAPS Act to this work?

Thank you for your work on this important topic.

Audrey Lensmire, PhD  
Associate Professor of Education  
Member: AACTE and AERA



Good afternoon. My name is Laurie Hahn Ganser, and I am here to testify against HF629. I am a career language arts and reading educator, and I have served school communities in the metro area in and around Minneapolis since 2011 as a language arts teacher, a reading interventionist, a literacy coach, and a curriculum coordinator. I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction focused on literacy education at the University of Minnesota, and I am a Minneapolis Public Schools parent of a 4th and 8th grader.

In June of 2019, I completed the first module of Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS). We studied teaching techniques and learning games, all in preparation for rolling out the professional learning series to every single kindergarten and first-grade teacher in the district. This initiative quickly took over measurable and immeasurable resources for teachers of kindergarten and first-grade at the expense of not only other elements of literacy but other content areas.

I am a reading teacher. I believe in the science of reading, foundational skills, and systematic instruction of foundational literacy skills. I can think of so many moments and so many students' faces when I watched them triumphantly read fluently and comfortably due to explicit instruction. Those moments feel like magic. I also understand that foundational skill instruction is one narrow slice of literacy instruction and a bill of this magnitude must consider other elements of literacy: reading engagement, culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally sustaining pedagogy for multilingual learners, and other elements of literacy that are named in our state standards and held up as critical by such organizations as the International Literacy Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Literacy Research Association. While I believe in explicit instruction of foundational skills, in HF629, I take issue with the way in which foundational skills have become a disproportionate focus at the expense of other equally critical elements of reading and literacy. This bill must change in order to consider the many elements of literacy that are represented in our state standards and in students' lives.

As the bill is written, I would like to highlight three major issues that come at the expense of the bill's narrow focus on foundational skills:

- 1.) In my experience in LETRS training, our trainers were not equipped to speak to culturally relevant pedagogy or multilingualism as it relates to teaching reading. The lack of attention to these needs will harm our most vulnerable students in Minnesota: students of color and multilingual learners. The bill does not adequately support accountability and professional development in order to serve these learners' needs.
- 2.) Teachers are responsible for ALL literacy standards and this bill represents only a narrow portion of them. Extensive financial and time investments have been made to develop and implement these standards and this bill neglects most of them.
- 3.) The bill requires revision to clarify what constitutes "evidence-based literacy instruction," "structured literacy," and "the science of reading." All of these terms represent broad bands of literacy within the field of research and yet, this bill only represents foundational skill instruction.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in opposition to this bill.