THE READING LEAGUE

Curriculum Navigation Report

myView Literacy Grades K–5

myView® LITERACY

2025 Publication
Reviewed with Curriculum Evaluation Guidelines (2nd Edition, 2023)

Introduction

CURRICULUM EVALUATION GUIDELINES DESCRIPTION

"Decisions regarding curriculum, instructional approaches, programs, and resources are critical and must be informed by more than experience, observations, or even belief systems. If we are to succeed in implementing effective practices, then we will need to embrace learning as a part of our work as much as teaching itself."

Hennessy, 2020, pg. 8.

Due to the popularity of the science of reading movement, the term "science of reading" has been used as a marketing tool, often promising a quick fix for decision makers seeking a program aligned with the scientific evidence base. However, as articulated in The Reading League's *Science of Reading: Defining Guide (2022)*,

> *The science of reading is a vast, interdisciplinary body of scientifically-based research about reading and issues related to reading and writing. Over the last five decades, this research has provided a preponderance of evidence to inform how proficient reading and writing develop; why some students have difficulty; and how educators can most effectively assess and teach, and, therefore, improve student outcomes through the prevention of and intervention for reading difficulties. (p.6)*

The Reading League's *Curriculum Evaluation Guidelines (CEGs)* are a resource developed to assist consumers in making informed decisions when selecting curricula and instructional materials that best support evidence-aligned instruction grounded in the science of reading.

The CEGs are anchored by frameworks validated by the science of reading. Findings from the science of reading provide additional understandings that substantiate both aligned and non-aligned practices (AKA "red flags") within the CEGs. These serve as a foundation for what to expect from published curricula that claim to be aligned with the scientific evidence of how students learn to read. The CEGs highlight best practices that align with the science of reading. Red flags specify any non-aligned practices in the following areas:



- **Word Recognition**
- **Language Comprehension**
- **Reading Comprehension**
- **Writing**
- **Assessment**



The CEGs have been used by educators, building and district leaders, local education agencies, and state education agencies as a primary tool to find evidence of red flags, or practices that may interfere with the development of skilled reading. While the CEGs have been useful for schools and districts for informing curricular and instructional decision-making, The Reading League recognized the challenge of school-based teams that might not have the capacity for an in-depth review process. In the spirit of its mission to advance the awareness, understanding, and use of evidence-aligned reading instruction, expert review teams engaged in a large-scale review of the most widely-used curricula currently used in the United States in order to develop informative reports of each.

This report was generated after a review of the curriculum using the March 2023 *Curriculum Evaluation Guidelines*, which have been refined based on feedback, a lengthy pilot review, and have undergone an inter-rater reliability study with positive results. As you read through the findings of this report, remember that red flags will be present for all curricula as there is no perfect curriculum. The intent of this report is not to provide a recommendation, but rather to provide information to local education agencies to support their journey of selecting, using, and refining instruction and instructional materials to ensure they align with the science of reading.

Disclaimer: The Reading League's curriculum review is deemed an informational educational resource and should not be construed as sales pitches or product promotion. The purpose of the review is to further our mission to advance the understanding, awareness, and use of evidence-aligned reading instruction.

Curriculum Description

The evaluation on the following pages features the review of the myView Literacy curriculum, which is created for students in Grades K–5. For this report, reviewers conducted a thorough examination of the available print and digital resources, including teacher-facing materials (e.g., Teacher's Editions, Reading Routine Companion, myFocus Intervention Materials, Assessment Guides, and Scope and Sequence Overviews), student-facing materials (e.g., Student Interactives, Decodable Readers, and Skills Practice Books), as well as classroom materials and manipulatives (e.g., Picture Word Cards, Alphabet Cards, and Sound Spelling Cards).

Reviewers were selected based on their deep knowledge of the science of reading and associated terminology and high-quality instructional materials. Once selected, they were assigned to teams of at least three reviewers. The team met regularly to establish reliability in their individual scores based on the Red Flag rubric that follows and to report their findings. For a more comprehensive description of the review process, visit The Reading League Compass's Curriculum Decision Makers page.



1 Red Flag statement is False.



2 Red Flag statement is minimally True. Evidence is minimal or briefly mentioned.



3 Red Flag statement is mostly True. If applicable, evidence is in multiple places throughout the curriculum.



4 Red Flag statement is always true, pervasive, and/or integral to the curriculum.



A black box indicates that this component is not addressed in this curriculum and must be addressed with other materials.

Reviewers used the notes section of each component to capture helpful evidence and notes, such as keywords that described a practice listed within the CEGs, specific examples, and precise locations of evidence. Notes were also included in the review of any optional aligned components.

Findings:

COMPONENTS SUPPORTING WORD RECOGNITION

1A: Word Recognition Non-Negotiables

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

WORD RECOGNITION NON-NEGOTIABLES	SCORE
1.1: Three cueing-systems are taught as strategies for decoding in early grades (i.e., directing students to use picture cues, context cues, or attend to the first letter of a word as a cue).	1
1.2: Guidance to memorize any whole words, including high frequency words, by sight without attending to the sound/symbol correspondences.	2
1.3: Supporting materials do not provide a systematic scope and sequence nor opportunities for practice and review of elements taught (e.g., phonics, decoding, encoding).	2

myView Literacy's **word recognition** non-negotiables are **"mostly met."** There was no evidence that the three-cueing system was taught as a strategy for decoding. However, the team could not locate strong evidence to support students learning to decode and practice decoding within the text. For example, in Grade 2, Unit 2, Week 4, students learn to read words with the long e sound, including "ee," "ea," "ey," "y," and "ie." Student's opportunities to practice this skill with text are included within the "weekly independent activity options" (Grade 2 Teacher's Edition, p. T214). This directs students to practice reading these words independently or with a partner. While teacher-led small groups may include decoding practice, only the teacher is directed to read the book aloud, and the students are not offered opportunities to decode independently (Grade 2 Teacher's Edition, p. T217).

Sound-symbol correspondences are discussed within the Reading Routines Companion, corresponding with the Teacher's Edition. When high-frequency words are introduced, teachers are instructed to reference these resources where additional practice and instructional routines can be found. The Reading Routines Companion includes a routine for "decodable" and "non-decodable" words. However, the Teacher's Edition does not specify which high-frequency words align with which routine as outlined in the myView scope and sequence. Teachers would need to rely on their knowledge to determine which words are decodable for the week. Additionally, the weekly planner provides guidance on teaching sound-symbol correspondences within high-frequency words on the first day of instruction. However, on days 2–5, the focus shifts solely to reading and spelling the words without emphasizing the connection between sounds and symbols.

Finally, the review team observed that myView's scope and sequence lacks a systematic structure and progresses too rapidly to ensure mastery of targeted phonics concepts. For example, in kindergarten, the sequence for introducing and teaching skills is inconsistent. Some vowels and consonants are introduced early, but students are expected to read words with consonant blends, including words with up to five phonemes (e.g., "stamp"), before all vowels and consonants have been taught. Furthermore, during Unit 2, Week 4 (the 10th week of school), kindergarten students are introduced to consonant blends. However, only three days are allotted for instruction, which is insufficient for learners to attain mastery. Furthermore, practice is not interleaved to allow for review and retrieval practice of targeted skills.

In Grade 1, the scope and sequence includes words with initial blends, words with final "x," and a review of "q," "v," "y," and "z," all within the same week. The skills appear to be based on their frequency within the decodable text rather than following a coherent, systematic order. Thus, students may fail to build a solid foundation in phonics due to the curriculum's lack of a systematic, logical progression.

1B: Phonological and Phoneme Awareness

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR PHONOLOGICAL AND PHONEME AWARENESS	SCORE	
1.7: Instruction only attends to larger units of phonological awareness (syllables, rhyme, onset-rime) without moving to the phoneme level (e.g., blends such as /t/ /r/ are kept intact rather than having students notice their individual sounds).	1	
1.8: Instruction is focused on letters only without explicit instruction and practice with the phonemes that letters represent.	1	
1.9: Phoneme awareness is not taught as a foundational reading skill.	1	
1.10: Phonological and phoneme awareness is not assessed or monitored.	2	

myView's **phonological and phoneme awareness practices** are **"mostly met."** Reviewers found that the program prioritizes phoneme awareness as a foundational reading skill. Most phoneme awareness lessons have students attend to words at the phoneme level. Thus, instruction progresses from phonological sensitivity to phonemic awareness appropriately. Furthermore, instruction focuses on both letters and the phonemes that letters represent, ensuring that learners build an understanding of the alphabetic principle. Finally, myView provides phonological and phoneme awareness assessments in kindergarten through Grade 2. The program states that "during second through fifth grade, we expect students will have already acquired proficiency in phonemic awareness...[and will be expanding] their phonics to complex multi-syllable words and advancing their fluency" (2nd Grade Assessment Guide, p. 36). As such, myView offers phonemic awareness assessments in kindergarten (on the baseline beginning of the year assessment, unit tests, and middle of the year and end of year tests), Grade 1 (baseline test only), and Grade 2 (baseline test only). Reviewers noted that Grade 1 assessment practices appeared cursory at best, particularly given that students are still mastering phoneme substitution and manipulation tasks at this stage. The limited assessment opportunities make it challenging to effectively monitor progress and address gaps in essential phonemic awareness skills. While the publisher indicated the inclusion of formative assessments, such as Exit Tickets and Monitor Progress Notes during daily small group time, this guidance is not made clear or explicit for teachers. To improve clarity, it is recommended that this information be highlighted in a callout box to ensure teachers can easily access and implement these assessment strategies.

1C: Phonics and Phonic Decoding

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR PHONOLOGICAL AND PHONEME AWARENESS	SCORE
1.15: Letter-sound correspondences are taught opportunistically or implicitly during text reading.	1
1.16: Instruction is typically "one and done;" phonics skills are introduced but with very little or short-term review.	3
1.17: Key words for letter/sound correspondences are not aligned with the pure phoneme being taught (e.g., earth for /ĕ/, ant for /ă/, orange for /ŏ/).	1
1.18: Phonics instruction takes place in short (or optional) "mini-lessons" or "word work" sessions.	3
1.19: The initial instructional sequence introduces many (or all) consonants before a vowel is introduced, short vowels are all taught in rapid succession and/or all sounds for one letter are taught all at once.	1
1.20: Blending is not explicitly taught nor practiced.	1
1.21: Instruction encourages students to memorize whole words, read using the first letter only as a clue, guess at words in context using a "what would make sense?" strategy, or use picture clues rather than phonic decoding.	1
1.22: Words with known sound-symbol correspondences, including high frequency words, are taught as whole-word units, often as stand-alone "sight words" to be memorized.	2
1.23: Few opportunities for word-level decoding practice are provided.	3
1.24: Early texts are predominantly predictable and/or leveled texts which include phonic elements that have not been taught; decodable texts are not used or emphasized.	1
1.25: Advanced word study (Grades 2–5) Instruction in phonics ends once single syllable phonics patterns (e.g., CVC, CVCe) are taught.	1
1.26: Advanced word study (Grades 2–5) No instruction in multisyllabic word decoding strategies and/or using morphology to support word recognition is evident.	1

myView's **phonics and phonic decoding** practices are **"somewhat met."** The scope and sequence appears to be designed to teach skills targeted by the decodable text for each week. Sound-symbol correspondences are taught first and then practiced in the text. For example, in Grade 2, Unit 2, Week 2, students learn about the vowel digraphs "ai," "ay," and "ea." The program teaches students that "we can spell long a with ai, ay, or ea," and then learners read the decodable text, Gail Quail Bakes Bread. However, the decodable book Gail Quail Bakes Bread focuses on "ea" representing the short "e" sound and does not provide opportunities for students to practice "ea" as a representation of the long "a" sound. Additionally, students were not explicitly taught that "ea" can make the short "e" sound, leaving them to learn it implicitly through reading. The decodable, A Change of Plans, includes one instance of the word "great" where "ea" represents the long "a" sound, but this isolated example provides limited practice.

Another area identified for improvement is myView's focus on long-term review. In Grades K–2, new skills are taught twice weekly, with a weekly review included in instruction. For example, in Grade 2, Units 1 and 2, targeted phonics skills are taught over the course of one week and then reviewed during the fifth lesson of the following week. The cumulative review sections, however, only address the skills taught during the current week and the previous week, nothing prior. As second graders progress to units 3–5, phonics skills are introduced in Lessons 1–3 and practiced within decodable text during Lessons 4–5. While small-group lessons do feature a review of the skills taught in the previous week, no whole-group, cumulative review is provided. In Grade 3, students engage in a cumulative review on Day 5 of each week to reinforce the weekly concepts. However, once a new week begins, previous concepts are not revisited unless the teacher chooses to review them. In fact, the only guidance offered advises educators to "use the Anchor Charts and Skills Practice Books to provide a cumulative review of word reading."

Reviewers found that myView's keyword choices are appropriate. However, the program's sound-spelling cards are rarely utilized. These cards feature different keywords for every spelling option. For example, the vowel sound long "e," spelled as "ee" and "ea," has two separate cards: "easel" and "bee." All spelling options for the sound /ē/ are listed on the back of these cards. The program includes 177 sound-spelling cards in total, which may be excessive, especially if they are not regularly used for instruction.

Phonics is taught through short mini-lessons and the targeted phoneme is not practiced enough within the controlled text. Teachers conduct these mini-lessons daily during the word study block, and any additional phonics instruction is based on student needs. Additionally, the team observed a greater emphasis on comprehension in these lessons rather than a grade-appropriate balance between comprehension and word recognition skills. For example, in the Grade 2 Teacher's Edition, small group phonics instruction is explicitly outlined for Lessons 1–3 of each week, while Lessons 4–5 focus solely on comprehension, fluency, and intervention related to the targeted comprehension skill. For Grade 3, small group word work instruction is only included in Lesson 1 of the week. Again, foundational skill work may be an option in small group targeted instruction for students having difficulty. However, phonics instruction appeared very disjointed and there is no interleaved practice to ensure students are mastering phonics skills as they are taught.

Reviewers observed that blending is taught but is not practiced nor taught explicitly enough to lead to student mastery. In Grades K–1, blending is taught during the "my turn" section of the lesson plan. Students are encouraged to blend sounds during this portion of the lesson. However, there are no specific lessons to teach students how to blend. There is a blending routine available in the Reading Routines Companion listed under the phonemic awareness section; however, this resource is difficult to find. The team recommends making this guidance more visible to educators as it may be overlooked. Direct instruction in blending is not included in Grades 2–5; however, reviewers considered this omission appropriate for student age and grade level.

Another potential area of improvement is the instruction of high-frequency words with irregular spellings. The Grade 2, Unit 3, Teacher's Edition states that "high-frequency words are words that often appear in texts but do not follow regular word study patterns, so students need to practice reading them" (p. 114). As such, these words are currently taught as whole word units. Additionally, when introducing a new phonics skill, there is minimal instruction dedicated to sound-symbol correspondences. The curriculum also uses letter tiles instead of grapheme tiles. As such, if the grapheme is represented by multiple letters, students must pull the multiple letter tiles rather than solely identifying the appropriate grapheme to match the phoneme. This emphasis focuses on spelling rather than using phoneme-grapheme mapping to sound out written words. For example, in Grade 2, when learning the vowel digraph "ai," the teacher uses individual letter tiles to represent the word "rail." Teachers are prompted to tell students, "This word has the vowels a and i together. The vowels ai in this word spell the vowel sound /ā/" (Grade 2 Reading Routines Companion, p. 39). This approach emphasizes how the word is spelled but does not provide students with opportunities to identify the individual phonemes represented by the letters or to blend them together.

Regarding practice, students read or write a few words each day based on the day's phonics skills. This is not sufficient for students to obtain mastery. The Skills Practice Book and Reading Routines Companion activities do provide students with practice opportunities; however, the workbook is set up in a traditional worksheet format with minimal opportunities for student writing, while the Reading Routines Companion activities offer educators limited guidance on delivery and fail to provide explicitness—especially for new or novice teachers. Most practice exercises ask learners to write part of a word or match a grapheme to a picture rather than providing opportunities for authentic practice with spelling and writing words.

The decodable texts in myView include only a limited number of phonics elements aligned with taught skills. These texts are not designed to effectively optimize student practice of the target skill, as the skill may only appear 3–5 times within the text. While the purpose of decodable text is to allow readers to practice applying their phonics skills in context, the minimal presence of the target skill fails to meet this purpose. As such, myView's decodable texts are not strong in effectively developing students' decoding skills and often resemble hybrid leveled texts rather than true decodable texts. Additionally, the decodable texts are not an integral component of the lessons and appear to be used more for comprehension than for intentional opportunities to practice phonic skills. For example, in Grade 2, Units 3–5 include decodable texts for students to practice the targeted phonics skills during Lessons 4 and 5 of the week. However, during Lesson 4, students are asked to read and answer comprehension questions, and they are only tasked to apply and practice the target skill in Lesson 5.

Finally, myView provides students with instruction in syllable division and syllable types, multisyllabic word decoding strategies, and morphology throughout Grades 2–5.

1D: Fluency

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR FLUENCY	SCORE
1.40: Fluency instruction focuses primarily on student silent reading.	1
1.41: Rate is emphasized over accuracy; priority is given to the student's ability to read words quickly.	3
1.42: Word-level fluency practice to automaticity is not provided, or fluency is viewed only as text-reading fluency.	2
1.43: Fluency is practiced only in narrative text or with repeated readings of patterned text.	2
1.44: Fluency assessment allows acceptance of incorrectly decoded words if they are close in meaning to the target word (e.g., assessment based upon the cueing systems, M/S/V).	1

myView's **fluency** practices are **"mostly met."** Fluency instruction is included in teacher-led small groups, making it optional based on student placement. It is also part of Day 1 of the weekly lessons during the weekly read-aloud. For example, in Grade 2, Unit 3, Week 1, Lesson 3, the Teacher's Editions directs educators to have students work on prosody with a short passage if assigned to a fluency group (p. 54). The Cold Reads for Fluency and Comprehension book is used during this small group work to assess students and chart fluency progress. This resource features text that aligns with the program's weekly theme. For example, in Grade 2, Unit 3, students are learning about Our Traditions through fables, fairy tales, and legends, and passages for fluency align to these text types—whereas in Grade 2, Unit 5, students are primarily reading informational text, so the featured fluency passages are informational. However, fluency work is frequently disconnected from the week's whole group lesson. For example, in Grade 2, Unit 3, all students are learning to read words that feature the spelling patterns for /ī/, including "i," "ie," "i_e," "igh," and "y." Students are asked to read and sort words into their corresponding patterns, but they do not have the opportunity to practice these skills to automaticity.

Reviewers noted that students are consistently asked to read with expression, and fluency instruction focuses on accuracy and prosody—not rate. Also, fluency assessment does not allow for the acceptance of incorrectly read words. However, the inclusion of fluency at the word level is not frequently modeled or practiced. The Cold Reads for Fluency and Comprehension resource includes a list of potential errors (i.e., omission, substitution, insertion, mispronunciation/misreading, hesitation, and self-correction) and the notations to mark the errors (p. 13). However, students only receive fluency assessments if placed into a small group that targets this skill. This is problematic as it may lead to missed opportunities for targeted support.

Findings:

COMPONENTS SUPPORTING LANGUAGE COMPREHENSION, READING COMPREHENSION, AND WRITING

SECTIONS 2–4: Non-Negotiables for Language Comprehension, Reading Comprehension, and Writing

This section begins with a review of non-negotiable elements for language comprehension, reading comprehension, and writing before moving on to the language comprehension strands highlighted in Scarborough's (2001) reading rope. Therefore, identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

NON-NEGOTIABLES FOR LANGUAGE COMPREHENSION, READING COMPREHENSION, AND WRITING	SCORE
2-4.1: (LC, RC, W) In early grades, the instructional framework is primarily a workshop approach, emphasizing student choice and implicit, incidental, or embedded learning.	1
2-4.2: (LC, RC, W) Students are not exposed to rich vocabulary and complex syntax in reading and writing materials.	1
2-4.3: (RC) Comprehension activities focus mainly on assessing whether students understand content (the product of comprehension) instead of supporting the process of comprehending texts.	1
2-4.4: (RC, W) Writing is not taught or is taught separately from reading at all times.	1
2-4.5: (LC, RC) Questioning during read-alouds focuses mainly on lower-level questioning skills.	1

myView's non-negotiables for **language comprehension, reading comprehension, and writing** are **"met."** The program does not utilize a workshop framework nor emphasizes student choice. While students are exposed to rich vocabulary and syntax within text, they are not provided with explicit instruction or engaged in activities that allow them to develop a deep understanding of vocabulary. Reading comprehension activities target two skills per week and emphasize the comprehension process through teacher-modeled think-alouds and the use of effective questioning. Students also build new knowledge by engaging with the weekly essential question. Target vocabulary and selected texts are intentionally connected to this question, reinforcing the knowledge-building opportunities that myView provides. While there is a separate writing block where students learn the writing process, they are also tasked to comment on what they read with a written response. However, the content of the standalone writing block does not align with the reading lesson. Finally, regarding questioning, myView provides educators with the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) questions aligned to the program's close reading lessons. Reviewers observed that most questions align to DOK level 2, which asks students to go beyond a recall question to describe or explain and DOK level 3, which asks readers to use reasoning and cite evidence to answer a question.

2B: Background Knowledge

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAG PRACTICES FOR BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE	SCORE	
2.1: Read-aloud opportunities emphasize simple stories or narrative texts. Read-aloud text is not sufficiently complex and/or does not include knowledge-building expository texts (i.e., topics related to science, social studies, current events).	1	
2.2: Opportunities to bridge existing knowledge to new knowledge is not apparent in instruction.	1	
2.3: Advanced (Grades 2–5): For students who are automatic with the code, texts for reading are primarily leveled texts that do not feature a variety of diverse, complex, knowledge-building text sets to develop background knowledge in a variety of subject areas.	1	

myView's practices for **background knowledge** are **"met."** The program uses read-aloud texts as the primary means to build background knowledge about the weekly question. The read-alouds include both narrative and informational texts, and, depending on the topic, the story may include science or social studies content. Texts are selected around a knowledge base. For example, in Grade 2, Unit 3, the texts align to the theme Our Traditions and include titles like *Traditional Tales, The Lion and the Mouse, The Horned Toad's Gift, The Legend of the Lady Slipper, Interstellar Cinderella, Cendrillion: An Island Cinderella*, and *The Abenaki*. Additionally, myView develops knowledge through the use of essential questions, which connect to the unit's theme and aligned texts. For example, in Grade K, Unit 2, students participate in the theme Living Together. They reflect on the essential question, "What do living things need?" and read knowledge-building texts of varying genres (e.g., informational, narrative, persuasive).

2C: Vocabulary

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR VOCABULARY	SCORE
2.7: Vocabulary worksheets and activities are used with little opportunity for deep understanding of vocabulary words.	3
2.8: Instruction includes memorization of isolated words and definitions out of context.	1
2.9: Tier 2 words are not taught explicitly and practiced; students are not given opportunities to use them in their speech, see them in print, and use them in writing.	3
2.10: Students are not exposed to and taught Tier 3 words.	2
2.11: Explicit instruction in morphology is not present and/or not taught according to a scope and sequence (i.e., simple to complex) consistently throughout K–5 instruction.	1

myView's practices for **vocabulary** are **"somewhat met."** The program's vocabulary instruction includes a definition, and the targeted words are included in the weekly reading. However, most vocabulary work is based on worksheet activities, with minimal emphasis on using the words in speaking or applying them outside the story's context. Thus, deep understanding of the word is not emphasized unless the teacher uses a vocabulary routine not included in the curriculum. Contextual and definitional information are connected to the weekly text, but instruction of Tier 2 words is not explicit. Reviewers observed that the Teacher's Edition instructs educators to introduce the words and define them as needed. However, outside of listening to the definitions, students are not offered opportunities to use the words in their speech or writing. Instead, students interact with the week's vocabulary words by highlighting or underlining them in text. Furthermore, while students are exposed to Tier 3 vocabulary, direct instruction is minimal and does not provide the depth needed for mastery. Finally, myView includes a scope and sequence for morphology instruction that progresses from simple to complex. In Grades K–2, morphology is taught within student vocabulary lessons, while in Grades 3–5, students engage in morphology lessons during the word work portion of the lesson plan. Reviewers did note, however, that instruction in morphology was somewhat stronger in the upper grades.

2D: Language Structures

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR LANGUAGE STRUCTURES	SCORE	
2.18: Conventions of print, grammar, and syntax are taught implicitly or opportunistically with no evidence of consistent, explicit, simple to complex instruction across all grade levels.	1	
2.19: Instruction does not include teacher modeling nor sufficient opportunities for discussion.	1	
2.20: Students are asked to memorize parts of speech as a list without learning in context and through application.	1	

myView's practices for **language structures** are **"met."** The review team observed that most conventions of print are explicitly taught within the weekly reading lessons, while grammar and syntax are explicitly addressed within the writing block. Instruction includes sufficient opportunities for both teacher modeling and discussion. Finally, while students are not asked to memorize the parts of speech, they are asked to include them within sentences when writing. This approach holds learners accountable for applying their knowledge in context, reinforcing both understanding and use.

2E: Verbal Reasoning

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR VERBAL REASONING	SCORE	
2.26: Inferencing strategies are not taught explicitly and may be based only on picture clues and not text (i.e., picture walking).	1	
2.27: Students do not practice inference as a discrete skill.	1	

myView's practices for **verbal reasoning** are **"met."** Inferencing is taught explicitly as a discrete skill. It is targeted within the weekly text during close reading and on Lesson 4 of the weekly plan. Instruction includes intentional use of teacher-modeled think-alouds to make inferencing transparent to students. This approach helps learners understand how skilled readers interpret implicit information in a text.

2F: Literacy Knowledge

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR LITERACY KNOWLEDGE	SCORE
2.33: Genre types and features are not explicitly taught.	1
2.34: Genre-specific text structures and corresponding signal words are not explicitly taught and practiced.	1

myView's practices for **literacy knowledge** are **"met."** Explicit instruction in the text types begins in kindergarten and builds through Grade 5. Additionally, there are weekly anchor charts used for teacher instruction. These charts highlight the genre-specific text structures and their corresponding signal words. Finally, while graphic organizers are present, the team did note that the organizational structure changes frequently. For example, Grade 1 initially uses an umbrella and raindrops to represent the main idea and supporting details. However, a couple of lessons later, the same concept is represented by a house and windows. Reviewers noted that this inconsistency fails to allow learners to establish a routine way of addressing the content, ultimately increasing their cognitive load and making it harder for them to establish a clear and reliable strategy for organizing their thoughts.

SECTION 3: Reading Comprehension

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAG PRACTICES FOR READING COMPREHENSION	SCORE	
3.1: Students are asked to independently read texts they are unable to decode with accuracy in order to practice reading comprehension strategies (e.g., making inferences, predicting, summarizing, visualizing).	1	
3.2: Students are asked to independently apply reading comprehension strategies primarily in short, disconnected readings at the expense of engaging in knowledge-building text sets.	1	
3.3: Emphasis on independent reading and book choice without engaging with complex texts.	1	
3.4: Materials for comprehension instruction are predominantly predictable and/or leveled texts.	1	
3.5: Students are not taught methods to monitor their comprehension while reading.	1	

myView's practices for **reading comprehension** are **"met."** The program's Teacher's Edition states that the text may be read independently, with a partner, or with the whole class. For example, in Grade 3, Unit 2, Week 5, teachers are prompted to discuss the Read First Strategies and help students understand that the story's purpose is to explore "the migration of butterflies, bats, and birds" (p. 288). The Read First Strategies include the following:

- **Read:** Remind students to read captions and headings to understand the text.
- **Look:** Encourage students to look at photos and maps to learn about the topic.
- **Ask:** Have students ask questions as they read to clarify information.
- **Talk:** Direct students to talk about the most important ideas, or key ideas, in the text.

The reading comprehension strategies are used with authentic text centered on a topic/theme. Additionally, every weekly text includes teacher-modeled think-alouds and comprehension close reading questions. These activities explicitly guide students in monitoring and enhancing their understanding of the text. Finally, featured texts are neither predictable nor leveled, and students are not offered free choice in book selections, ensuring that all learners engage with these intentionally selected materials.

4A: Writing — Handwriting

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAGS PRACTICES FOR HANDWRITING	SCORE	
4.1: No direct instruction in handwriting.	1	
4.2: Handwriting instruction predominantly features unlined paper or picture paper.	1	
4.3: Handwriting instruction is an isolated add-on.	1	

myView's practices for **handwriting** are **"met."** Reviewers observed that direct instruction in handwriting is embedded within the curriculum using the D'Nealian Curriculum. Students learn manuscript in Grades K–1, while students in Grade 2 begin to transition to cursive. myView provides D'Nealian style manuscript and cursive resources as "handwriting models," but these are not explicitly integrated into core materials or the Teacher's Edition. Instead, they are presented as an optional resource. For Grades 3 and beyond, students are expected to write in cursive and teachers have access to handwriting resources and materials; however, there is no explicit handwriting instruction in these grades as it is assumed students mastered cursive handwriting by the end of Grade 2. Teachers are provided with the Stroke Modeling Animations, which are offered on the program's digital platform. These short videos provide modeling of proper size, slant, and spacing. myView's handwriting paper also includes lines to assist students with proper letter formation.

4B: Writing — Spelling

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAG PRACTICES FOR SPELLING	SCORE	
4.7: No evidence of explicit spelling instruction; no spelling scope and sequence for spelling, or the spelling scope and sequence is not aligned with the phonics / decoding scope and sequence.	1	
4.8: No evidence of phoneme segmentation and/or phoneme-grapheme mapping to support spelling instruction.	3	
4.9: Patterns in decoding are not featured in encoding/spelling; spelling lists are based on content or frequency of word use and not connected to decoding/phonics lessons.	1	
4.10: Students practice spelling by memorization only (e.g., rainbow writing, repeated writing, pyramid writing).	1	
4.11: Spelling patterns for each phoneme are taught all at once (e.g., all spellings of long /ā/) instead of a systematic progression to develop automaticity with individual grapheme/phonemes.	2	

myView's practices for **spelling** are **"somewhat met."** Spelling instruction is embedded within the program's writing block. There is a scope and sequence for spelling, and it is aligned to the program's phonics scope and sequence. Furthermore, reviewers found evidence of explicit spelling instruction, and the lessons follow an "I do, we do, you do" format. One area for improvement is the use of phoneme segmentation. Reviewers observed minimal phoneme segmentation or phoneme-grapheme mapping to support student spelling. Occasionally, the teacher is prompted to segment the word for the students to assist them in writing the sounds; however, students do not have to segment and map the words for themselves. Spelling instruction was typically presented as a list of words.

Spelling instruction includes a preassessment, an explanation of the spelling rule, teacher modeling of how to spell a few select words, and then students complete a worksheet with the targeted spelling rule. These worksheets primarily consist of activities that task students to unscramble words, fill in the blank, or write the missing letter. For example, in the Grade 2 Student Interactive book for Unit 4, students are learning about the letter patterns "aw," "au," "augh," and "al." The corresponding worksheet asks students to "write the missing letters to make a Spelling Word. Write each word" (p. 603). The first example presents students with this fill in the blank: ch __ k.

They are asked to write the letter pattern "-al" to make the word "chalk." However, students are provided with a list of the week's spelling words on the same page, so the task predominantly involves copying—and again, students are not tasked to use phoneme-grapheme mapping to spell.

The introduction of spelling patterns varies by grade level. In K–1, various phonics skills are taught in the same week for decoding, but only one skill is the focus for the spelling list. For example, in Grade 1, Unit 2, Week 2, students learn to read words with the consonant patterns "-ck," the plural "-s," and consonant "s" as /z/ as well as initial consonant blends. However, the spelling list only focuses on words that are spelled "-ck" when the /k/ sound follows a short vowel.

In Grade 2, spelling words follow the phonics skill lesson. However, many graphemes are provided for a phoneme within each week. For example, in Grade 2, Week 8, students learn the vowel digraphs "ai," "ay," and "ea," which represent the long "a" sound. During Week 9, however, they only learn the vowel digraph "ie." This is followed by Week 10 when they learn long "e" spelled with "ee," "ea," "ey," and "y."

In Grade 3, students spend only one week on vowel digraphs. Teachers are instructed to "remind students that a vowel digraph is two letters that spell one vowel sound. The vowel sound is usually, but not always, long" (Grade 3 Teacher's Edition, Unit 1, p. 216). Teachers then review the most common vowel digraphs, including "ee" and "ea," which spell the sound /ē/, the vowel digraphs "ai" and "ay" that spell the sound /ā/, and the vowel digraphs "ow" and "oa" that spell the sound /ō/. Teachers are also asked to mention exceptions, such as "ea," representing the sound /ĕ/ in "bread." Reviewers noted that vowel digraphs could be difficult for students to master and expressed concern that this may not be sufficient focus or repetition to ensure students develop a strong understanding and mastery of this concept.

4C: Writing — Composition

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

RED FLAG PRACTICES FOR COMPOSITION	SCORE	
4.17: Writing prompts are provided with little time for modeling, planning, and brainstorming ideas.	1	
4.18: Writing is primarily unstructured with few models or graphic organizers.	1	
4.19: Conventions, grammar, and sentence structure is not explicitly taught and practiced systematically (i.e., from simple to complex) with opportunities for practice to automaticity, instead it is taught implicitly or opportunistically.	1	
4.20: Writing instruction is primarily narrative or unstructured choice.	1	
4.21: Students are not taught the writing process (i.e., planning, revising, editing).	1	
4.22: Writing is taught as a standalone and is not used to further reading comprehension.	2	

myView's practices for **composition** are **"mostly met."** Reviewers observed that the program's writing lessons are scripted and explicit. Students engage in the writing process with one week designated for prewriting, two weeks spent on drafting, one week allotted for revising and editing, and one week set aside for students to publish and share their work. This general structure of writing lessons and activities was consistent across the grade levels. Writing also occurs within the reading portion of the curriculum, mainly in the form of reading response questions. However, not as much time is provided for teacher modeling, and the writing process is not included within these "writing to text" lessons.

Additionally, the team found that writing lessons are not connected to the program's reading lessons, as the standalone writing lessons focus on specific writing genres and guide students through the writing process for each genre. For example, in Grade 3, Unit 1, the unit theme is "How does our environment affect us?" Students read various text types in weeks 1–5, including folktales, realistic fiction, informational text, and myth. However, these weekly stories do not align to the target writing genre, which is personal narrative. Within the writing lessons, the publisher includes these weekly texts and how they could be used to further student understanding of the genre, but this connection appears superficial and lacks meaningful alignment. For example, in Grade 3, Unit 1, the program attempts to link writing a personal narrative with the informational weekly text by having students "learn about grammatical skills related to their personal narratives, as well as text and graphic features that highlight the organization of the text [Living in Deserts]" (p. 409). This disjointed approach fails to capitalize on instruction that integrates reading and writing in a way that reinforces and deepens students' understanding of both. myView does provide Mentor Printables as a means to connect reading genre and writing across Grades K–5. While the Mentor Printables provide examples within the same genre as the writing unit, this is not the same as making explicit connections to what students are reading and learning about during shared or close reading. One area for revision is aligning writing tasks with the specific texts and concepts students engage with during reading instruction, reinforcing comprehension and deepening their understanding across contexts.

Findings:

COMPONENTS SUPPORTING ASSESSMENT

SECTION 5: Assessment

Identification of the following red flag practices were prioritized in the review of this section.

NON-NEGOTIABLES FOR ASSESSMENT	SCORE
5.1: Assessments measure comprehension only without additional assessment measures to determine what is leading to comprehension weaknesses (e.g., phonics, phoneme awareness, nonsense word fluency, decoding, encoding, fluency, vocabulary, listening comprehension).	1
5.2: Assessments include miscue analysis in which misread words that have the same meaning are marked as correct.	1

RED FLAG PRACTICES FOR ASSESSMENT	SCORE
5.6: Assessments result in benchmarks according to a leveled text gradient.	1
5.7: Foundational skills assessments are primarily running records or similar assessments that are based on whole language or cueing strategies (e.g., read the word by looking at the first letter, use picture support for decoding).	1
5.8: Phonics skills are not assessed.	1
5.9: Phoneme awareness is not assessed	1
5.10: Decoding skills are assessed using real words only.	2
5.11: Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) assessments are not used.	2
5.12: The suite of assessments does not address aspects of language comprehension (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, listening comprehension).	1
5.13: Multilingual Learners are not assessed in their home language.	4

myView's non-negotiables and practices for **assessment** are **"mostly met."** Students' comprehension, phonics, and language conventions are assessed weekly. Additionally, outside of the unit assessments, students are also assessed regularly through both formal and informal measures. The program's assessments do not provide a text level of any kind; however, there are no guidelines for teachers on how to support students based on their performance on the unit tests. While next steps are consistently provided throughout the units for formative assessments, the summative assessments lack similar clarity.

For example, in the Summative Assessments Teacher's Manual, teachers are instructed to administer a baseline assessment, determine the total score, and provide students with the following supports based on that score:

Students who score more than 90% on the Baseline Test may benefit from:

- regular instruction during whole-class time
- options for advanced learners during small-group time, independent investigative work, and challenging content and activities
- being matched with appropriate texts
- being grouped with other advanced learners into a book club and reading authentic trade books that match their interests

Students who score between 60% and 89% on the Baseline Test might benefit from:

- regular instruction during whole-class time
- on-level work during small-group time
- *myFocus* readers to practice word-reading skills
- being matched with appropriate texts
- being grouped with other on-level learners into a book club and reading authentic books that match their interests

Students who score below 60% on the Baseline Test might benefit from:

- regular instruction during whole-class time
- intervention activities during small-group time, more scaffolding, more practice with critical skills, and more opportunities to respond
- *myFocus* readers to practice word-reading skills
- being matched with appropriate texts
- receiving more frequent additional support and intensive instruction

While the manual outlines general student support, it does not provide clear criteria for structuring small-group interventions or tailoring activities to meet individual needs. Additionally, the recommendations do not address how to monitor progress over time or adjust instruction based on ongoing assessments. More explicit strategies, concrete examples, and practical implementation steps would strengthen the guidance provided to teachers.

While myView does include Nonsense Word Assessments in the Summative Assessment, they are limited to these two examples: Grade K Summative Assessment p. T84 and Grade 1 Summative Assessment p. T60. Additionally, in Grades 1–5, Cold Reads for Fluency and Comprehension include weekly Oral Reading Rate and Accuracy assessments. For Grade K, teachers can access fluency routines in the Reading Routines Companion anytime. However, students only receive this assessment if placed within a small group targeting fluency.

Listening comprehension is assessed through teacher questioning provided during the weekly read-aloud. After reading, a formative assessment is administered during Lessons 3–5. This assessment consists of a worksheet that focuses on the week's comprehension skills and how they relate to the weekly text. If a student cannot fill out the worksheet independently, the teacher is given the option to have a conversation with the student instead.

Summative and baseline assessments do not isolate language comprehension skills; instead, these skills are assessed through reading comprehension tasks only. If students cannot read the words, they will be flagged for intervention with vocabulary, syntax, and comprehension, even if these skills are on grade level. Additionally, the publisher states that reading comprehension assessments are designed to measure both word recognition and understanding, "so reading aloud or translating actually changes the intent of the tests" and questions should not be translated into a learner's home language (Summative Assessments Teacher's Manual p. 31). As such, myView does not assess multilingual learners in their home languages, and educators would need to look to outside assessment tools to ensure that students are assessed in this manner. However, the team also noted that this would most likely be the case with most core curricula programs.

Final Report Summary

Overall, the reviewed components for the myView curriculum were found to **"meet"** or **"mostly meet"** most criteria for Grades K–5. This means there was limited evidence of red flag practices. While an evidence-aligned core curriculum is a critical part of any literacy program, it is no substitute for building a solid foundation of educator and leader knowledge in the science of reading and a coaching system to support fidelity of implementation.

STRENGTHS

myView's emphasis on building background knowledge through its thematic units and offering learners multiple themed texts on a topic makes it a curriculum that supports knowledge acquisition and allows learners to make meaningful connections across different sources.

myView assists students in building new knowledge through engagement with the weekly essential question. Target vocabulary and selected texts intentionally align to this question, reinforcing key concepts and promoting deeper understanding.

myView capitalizes on the integration of reading and writing through reading response questions. These questions encourage active engagement with text, foster critical thinking, and support students' ability to express their understanding through writing.

myView's Reading Routines Companion provides educators with a helpful resource that includes explicit teacher talk and instruction that introduces the skill, includes teacher modeling, and provides for guided and independent practice. This resource includes routines for phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension.

myView offers high-quality materials in the Foundational Skills Toolkit, including diverse cards, letter tiles, and decodable texts. However, despite the inclusion of letter tiles, reviewers noted the absence of grapheme tiles, which display the entire grapheme on a single card. The team recommends including grapheme tiles to enhance student understanding of phoneme-grapheme correspondences and to support spelling.

CHALLENGES

myView's emphasis on building background knowledge through its thematic units and offering learners multiple themed texts on a topic makes it a curriculum that supports knowledge acquisition and allows learners to make meaningful connections across different sources.

myView assists students in building new knowledge through engagement with the weekly essential question. Target vocabulary and selected texts intentionally align to this question, reinforcing key concepts and promoting deeper understanding.

myView capitalizes on the integration of reading and writing through reading response questions. These questions encourage active engagement with text, foster critical thinking, and support students' ability to express their understanding through writing.

myView's Reading Routines Companion provides educators with a helpful resource that includes explicit teacher talk and instruction that introduces the skill, includes teacher modeling, and provides for guided and independent practice. This resource includes routines for phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension.

myView offers high-quality materials in the Foundational Skills Toolkit, including diverse cards, letter tiles, and decodable texts. However, despite the inclusion of letter tiles, reviewers noted the absence of grapheme tiles, which display the entire grapheme on a single card. The team recommends including grapheme tiles to enhance student understanding of phoneme-grapheme correspondences and to support spelling.

References

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

Gough, P. & Tunmer, W. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7, 6–10.

Hennessy, N. L. (2020). *The reading comprehension blueprint: Helping students make meaning of text*. Brookes Publishing.

Hoover, W. A. & Tunmer, W. E. (2019) The cognitive foundations of learning to read: A framework for preventing and remediating reading difficulties. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties,* 24(1), 75-93.

Moats, L. C. (1998). Teaching decoding. American Federation of Teachers.

Moats, L. C. (2020). *Teaching reading is rocket science: What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do.* American Federation of Teachers. Retrieved from: https://www.aft.org/ae/summer2020/moats

The Reading League. (2026). *Curriculum Evaluation Guidelines, Third Edition (2026)*.

The Reading League. (2023). *Science of Reading: Defining Guide*.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *myView Literacy*. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *Cold reads for fluency and comprehension*. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). myView Literacy. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *Grade 2 assessment guide*. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *Grade 2 reading routines*. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *Grade 2 teacher's edition*. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *Grade 3 teacher's edition*. Savvas Learning Company.

Savvas Learning Company. (2025). *Summative assessments teacher's manual*. Savvas Learning Company.

Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. Neuman & D. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook for research in early literacy*. Guilford Press.

PUBLISHER'S RESPONSE

myView LITERACY

myView Literacy
Grades K–5

The Reading League Curriculum Evaluation: Savvas Publisher's Response to *myView Literacy* © 2025

Savvas Learning Company's *myView Literacy* © 2025 provides instruction based on the Science of Reading, emphasizing both foundational skills and language comprehension supported with student-centered practice to support literacy development. *myView Literacy* incorporates evidence-based research and established best practices, offering explicit and systematic instruction in key reading and writing skills. Developed in collaboration with literacy scholars and authors, *myView Literacy* undergoes regular evaluation to assess its effectiveness and usability in the classroom.

Savvas Learning Company is committed to the Science of Reading and appreciates the opportunity to partner with The Reading League and respond to their Curriculum Evaluation of *myView Literacy*.

Starting in the 2025–2026 school year, *myView Literacy* will incorporate structured remediation during small group instruction, following a continuous improvement model, based on established reading research. The myFoundations Teacher's Guide provides a comprehensive, research-based framework for strengthening foundational literacy skills for students in Grades K–5. By supporting educators with a clear, structured path to literacy mastery, myFoundations supports educators in reinforcing essential reading skills.

Savvas Response to Challenges Identified in the Report

The Reading League cited five challenges in *myView Literacy*. The following identifies each challenge and provides specific clarifications on Savvas's approach to the topic.

Challenge 1: *myView Literacy* assessment materials do not provide educators with clear directions on what to do with the assessment data they collect. For example, the program does not provide clear criteria for structuring small group interventions or tailoring activities to meet individual student needs. Additionally, the recommendations do not address how to monitor progress over time or adjust instruction based on ongoing assessments. Providing more explicit strategies, concrete examples, and practical implementation steps would enhance the support available to teachers.

Savvas Response: *myView Literacy* incorporates data-driven instruction through a suite of robust common formative and summative assessment tools to help teachers

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

monitor student progress, identify gaps, and make informed instructional decisions. By analyzing data, teachers can target specific skills and provide tailored interventions to ensure each student's success.

The Assessment Guide in *myView Literacy* provides a layout of assessment points throughout the year, detailed explanations on administering and scoring assessments, progress monitoring, and instructional grouping recommendations. The Assessment Guide for each grade level is an important resource for understanding and interpreting results with all program assessments.

Our digital platform, Savvas Realize, saves time with powerful reporting tools and personalized differentiation recommendations. Teachers and administrators can use the features in Savvas Realize to make data-driven instructional decisions:

- Users can drill down into data points on graphs and charts to learn more about student mastery, progress, and usage. Data can be filtered by date range.
- Users can view data by Class Results by Assignment or Class Mastery by Standard.
- The Class Results by Assignment page covers class, group, and individual student test scores and shows how students mastered certain standards based on test scores.
- The Mastery by Standards report shows how a class mastered state and national standards and how individual students mastered state and national standards across assignments over time. Teachers and administrators also can use the data to understand which assessments contributed to the mastery data displayed for each student.
- The Data tab provides a complete display of classes, groups, and individual student mastery, performance, and usage statistics.
- The Usage page displays the amount of time students spend working on specific activities.

In Grades K–2, the Phonological and Phonemic Awareness assessments are integrated into the Small Group Foundational Skills section of the Teacher's Edition (TE). These formative assessments help teachers evaluate whether students have mastered specific phonological and phonemic awareness skills taught that week. The TE provides actionable suggestions for how to support students based on their assessment results, including targeted interventions for students who struggle and enrichment options for those who have mastered the skill. Each phonemic awareness (PA) skill is accompanied by a teaching point, and differentiated support is offered, with options to make the skill

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

easier or harder based on individual student needs. If additional practice is needed, teachers are directed to the Reading Routines Companion for extra resources.

In Grades 3–5, a screening routine assessment is available in the Reading Routines Companion to help teachers assess students' phonemic awareness at the start of each skill strand. This assessment helps place students in the appropriate phonemic awareness routine, ensuring they receive instruction at the right level for their current skill development.

Challenge 2: *myView Literacy* skill sequence appears to align more with the program's decodable texts rather than a well-structured, logical progression of skills and high-frequency words. This creates a disjointed experience for students and may lead to gaps or inconsistencies in their learning.

Savvas Response: The phonics scope and sequence for Grade K presents content in a systematic and recursive way. In Units 1–3, students are introduced to new sound-spelling patterns and practice decoding and encoding with these patterns. Savvas was meticulous in aligning the sound-letter patterns to the decodable texts in this grade, and provides a great deal of review and practice within these first three units to ensure student mastery. Not only can students practice in the Student Interactive, they also can practice with online phonics practice activities found on Savvas Realize, as well as with the Skills Practice Book, the Reading Routines Companion, and the myFoundations Student Practice Book. As Grade K students enter Units 4 and 5, no new sound-spelling patterns are introduced. Instead, the skills initially covered in the early units are spiralled and reviewed in depth and provide students with opportunities for growing success as readers and writers.

Challenge 3: *myView Literacy* vocabulary instruction lacks an explicit approach to developing depth of word knowledge. While words are drawn from the texts students are reading and defined in a student-friendly way, the associated activities primarily focus on memorization and worksheet-based application. Incorporating a structured vocabulary routine along with activities that encourage students to use words in meaningful, authentic contexts, including in speaking and writing, would serve to enhance its programming.

Savvas Response: At the start of each unit, students are presented with four to five academic vocabulary words. These grade-appropriate words are thematically connected to the unit theme and Essential Question. During the unit opener, students apply their prior knowledge of the academic words using an Oral Vocabulary Routine with “Expand” and “Ask” questions. This is followed by additional practice in the Student Interactive that progresses from an oral or drawing practice in Grade K to written

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

activities in Grades 3–5. As students work their way through a unit of study, they are encouraged to add newly acquired academic words and phrases to a Word Wall.

During the Weekly Launch, students participate in a word practice discussion (Language of Ideas) in which they use the academic words to build knowledge and make connections to information in an infographic. In subsequent lessons during the week, the academic words are explicitly used in collaborative conversations, close-read questions, lessons, and notes that help teachers make connections between the words and the lesson content.

Over the course of a unit, *myView Literacy* systematically builds on these academic words by *generating, applying,* and *synthesizing* the words through oral instruction, close read questions, vocabulary practice activities, collaborative conversations, and writing activities. The weekly Academic Vocabulary topics ensure that students' word knowledge will be incremental, multidimensional, and interrelated.

Challenge 4: *myView Literacy* fails to provide students with adequate opportunities to practice target skills. This includes practice opportunities across the program's multiple domains (e.g., phonemic awareness, phonics, high-frequency words, vocabulary, etc.). Embedding more student practice is recommended to allow learners to reinforce, solidify, and ultimately, master new learning.

Savvas Response: In *myView Literacy,* Phonological Awareness and Phonics are taught in Grades K–2 while High-Frequency Words and Vocabulary are taught in Grades K–5. In each grade, instruction for phonics and phonological awareness follows a Teach, Model and Guide Practice, and Practice pedagogy. High-Frequency Words and Vocabulary are explicitly taught in each Week's Lesson 1, and Lessons 2–5 provide time for practice and/or application. Practice is provided in a wide variety of formats: Student Interactive practice pages, Skills Practice Book pages, myFoundations Student Practice Book pages, activities from the Reading Routines Companion.

Challenge 5: While *myView Literacy* offers some high-quality resources, the sheer volume of materials may overwhelm both experienced and novice teachers. This abundance of curricular resources also has implications for the timing of the literacy block as it may not fit within the time constraints of a typical school day.

Savvas Response: *myView Literacy* provides instruction tailored for any reading block whether it's 30, 60, 90 minutes or more. Teachers are provided with explicit guidance and time stamps to adjust their instruction based on the needs of their schedule. Everything required to begin instruction in *myView Literacy* is organized around four connected resources that establish routines, streamline planning time, and prioritize

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

student achievement. Please see our Reading Block map for each individual resource's suggestion use within the reading block.

1. *Core Teacher's Edition*—Teachers begin the explicit instruction for each day with the Core TE. This instruction is intended for all students and provides explicit reading and writing instruction. Teachers should use the Core TE as their main planning tool and are provided with detailed planners that highlight both skills and resources at the unit, week, and daily lens.

2. *Student Interactive*—The Student Interactive book is a consumable student edition that accompanies the Core Teacher's Edition. Each page is referenced in the Teacher's Edition with visuals, answer keys, and corresponding instruction.

3. *Reading Routines Companion*—Connected to the lessons within the Core Teacher's Edition but with a deliberate focus on deeper practice and structured differentiation support, the Reading Routines Companion provides a different instructional approach for students that have demonstrated the need for more support based on the Core lesson.

4. *myFoundations Teacher's Guide*—Each structured literacy intervention lesson in the myFoundation's Teacher's Guide aligns directly to the whole group instruction within the Core Teacher's Edition, providing a different instructional approach and even stronger scaffolding. Teachers are provided with explicit scripting and activities that scale back skills and build towards independence. Progress monitoring helps teachers understand how to consistently evaluate student needs and ensure that student groupings remain fluid.

Savvas Realize digital platform provides daily lesson slides that seamlessly integrate all materials for teachers and students at point of use. The Realize digital platform organizes every element of a daily lesson for teachers and students in order to optimize classroom instruction time.

Savvas Response to Red Flags

Red Flag Practices for Phonics and Phonic Decoding
1.16: Instruction is typically "one and done"; phonics skills are introduced but with very little or short-term review.
Savvas Response
For all grades, we have a cumulative review cadence provided by author Dr. Sharon Vaughn.

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

This review is covered by Digital Learning Activities on Realize, the Skills Practice Book, and the forthcoming Daily Spiral Review presentation slides. In Grades 3–5, we intentionally provide cumulative review for students who need it, and additional cumulative review can be found included in materials such as the Skills Practice Book and myFoundations Student Practice Book.

Red Flag Practices for Phonics and Phonic Decoding
1.18: Phonics instruction takes place in short (or optional) “mini-lessons” or “word work” sessions.
Savvas Response
In Grades K–2, phonics instruction is found in every lesson to be a core component of the Foundational Skills strand, which is part of the daily 60-minute reading block. More instruction is provided in Small Group, which can be used with the entire class as needed, but Whole Group instruction is daily and robust. For Grade 3, phonics instruction is emphasized less, as the transition to Word Study begins. The Decodable Stories in GK–1, Decodable Readers in GK–3, and online Foldable Decodables in GK–3 all provide students with interleaving opportunities. Because the stories were written in alignment with each grade's phonics scope and sequence, we were able to create stories that allow for practice of the new skill as well as cumulative review of skills from early lessons.

Red Flag Practices for Phonics and Phonic Decoding
1.23: Few opportunities for word-level decoding practice are provided.
Savvas Response
Multiple opportunities for word-level decoding are present in the Student Interactive, Skills Practice Book, and Reading Routines Companion activities. Additionally, while The Reading League review was being conducted, Savvas was mid-development on myFoundations. Because the component, which is one of the core four components of the *myView Literacy* program and included with program purchase, is now available, we are including references to myFoundations in our response. The myFoundations phonics lessons explicitly require students to decode and encode in every lesson.

Red Flag Practices for Fluency
1.42: Word-level fluency practice to automaticity is not provided, or fluency is viewed only as text-reading fluency.
Savvas Response
Accurate word reading is a crucial skill in developing reading fluency. myFoundations fluency instruction provides concentrated practice for word reading in isolation, as well as in connected text, to help develop automaticity. In Grades 1–3, students will have the opportunity to practice word reading fluency using a research-based word list provided in the MyFoundations Student Practice Book.

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

Red Flag Practices for Vocabulary
2.7: Vocabulary worksheets and activities are used with little opportunity for deep understanding of vocabulary words.
Savvas Response
During Small Group instruction in *myView Literacy,* vocabulary lessons found in the myFoundations Teacher's Guide provide ways for all students to engage in activities that focus on learning new concepts and new labels for known concepts. As they create a word-rich environment, teachers model and provide practice for students to develop vocabulary knowledge through speaking, listening, and writing about a variety of words. Teachers help students explore word relationships using graphic organizers. They model good word-learning strategies using critical vocabulary from *myView Literacy* units. Students then demonstrate knowledge of words in different contexts, using both chosen vocabulary and self-selected words of interest. These activities, along with core academic and selection vocabulary work, help develop deep understanding of vocabulary words in students.
Red Flag Practices for Vocabulary
2.9: Tier 2 words are not taught explicitly and practiced; students are not given opportunities to use them in their speech, see them in print, and use them in writing.
Savvas Response
"Vocabulary in Context," "Close Read: Vocabulary in Context", "Academic Vocabulary," and "Possible Teaching Point: Academic Vocabulary" are present in all Grade K–5 units. At the start of each unit, students are presented with four to five academic vocabulary words. These grade-appropriate words are thematically connected to the unit theme and Essential Question. During the unit opener, students apply their prior knowledge of the academic words using an Oral Vocabulary Routine with "Expand" and "Ask" questions. This is followed by additional practice in the Student Interactive that progresses from an oral or drawing practice in Grade K to written activities in Grades 3–5. As students work their way through a unit of study, they are encouraged to add newly acquired academic words and phrases to a Word Wall. Over the course of a unit, *myView Literacy* systematically builds on these academic words by generating, applying, and synthesizing the words through oral instruction, close read questions, vocabulary practice activities, collaborative conversations, and writing activities. The weekly Academic Vocabulary topics ensure that students' word knowledge will be incremental, multidimensional, and interrelated.

Red Flag Practices for Spelling
4.8: No evidence of phoneme segmentation and/or phoneme-grapheme mapping to support spelling instruction.
Savvas Response
A foundation of phoneme segmentation and phoneme mapping is explicitly taught for students

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

in Foundational Skills, Grades K–1. As students progress through the program, these foundation-building skills are mastered, and application of this mastery is the basis for encoding through spelling. Additionally, while The Reading League review was being conducted, Savvas was mid-development on myFoundations. Because the component, which is one of the core four components of the *myView Literacy* program and included with program purchase, is now available, we are including references to myFoundations in our response. The teachers who use myFoundations activities for Small Group instruction will encounter standardized language emphasizing phoneme segmentation and phoneme-grapheme mapping that they can rely on to support all students (ex: "The word is corn. Say corn. Say the sounds as we place the letters: /k/ /or/ /n/. Spell the word corn.").

Red Flag Practices for Assessment
5.13: Multilingual learners are not assessed in their home language.
Savvas Response
MyView Literacy offers a cohesive vision for multilingual learners based on these key tenets. The instructional approach ● comes from an assets-based viewpoint ● focuses on the same learning objectives as fluent English speakers ● scaffolds the language demands of the same text or task provided to all learners ● balances activities across all language domains ● engages students' multilingual resources ● addresses the requirements of state/district evaluation processes *myView Literacy* instructional supports are crafted to ensure that *all* students work toward the same learning objectives and are created with the understanding that *all* students come to school with cultural and language resources and assets. Instructional support notes for multilingual learners include: **Language Support** – scaffolding for multilingual learners with *Light, Moderate,* and *Substantial* support based on the language objectives and demands of the task. These general labels of support ensure the task rather than the proficiency level is being scaffolded. In addition to scaffolds, the Language Support notes also appear in the side columns of the Teacher's Edition to reference additional activities and routines from the *Language Awareness Handbook.* **Language Demands** – at the sentence and discourse levels, notes appear prominently in these key areas of the instruction: at point of use in the side column, in the main column of Read the Text spreads, and during the Week 6 Project-based Inquiry. Language Demands notes in the side column and in Week 6 provide more targeted word, sentence, and discourse level support for a lesson or skill. Language Demands on the Read the Text spread provide an overview of a text's language challenges at the word, sentence, and discourse levels**.** **Language Links** – notes connect and engage with students' multilingual resources and appear prominently in two key locations: at point of use in the side column and in the main column of foundational reading and word-work pages. The purpose of the Language Links notes is to create teacher awareness of language transfer, such as cognates, false cognates,

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.

and comparative and contrastive analysis features of language, as well as highlighting other language variations.
Language Checkpoint – formative assessment that appears once per week in the Lesson 5 Small Group. A Language Checkpoint generates data on a weekly skill or topic to inform instruction. These assessments are scaffolded at three proficiency levels: Emerging, Expanding, and Bridging. The proficiency level descriptors are meant to be cumulative, building on students' previous levels. As multilingual learners gain proficiency in English, their ability to effectively use a range of linguistic resources increases.

Additional support for multilingual learners can be found in the *Language Awareness Handbook*. This valuable resource provides integrated reading and writing support while working in tandem with core whole and small group instruction in *myView Literacy*. These linguistically accommodated lessons are intended to be used during small group time with students who need additional scaffolded instruction and supports such as routines, sentence frames, and graphic organizers.

Copyright © Savvas Learning Company LLC. All Rights Reserved.