



A Landscape Analysis of
Tennessee Educator
Preparation Providers'
Instructional Programming
& Pedagogical Practices in
Foundational Literacy Skills

Executive Report

April 14, 2022

Zoi A. Traga Philippakos
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Louis Rocconi
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Sherry Mee Bell
University of Tennessee, Knoxville



THE UNIVERSITY OF
TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,
HEALTH & HUMAN SCIENCES

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Overview	1
Summary Abstract	1
Bulleted Summary of Instructional Programming and Pedagogical Practices	3
Early Childhood (Pre-K-K and/or Pre-K-Grade 3)	3
Elementary Education (Grades K- 5)	4
Special Education (Pre-K-Grade 3, and/or Comprehensive Grade K-Grade 12, and/or Interventionist Grade K-Grade 8 and/or Interventionist 6-12).....	5
Methods	6
Findings	7
1.0. Early Childhood (Pre-K-K and/or Pre-K-3)	8
1.1. Respondents’ Demographics	8
1.2. Participation in Early Reading Training (Course I and II).....	8
1.3. Foundational Skills Training and Instructional Influences	9
1.4. Number of Courses and Time Allocation to Foundational Skills.....	11
1.5. Instructional Practices	14
1.6. Description of a Lesson on Foundational Skills.....	15
1.7. Pedagogical Principles of Instruction.....	15
1.8. Pedagogical Practices Expected by Candidates	15
1.9. Use of Materials and Curricula	16
1.10. Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants.....	16
2.0. Elementary Education (Grades K- 5)	17
2.1. Respondents’ Demographics	17
2.2. Participation in Early Reading Training (Course 1 and 2)	17
2.3. Foundational Skills Training and Instructional Influences	18
2.4. Number of Courses and Time Allocation to Foundational Skills.....	20
2.5. Instructional Practices	24
2.6. Description of a Lesson on Foundational Skills.....	25
2.7. Pedagogical Principles of Instruction.....	25
2.8. Pedagogical Practices Expected by Candidates	26
2.9. Use of Materials and Curricula	26
2.10. Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants.....	26
3.0. Special Education	27
3.1. Respondents’ Demographics	27
3.2. Participation in Early Reading Training (Course I and 2).....	27
3.3. Foundational Skills Training and Instructional Influences	28
3.4. Number of Courses and Time Allocation to Foundational Skills.....	29
3.5. Instructional Practices	33
3.6. Description of a Lesson on Foundational Skills.....	33
3.7. Pedagogical Principles of Instruction.....	34
3.8. Pedagogical Practices Expected by Candidates	34
3.9. Use of Materials and Curricula	34
3.10. Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants.....	34
Appendix A1: Survey and Definition of Terms	36

A Landscape Analysis of Tennessee Educator Preparation Providers' Instructional Programming and Pedagogical Practices in Foundational Literacy Skills

Executive Report

April 14, 2022

This landscape analysis was conducted in compliance with terms of the [Tennessee Literacy Success Act](#) (T.C.A. Title 49, Chapter 1, Part 9). This Act was the result of the First Extraordinary Session of the 112th General Assembly and outlines foundational literacy requirements for Tennessee school districts and public charters, educator preparation programs, and educators. The Act requires the Tennessee Department of Education to conduct a “landscape analysis of literacy instruction, including instructional programming and pedagogical practices utilized by educator preparation providers” for purposes of consolidating existing information for the general assembly.” This report provides findings of this Tennessee Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) landscape analysis.

Overview

In response to the state's efforts to improve literacy performance and instruction, EPPs approved by the State Board of Education were surveyed to understand how educator preparation licensure programs address foundational skills. This landscape analysis provides information on the instructional programming and pedagogical practices used by Tennessee EPPs to prepare teachers to teach foundational literacy skills. The analysis provides information on how EPP faculty participation in the state's Course I and Course II Early Reading Trainings (spring and summer 2021) impacted EPP instructional practices. This report provides data on the amount of time spent in EPP coursework and applied experiences on various facets of foundational literacy skills. EPPs' pedagogical practices and EPP use of High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM) also are examined. Finally, this analysis provides information on Tennessee EPPs' interest in integrating content into their programs from the Tennessee Department of Education EPP Innovation Foundational Skills Integrated Content grants.

Summary Abstract

Purpose. The purpose of this landscape analysis was to consolidate information for the Tennessee General Assembly on how Tennessee educator preparation providers (EPPs) prepare teachers of young children to teach foundational literacy skills. All state-approved EPPs within Tennessee received a link to a survey that was developed to examine EPP foundational literacy skills instructional programming and pedagogical practices. Specifically, EPPs were surveyed about their participation in Course I and Course II of the Tennessee Early Reading Training provided by the Tennessee Department of Education in spring and summer 2021. EPPs also were surveyed about time allotted to foundational literacy in coursework across early childhood education, elementary education, and special education programs, specific practices emphasized by EPPs in the instruction of teacher candidates, and specific pedagogical practices teacher candidates are expected to apply in courses and in-school experiences. All EPPs were asked to indicate their interest in adopting Foundational Skills Integrated Content (Pre-K-Grade 3 and Elementary K-Grade 5) and the Foundational Skills Integrated Content (Special Education) developed through the EPP Innovation Grants awarded by the state during the 2021-22 school year.

All EPPs within the state responded to the survey as follows: 17 prepare early childhood teachers (Pre-K-K and/or Pre-K-Grade 3); 37 prepare elementary teachers (Grades K-5); and 18 prepare special education teachers. Some EPPs prepare teachers in only one of the areas above, others in two of the areas and others in all three. Responses were collected separately by program/licensure area. EPPs were asked to indicate time devoted to foundational literacy skills in stand-alone courses, in courses that included practical/clinical experience in school classrooms and in courses that combined in the same course in-school work, prior to formal student teaching or teaching internship.

Tennessee Early Reading Training Course I and II. Across all EPPs that prepare teachers to teach young children foundational literacy skills, responses about Tennessee's Early Reading Training Course I and Course II showed that range of participation by EPPs varied. A majority of the state's EPPs required the training but some did not. The majority of EPPs who participated rated the content as highly effective or

very effective. EPPs indicated the training either strengthened or validated their approaches to preparing teachers to teach foundational literacy skills. Key shifts in instruction included use of decodable texts, stronger emphasis on explicit instruction and sounds-first instruction, and integrating High-Quality Instructional Materials.

Early Childhood. EPPs in early childhood programs on average devote approximately 4 courses and 12 course credit hours to foundational literacy topics. Early childhood EPPs provide an average of 3 courses and approximately 10 course credit hours dedicated to practical experiences in schools, with teacher candidates working with classroom students. Early childhood EPPs provide an average of 4 courses and 12 course credit hours combining coursework and applied, in-school work into the same course. Early childhood EPPs devote from 7-9 hours of in-class instruction on each of these topics: literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, and vocabulary (see Appendix for definition of terms). Early childhood EPPs candidates spend on average 7-9 hours of applied in-school practice on each of these topics: literacy development, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension. The most prominent instructional practices of early childhood EPPs include explicit instruction of foundational skills, lectures with faculty presenting content, evidence-based practices, and use of flipped classrooms. The most used pedagogical principles in instruction of foundational skills reported by early childhood EPPs include science of reading, structured literacy, and culturally responsive teaching. Of the pedagogical practices expected of early childhood teacher candidates, EPPs identified explicit instruction, modeling with practice and feedback, systematic instruction, flexible grouping, culturally relevant strategies, and use of decodable texts.

Elementary Education. Elementary education EPPs provide on average approximately 3.5 courses and 10 course credit hours devoted to foundational literacy. Elementary EPPs provide an average of 2.5 courses and 7 course credit hours dedicated to practical experiences in schools, and an average of 3.5 courses and 9 course credit hours that combine coursework and applied, in-school work. Elementary EPPs dedicate more than 11 hours to in-class instruction on literacy development and between 9-11 hours on each of the following: phonological awareness, phonics, and vocabulary. Elementary EPPs also spend 9-11 clock hours in applied in-school practice on reading comprehension, and between 7-9 clock hours on each of the following: literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, orthography and spelling, fluency, high frequency words, vocabulary, and writing. The most prominent instructional practices of elementary EPPs include explicit instruction of foundational skills, discussion of evidence-based practices, and modeling with instructors demonstrating specific practices. The most used pedagogical principles in instruction of foundational skills reported by Elementary EPPs include science of reading, culturally responsive teaching, and structured literacy. Of the pedagogical practices expected of elementary teacher candidates, EPPs identified explicit instruction, modeling by the teacher candidate with practice opportunities for students and feedback, systematic instruction, use of decodable texts, flexible grouping, culturally relevant strategies, and whole-class instruction.

Special Education. Special education EPPs devote an average of 4 courses and 12 course credit hours to foundational skills in literacy, an average of 3 courses and 7 course credit hours in applied practical experiences in schools, and an average of 4 courses and 10 course credit hours combining coursework and applied, in-school work. Special education EPPs dedicate 9-11 clock hours of in-class instruction to each of the following: literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and reading

comprehension. Special education EPPs also devote 7-9 hours to applied in-school practice to each of the following: literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension. The most used pedagogical principles in instruction of foundational skills reported by special education EPPs include science of reading, culturally responsive teaching, and structured literacy. Of the pedagogical practices expected of special education teacher candidates, EPPs identified explicit instruction, systematic instruction, flexible grouping, and modeling with practice and feedback.

Overall, responses across programs show an emphasis on explicit and systematic instruction, and no less than 3 courses and 9 course credit hours in coursework devoted to literacy skills prior to student teaching or a teaching internship.

EPP Innovation Integrated Content Modules. EPP faculty were asked about their awareness of and interest in the EPP integrated content modules being developed for early childhood/elementary and for special education programs. The majority of faculty across all EPPs indicated awareness of the content and a majority expressed interest in the content aligned with their specific program area (i.e., Early Childhood and Elementary EPPs expressed interest in Pre-K-3 and grades K-5 content and special education EPPs expressed interest in special education content). However, much smaller percentages (from 12.5% to 18%) indicated content outside their licensure area would be of relevance despite the fact that most classrooms have students who are receiving special education services and most students receiving special education services spend the majority of their school day in general education classrooms.

Bulleted Summary of Instructional Programming and Pedagogical Practices

Early Childhood (Pre-K-K and/or Pre-K-Grade 3)

- Of 17 early childhood EPPs, 12 (71%) required participation in Tennessee's Early Reading Training Course I; 32 early childhood EPP faculty participated. Responding faculty indicated content such as importance of explicit instruction and use of decodable texts has influenced their instruction. Of 17 early childhood EPPs, 10 (59%) required participation in the state's Early Reading Training Course II; 20 early childhood faculty participated. Responding faculty shared features of Course II training that influenced their instruction such as the value of opportunities to practice and apply sounds-first instruction and better understanding of the simple view of reading.
- Early childhood EPPs reported an average of 4.24 courses ($SD = 3.11$, range: 2-12) and 12.29 course credit hours ($SD = 6.56$; range 6-33) dedicated to addressing foundational skills in literacy, an average of 3.00 courses ($SD = 3.02$; range 0-14) and 10.00 ($SD = 7.11$; range 0-28) course credit hours dedicated to applied practical experiences in schools, and an average of 4.35 courses ($SD = 8.04$; range 0-35) and 12.12 course credit hours ($SD = 14.50$; range 0-62) that combine coursework and applied, in-school work into the same course. (**Note:** SD = standard deviation, a number that represents the amount of variability within the set of values)
- Across stand-alone courses, stand-alone practical experiences and courses that include practical experiences, EPPs reported devoting between 9-12 hours to reading comprehension, and from 7-9 hours to in-class instruction on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, and

vocabulary. EPPs also reported spending 7-9 hours applied in-school practice on literacy development, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension.

- The most prominent instructional practices reported by EPPs include explicit instruction on foundational skills, lectures with faculty presenting content, evidence-based practices, and use of flipped classrooms.
- The most used pedagogical principles in instruction of foundational skills reported by EPPs include science of reading (88%), structured literacy (71%), and culturally responsive teaching (71%). Of the pedagogical practices expected of teacher candidates, EPPs identified explicit instruction (100%), modeling with practice and feedback (100%), systematic instruction, flexible grouping, and relevant strategies (94%), and use of decodable texts (77%).

Elementary Education (Grades K- 5)

- Of 37 elementary EPPs, 32 (86.5%) required participation in the state's Early Reading Training Course I; 81 elementary EPP faculty participated. Responding faculty indicated features such as the videos allowed for practice and noted instructional shifts from the former *Read to be Ready* initiative.
- Of 37 elementary EPPs, 27 (73.6%) required participation in the state's Early Reading Training Course II; 62 elementary EPP faculty participated. Responding faculty indicated features such as videos, exposure to High-Quality Instructional Materials and opportunity to interact with faculty from other EPPs as positive influences on their instructional practices.
- Elementary EPPs reported an average of 3.54 courses ($SD = 2.30$, range: 1-12) and 10.22 course credit hours ($SD = 5.63$; range 3-28) dedicated to addressing foundational skills in literacy, an average of 2.59 courses ($SD = 2.53$; range 0-14) and 7.27 ($SD = 6.48$; range 0-24) course credit hours dedicated to applied practical experiences in schools, and an average of 3.46 courses ($SD = 5.67$; range 0-35) and 9.14 course credit hours ($SD = 10.46$; range 0-62) that combine coursework and applied, in-school work into the same course.
- Across stand-alone courses, stand-alone practical experiences and courses that include practical experiences, EPPs reported dedicating more than 11 hours to in-class instruction on literacy development and between 9-11 hours on phonological awareness, phonics, and vocabulary. EPPs also reported spending 9-11 hours in applied in-school practice on reading comprehension, and between 7-9 hours on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, orthography and spelling, fluency, high frequency words, vocabulary, and writing.
- The most prominent instructional practices reported by EPPs include explicit instruction on foundational skills, discussion of evidence-based practices, and modeling with instructors demonstrating specific practices.
- The most used pedagogical principles in instruction of foundational skills reported by EPPs include science of reading (89%), culturally responsive teaching (78%), and structured literacy (65%). Of the pedagogical practices expected of teacher candidates, EPPs identified explicit instruction (100%), modeling with practice and feedback (100%), systematic instruction (95%), use of decodable texts (92%), flexible grouping (89%), culturally relevant strategies (84%), and whole-class instruction (81%).

Special Education (Pre-K-Grade 3, and/or Comprehensive K-Grade 12, and/or Interventionist K-Grade 8 and/or Interventionist Grades 6-12)

- Of 18 special education EPPs, 12 (67%) required participation in the state's Early Reading Training Course I; 36 special education EPP faculty participated. Responding faculty indicated features such as the videos allowed for practice and noted instructional shifts from the former *Read to be Ready* initiative.
- Of 18 special education EPPs, 10 (56%) required participation in the state's Early Reading Training Course II; 22 special education EPP faculty participated. Responding faculty indicated features such as sample videos and the shift from planning instruction to preparing to use High-Quality Instructional Materials as positive influences on their instructional practices.
- EPPs reported an average of 4.39 courses ($SD = 2.79$, range: 1-12) and 11.78 course credit hours ($SD = 5.78$; range 1-24) dedicated to addressing foundational skills in literacy, an average of 2.94 courses ($SD = 3.17$; range 0-14) and 7.28 ($SD = 6.42$; range 0-23) course credit hours dedicated to applied practical experiences in schools, and an average of 4.17 courses ($SD = 7.94$; range 0-35) and 10.00 course credit hours ($SD = 14.26$; range 0-62) that combine coursework and applied, in-school work into the same course.
- Across stand-alone courses, stand-alone practical experiences and courses that include practical experiences, EPPs reported dedicating 9-11 hours to in-class instruction on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. EPPs also report spending 7-9 hours in applied in-school practice on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension.
- The most prominent instructional practices reported by EPPs include explicit instruction on foundational skills and use of lectures with faculty presenting content.
- The most used pedagogical principles in instruction of foundational skills reported by EPPs include science of reading (94%), culturally responsive teaching (77%), and structured literacy (71%). Of the pedagogical practices expected of teacher candidates, EPPs identified explicit instruction (100%), systematic instruction, flexible grouping, and modeling with practice and feedback (94%), culturally relevant strategies (88%), use of decodable texts (77%), whole-class instruction (59%), and interpreting miscues (53%).
- Across early childhood, elementary education and special education, a majority of EPP respondents indicated awareness of and interest in the EPP Innovation Integrated Content modules that align with their licensure areas.

Methods

Instrumentation

A survey was designed by three University of Tennessee faculty members to collect information on EPP instructional programming and pedagogical practices for the EPP Landscape Analysis. The Tennessee Department of Education approved the survey and distributed it to EPPs. The survey contained 57 questions including both quantitative as well as open ended responses (see Appendix A1, Figure 1.1.). The survey required 15-25 minutes to complete. It consisted of the following sections:

Introduction. This section contained an explanation of the survey's purpose and guidelines about the qualifications of the individual(s) who should complete it. In addition, respondents identified which licensure program they were rating (i.e., early childhood, elementary education, special education).

Definitions. To assure that all respondents had a common understanding of specific terms that address pedagogy and instructional programming, the survey included a definition of terms (See Textbox 1.1. in Appendix A1).

Demographic information. Respondents identified their institution, affiliation (e.g., associate professor, clinical, adjunct), number of literacy faculty at their institution, and the number of years they were a literacy instructor.

Respondents provided information on institutional participation in the summer training and coaching offered by the state (e.g., TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training), data on who attended (e.g., dean, tenure-track professors, clinical professors) and how many faculty participated were also collected.

Respondents who did not attend responded to an open-ended question regarding the reasons for their lack of participation. Information on respondents' view of the trainings, if attended, and how it influenced their current instruction was also gathered.

Time allocation. Questions in this section focused on how to better understand the number of courses devoted to foundational skills and the number of courses that incorporate clinical experiences prior to student teaching or teaching internship. Items examined how much time EPPs devote to in-course instruction on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, orthography and spelling, advanced decoding, fluency, high frequency words, vocabulary, morphology, text complexity, reading comprehension, and writing. Items also examined the time allocation during applied in-school practice on those same components of literacy.

Instructional practices. Survey items examined specific practices EPPs apply in foundational literacy skills instruction. Respondents selected and ranked practices to determine the most frequent practices. In addition, respondents described a typical lesson with objectives, tasks, and activities. They also shared whether they use High-Quality Instructional Materials and whether the state's [TN Foundational Skills Curriculum Supplement](#) was incorporated into their instruction.

Interest in EPP resources. Items examined whether EPP respondents are interested in using the materials currently developed by the Foundational Skills Integrated Content Pre-K-Grade 3 and Elementary K-Grade 5, and Foundational Skills Integrated Content Special Education EPP Innovation grants. This question addressed interest in implementation of revisions in current EPP courses addressing foundational literacy skills.

Survey Development and Validation

The research team (i.e., three university faculty with expertise in literacy instruction and research methodology) developed all items and internally administered the survey to examine the items' clarity and need for revisions at the sentence-phrasing level. The team consulted researchers from the University of Tennessee involved in teacher preparation to assure that no important content was omitted. The survey was shared with the Tennessee Department of Education for the department's experts to review and share revisions.

The final survey items addressed instructional programming and pedagogical practices. The Tennessee Department of Education shared an email invitation to EPPs within the state and distributed the link to the survey, using the Qualtrics platform of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Timeline. The survey ran from February 11, 2022 to March 2, 2022 with two reminders sent to institutions.

Analysis. The survey used both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. Quantitative survey responses were summarized using descriptive statistics as well as frequency counts and proportions. Open-ended survey responses were analyzed using a thematic analysis to identify and summarize patterns of responses among respondents.

Findings

39 Tennessee EPPs provided 72 responses across licensure programs. The survey addressed practices and programming in early childhood ($n = 17$), elementary education ($n = 37$), and special education programs ($n = 18$). In the next sections information is provided for Early Childhood (section 1.0), Elementary (section 2.0), and Special Education (section 3.0).

1.0. Early Childhood (Pre-K–K and/or Pre-K–3)

1.1. Respondents' Demographics

Of the 17 respondents for early childhood teacher preparation, 3 professors (18%), 5 associate professors (29%), 4 assistant professors (24%), 5 “other” responses (29%) (i.e., 1 associate dean, 3 directors, 1 instructor) completed the survey. Of these 17 respondents, eight were tenured (47%); of these, on average they have 11.6 years’ experience as a literacy instructor in an EPP ($SD= 9.94$) and have been in their current EPP for 8.3 years ($SD= 6.25$). On average across the EPPs that prepare early childhood teachers, 4.5 faculty ($SD =2.70$) teach coursework on literacy.

1.2. Participation in Early Reading Training (Course I and II)

Course I asynchronous training. Of the 17 early childhood respondents, 12 (71%) participated in the TN Early Reading Training (ERT) Course I asynchronous training, and 5 (29%) were required by their EPP to obtain certificates to verify participation.

Five EPP respondents who did not participate provided reasons such as sickness (COVID-19), alternative forms of training (Teach for America preservice programming), unclear communication regarding availability trainings, and discontinuation because the content was similar to what they already taught in their courses.

Attendees of Course I training. Overall, a total of 32 EPP faculty from 17 early childhood teacher preparation programs completed the Course I ERT training. Respondents included 21 tenured or tenure-seeking faculty including 4 administrators (13%), 7 full professors (22%), 6 associate professors (19%), and 4 assistant professors (13%). An additional 11 non-tenure track faculty completed the training including 2 clinical faculty and 2 lecturers (6% respectively), 5 adjuncts (16%), and 2 “other” (6%) (e.g., program coordinator). (See Table 1.1. with ranks of EPP participants in Course I of asynchronous training).

Table 1.1. Ranks and Numbers of EPP Early Childhood Participants in Course I of Asynchronous Early Reading Training

Rank	Number attended
Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head)	4
Professor	7
Associate Professor	6
Assistant Professor	4
Clinical (professor, associate, assistant)	2
Lecturer	2
Adjunct faculty	5
Other (e.g., program coordinator)	2

Course II synchronous training. Ten EPP respondents shared that their program required participation in the second week (59%) of synchronous ERT training. Five respondents who did not attend the Course II synchronous training provided reasons such as sickness, lack of availability of spots, unclear regarding

availability of trainings, and completion of Teach for America preservice programming as an alternate to the summer ERT Course II training.

Attendees of Course II training. Overall, 20 early childhood EPP personnel attended the Course II synchronous ERT. The 14 tenure track faculty who participated included 2 administrators (10%), 6 full-time professors (30%), 3 associate professors and 3 assistant professors (15% respectively). The 5 non-tenure track faculty who participated included 2 clinical faculty (10%), 2 lecturers (10%), and one adjunct (5%). No graduate student attended the sessions, while 1 “other” attendee was listed (e.g., program coordinator). (See Table 1.2. with ranks for EPP respondents in Course II of Synchronous training).

Table 1.2. Ranks and Numbers of EPP Early Childhood Participants in Course II of Synchronous Early Reading Training

Rank	Number attended
Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head)	2
Professor	6
Associate Professor	3
Assistant Professor	3
Clinical (professor, associate, assistant)	2
Lecturer	2
Adjunct faculty	1
Other (e.g., program coordinator)	1

1.3. Foundational Skills Training and Instructional Influences

Respondents were asked whether they teach literacy coursework in foundational skills and whether they, personally, attended the Tennessee Early Reading Trainings (Course I and Course II). 15 (88%) indicated they were faculty teaching literacy courses in foundational skills and 12 (71%) attended the asynchronous Course I training.

Asked to share the ways Course I training influenced their instruction and the ways that program faculty structured the literacy courses, 12 responses were provided, and the following patterns emerged: confirmation of current practices and revisions made on programs ($n = 4$), better understanding about the simple view of reading, the sounds first initiative, and emphasis on skills-based instruction ($n = 5$), revisions on content and on textbook ($n = 3$).

One participant noted:

“[...] some content from the online training dispelled some of my misconceptions of skill-based instruction. For example, I now see the value of systematic over incidental phonics instruction. I now also understand improvements made in decodable books. Decodable books are now less contrived and more interesting than they used to be.”

Another explained,

“I also benefited from reading through the limitations of the whole language approach balanced literacy as we were reminded that ‘in practice, it is often not well defined and includes practices

that are not supported by research, like inconsistent phonics instruction, leveled reading groups, and heavily comprehension skills-focused instruction.”

The aspects of the training that respondents found to be the effective primarily addressed the provision of resources. Specifically, seven commented on the use of videos of sample instruction, one on the overall manner of presentation of all materials, on the assessment tools provided and explained, and one on the phonological awareness and phonics review. One EPP respondent reiterated the practices reaffirmed current efforts and an emphasis on evidence-based instruction and shared that *“the available resources including videos and guides are likely helpful tools for preservice teachers.”*

Of the 12 EPP respondents who completed Course I training, 10 (83%) said it was effective and 2 (17%) said it was very effective. Respondents used the following terms to describe their rating: easy ($n = 1$), interactive ($n = 1$), comprehensive ($n = 1$), clear ($n = 1$), with practical examples ($n = 1$). One explained there was nothing new in content ($n = 1$), and another shared that additional information on ways to provide interventions to students who struggle or have dyslexia would have been helpful ($n = 1$).

“ I now see the value of systematic over incidental phonics instruction. I now also understand improvements made in decodable books. Decodable books are now less contrived and more interesting than they used to be.

TRAINING PARTICIPANT

”

Nine early childhood EPP respondents (53%) attended Course II of the ERT, Of the 8 who did not attend, their reasons reflected similar reasons as in those in Course I programming.

When asked to share the ways the content of the Course II training influenced their instruction and the ways that program faculty structured literacy courses, three respondents indicated the training gave them opportunities to learn about the EPP Innovation Integrated Content modules developed for foundational skills, and one commented on their current collaboration with the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to evaluate those modules. One explained the training resulted in including in their courses assignments for students that connected with the foundational skills resources provided by the Tennessee Department of Education, and one more commented on the use of such examples and practices.

Two respondents said the training reaffirmed their current practices and as one explained, “reinvigorated my teaching.” Two commented on the training structure, and the inclusion of practice opportunities, as aspects they found most influential in instructional shifts. Another commented on the use of practices from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville modules, and one on the assessment tools for foundational skills.

Nine (53%) completed the Course II training and 7 (78%) said it was effective or very effective and 2 (22%) indicated the training was neither effective or ineffective. One participant who provided a neutral rating indicated the content was helpful but questioned the effectiveness of the presenter. Another expressed a need for more information to support struggling readers and those with dyslexia.

Three who rated the training as effective shared that the content was easy and clearly sequenced. One explained it had a lot of information and represented change, while one more pointed out the renewed focus on the science of reading that the training validated.

1.4. Number of Courses and Time Allocation to Foundational Skills

Early childhood EPP respondents provided information on the number of courses and amount of time devoted to teaching foundational literacy skills. Responses indicated a range from 2 to 12 courses (average = 4.24, *SD* = 3.11) devoted to addressing foundations skills in literacy coursework for initial licensure (See Table 1.3. frequency counts). However, one EPP identified 12 courses addressing foundational literacy. Because this number represents an outlier, it was removed to provide a more realistic average. When removed, the mean and standard deviation of courses addressing foundational literacy across the EPPs is 3.20 (*SD*= 1.15).

Table 1.3. Number of Courses that Address Foundational Literacy Skills Reported by Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Respondents

Foundational Skills	
Number of courses	EPPs
2	6
3	2
4	5
5	2
12	2
4.24	Mean
3.11	<i>SD</i>
Adjusted for Outlier	
3.20	Mean
1.15	<i>SD</i>

Respondents also shared the number of course credit hours provided for those courses (See Table 1.4. for number of course credit hours on foundational skills); average = 12.20; *SD* = 6.56 One EPP indicated 33 course credit hours (outlier). When removed, the mean and standard deviation reduced to 11.00 and 3.95, respectively. The tables include the outlier.

Table 1.4. Number of Course Credit Hours Devoted to Foundational Skills as Reported by Early Childhood Teacher Preparation Respondents

Foundational Skills	
Number of credit hours	EPPs
6	4
9	2
10	1
12	4
13	2
15	2

20	1
33	1
12.29	Mean
6.56	SD
Adjusted for Outlier	
11.00	Mean
3.95	SD

Respondents reported a range from 0 to 14 courses and 0 to 28 course credit hours with applied practical experience (See Table 1.5. and 1.6). The mean is affected by an outlier (EPP with 14 number of courses and 28 number of course credit hours). Without it, the mean for provided courses is 2.31 and the standard deviation drops at 1.08, while the mean for provided course credit hours and standard deviation reduced to 8.88 and 5.56, respectively.

Table 1.5. Number of EPP Early Childhood Courses Providing Applied Practical Experience in Foundational Literacy Skills

Applied Practical Experience/ Field Experiences	
Number of courses	EPPs
0	1
1	2
2	6
3	5
4	2
14	1
3.00	Mean
3.02	SD
Adjusted for Outlier	
2.31	Mean
1.08	SD

Table 1.6. Number of EPP Early Childhood Course Credit Hours Providing Applied Practical Experience in Foundational Literacy Skills

Applied Practical Experience/ Field Experiences	
Number of credit hours	EPPs
0	1
3	1
4	1
6	4
9	4
10	1
12	1
13	1

17	1
23	1
28	1
10.00	Mean
7.11	<i>SD</i>
Adjusted for Outlier	
8.88	Mean
5.56	<i>SD</i>

Respondents reported a range of 0 to 35 courses and of 0 to 62 course credit hours in course work and applied, in-school experience into the same course. One EPP respondent shared a higher number of courses and course credit hours, and when removed from the analysis, the mean for provided courses reduced to 2.44 and the standard deviation to 1.55. When the EPP was removed from the analysis (as an outlier) the mean of course credit hours reduced to 9.00 and the standard deviation was 6.93. (Tables 1.7. and 1.8. provide the information with the outlier).

Table 1.7. Number of Early Childhood Preparation Courses Combining Course Work and Applied, in-School Experiences in the Same Course

Courses that combine course work and applied, in-school experiences into the same course

Number of courses	EPPs
0	2
1	2
2	5
3	3
4	2
5	2
35	1
4.35	Mean
8.04	<i>SD</i>
Adjusted for Outlier	
2.44	Mean
1.55	<i>SD</i>

Table 1.8. Number of Course Credit Hours that Combine Course Work and Applied, in-school Experience in Same Course

Courses that combine course work and applied, in-school work into the same course

Number of credit hours	EPPs
0	2
4	2
6	4

9	2
10	1
12	1
13	1
15	1
16	1
28	1
62	1
<hr/>	
12.12	Mean
14.50	<i>SD</i>
Adjusted for Outlier	
9	Mean
6.93	<i>SD</i>
<hr/>	

In-class instruction

The median response from the 17 respondents on time devoted to in-class instruction prior to internship or student teaching to literacy components was 9-11 hours on reading comprehension, 7-9 hours on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, and vocabulary, 4-6 hours on advanced decoding, fluency, high frequency words, text complexity, and writing, and 1-3 hours on orthography and spelling, and morphology.

Applied in-school practice

The median response from the 17 respondents on literacy components and time allocation was 7-9 hours spent on literacy development, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension, 4-6 hours on phonological awareness, fluency, high frequency words, text complexity, and writing, and 1-3 hours on orthography and spelling, advanced decoding, and morphology.

1.5. Instructional Practices

Respondents were asked to refer to a comprehensive list (see Appendix A.1 Item # 38) and to rank the three most prominent practices used in their in-class instruction in their literacy courses. Nine EPPs ranked first explicit instruction on foundational skills, 3 the use of lecture with faculty presenting content on a topic, 2 ranked discussion of evidence-based practices as first choice, and 2 the use of flipped classrooms in which presentations, tasks, and readings are completed asynchronously out of class. One ranked first the use of student-led presentations with students presenting as a group or individuals on a topic.

For second most prominent practices, 8 EPP respondents ranked applied practice in class with students practicing tasks and role-playing instructional procedures (e.g., teacher candidates assume the role of the teacher), 4 ranked modeling with instructor demonstrating live specific practices, 2 the use of cooperative groups with students collaborating to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relates to content learning, one ranked inquiry-based learning, one student led presentations, and one the use of explicit instruction in foundational skills concepts.

For third most prominent practices, 4 EPP respondents indicated the use of explicit instruction on foundational skills, 3 the use of applied practice in class with students practicing tasks and role-playing instructional procedures, and 3 the use of discussion of evidence-based literacy practices. Two ranked the use of flipped classrooms with presentations, tasks and reading completed asynchronously out of the class and in-class time devoted to application, and 2 the use of cooperative groups, while one EPP ranked third student-led presentations, one the use of assessments to ensure mastery, and one the use of modeling with instructor demonstration live of specific practices.

1.6. Description of a Lesson on Foundational Skills

Seven of the 17 EPP respondents described a typical lesson on foundational skills. The analysis identified one detailed explanation of a flipped classroom model of instruction with out-of-class quizzes prior to any task, completion of readings, of reading guides, of a podcast with a lecture and activities, and of a quiz at the end of the module with all information. The description addressed in-class applications with students reviewing content in structured activities, completing in-class activities with the instructor modeling, and teacher-candidate practice of whole group and small group tasks from High-Quality Instructional Materials and the TN Foundational Skills Supplemental resources. Finally, students role-play how to communicate content-specific information that address students' needs in parent-teacher conferences and the course ends with a question that addresses all content (exit ticket).

One EPP referred to the use of modules of instruction currently developed by a Tennessee EPP (i.e., University of Tennessee, Knoxville) and on the application in-class of practices using the Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) curriculum. Twelve EPPs commented on the inclusion of a review and/or preview of new content, practice with teacher modeling, guided practice, and teacher candidates' small-group work.

One EPP referred to the use of picture books to design a lesson and teacher candidates working together to teach the lesson. Another commented on the use of handouts that teacher candidates placed in their notebooks and then on the use of case studies for student practice. Across EPP respondents, overall, they commented on the inclusion of videos of instruction and of case-studies for teacher candidates' preparation.

1.7. Pedagogical Principles of Instruction

Respondents were asked to identify the pedagogical principles of practices their EPP utilizes in the instruction of foundational skills. Fifteen EPPs (88%) identified science of reading as principle of teaching, 12 (71%) structured literacy, 12 (71%) culturally responsive teaching, and 6 (35%) balanced literacy as the method of teaching (See Appendix A.1 with definitions).

1.8. Pedagogical Practices Expected by Candidates

All 17 early childhood EPP respondents (100%) indicated they expect their teacher candidates to be able to use explicit instruction and modeling with practice and feedback, respectively, 16 (94%) identified systematic instruction, flexible grouping, and culturally relevant strategies, 13 (77%) the use of decodable texts, 11 (65%) mentioned whole group instruction, 10 (59%) writers' workshop, 8 (47%) use of

predictable texts, 6 (35%) guided reading and the use of miscues (meaning, sound, visual), 4 (24%) application of a leveling system, 4 (24%) implicit practices, 3 (18%) incidental practices, and 2 other responses (e.g., small group instruction; shared and interactive reading and writing).

Asked to identify the 5 pedagogical practices respondents from early childhood EPPs emphasized the most, all 17 (100%) shared they emphasized modeling, 16 (94%) selected explicit instruction, 12 (71%) systematic instruction, 11 (65%) culturally relevant strategies and flexible grouping, respectively, 6 (35%) use of decodable texts, 3 (17%) guided reading and interpretation of miscues, respectively, 2 (12%) whole-class instruction, one (6%) writers' workshop and use of predictable texts, respectively, and 2 "other" responses (e.g., shared and interactive reading/writing, small group instruction).

1.9. Use of Materials and Curricula

Eleven early childhood EPP respondents (65%) reported that they use the TN Foundational Skills curriculum supplement, and 13 EPPs (77%) shared they use High-Quality Instructional Materials. Those resources included CKLA ($n = 6$), Wit and Wisdom ($n = 5$), McGraw Hill ($n = 2$), the Montessori didactic materials and Waseca for language and literacy development ($n = 1$), EL Education ($n = 2$), TN Foundational Skills supplement ($n = 1$), Heggerty ($n = 1$), and Benchmark Advanced ($n = 1$) (see link with High-Quality instructional materials for the state of Tennessee: [High-Quality Instructional Materials](#)).

1.10. Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants

Respondents were asked to share if they were aware of the state's EPP Innovation Foundational Skills Integrated Content grants with 12 EPP respondents (71%) indicating they were aware of the grants for the Pre-K- Grade 3, K- Grade 5 EPP innovation grants, and 9 EPPs (53%) indicated they knew of the special education interventionist innovation grants.

All early childhood respondents (100%) said they would be interested in using the content and 14 (82%) indicated the Pre-K- Grade 3, Grade K-5 EPP Innovation grant work was relevant to their program while 3 (18%) indicated that the special education content was relevant to them.

2.0. Elementary Education (Grades K- 5)

2.1. Respondents' Demographics

The 37 respondents for K-5 teacher preparation who completed the survey included 8 professors (21.6%), 7 associate professors (18.9%), 9 assistant professors (24.3%), one adjunct (2.7%), and 12 “other” responses (32.4%) (e.g., 5 directors, 4 deans or associate deans, one assessment coordinator, one lecturer, and one instructor). Of the 37, 13 were tenured (35.1%); of these, on average they have 10.6 years’ experience as a literacy instructor in an EPP ($SD = 8.53$), and have been in their EPP for 8.5 years ($SD = 6.51$). On average across the EPPs that prepare K-5 teachers, 3.7 faculty are teaching coursework on literacy ($SD = 2.09$).

2.2. Participation in Early Reading Training (Course 1 and 2)

Course I asynchronous training. Thirty-two of the 37 (86.5%) respondents whose EPPs prepare elementary teachers participated in the TN ERT Course I asynchronous training and 12 of the 32 (37.5%) indicated that certificates were required by their EPP to verify participation. Five who did not participate identified reasons such as: scheduling conflicts, prior confidence in the topics addressed similar training provided through Teach for America preservice programming and unclear communication about the training.

Attendees of Course I training. From the 37 EPPs that prepare elementary teachers, 81 faculty completed ERT Course I with 57 of these in tenure track positions: 20 administrators (24.7%), 9 full professors (11.1%), 14 associate professors (17.3%), and 14 assistant professors (17.3%). Other participants included 10 clinical faculty (12.3%) 3 lecturers (3.7%), 8 adjuncts (9.9%), two graduate students (2.5%) and one “other” response (1.1%).

(See Table 2.1. with ranks for EPP participants in Course I training).

Table 2.1. Table 1.1. Ranks and Numbers of EPP Elementary (Pre-K-3 and Grades K-5) Participants in Course I of Asynchronous Early Reading Training Ranks of Attendees for Course I Asynchronous Training

Rank	Number attended
Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head)	20
Professor	9
Associate Professor	14
Assistant Professor	14
Clinical (professor, associate, assistant)	10
Lecturer	3
Adjunct faculty	8
Graduate students	2
Other (e.g., instructor)	1

Course II synchronous training. Twenty-seven (73%) respondents indicated that their program required taking part in the Course II synchronous trainings. Reasons provided for why some did not participate in Course II synchronous training echoed those provided in the previous section.

Attendees of Course II training. Elementary EPP faculty who participated in ERT Course II synchronous training totaled 62 with 42 in tenure track positions: 13 administrators (21%), 9 full-time professors (14.5%), 10 associate professors and 10 assistant professors (16.1% respectively). Non-tenure track faculty who participated included 10 clinical faculty (16.1%), 3 lecturers (5%), 5 adjuncts (8.1%), one graduate student (1.6%), and one “other” (1.6%) identified as an instructor.

(See Table 2.2. with ranks for EPP participants in ERT Course II of synchronous training).

Table 2.2. Table 1.2. Ranks and Numbers of EPP Grades Pre-K-3 and K-5 Participants in Course II of Synchronous Early Reading Training

Rank	Number attended
Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head)	13
Professor	9
Associate Professor	10
Assistant Professor	10
Clinical (professor, associate, assistant)	10
Lecturer	3
Adjunct faculty	5
Graduate students	1
Other (e.g., instructor)	1

2.3. Foundational Skills Training and Instructional Influences

Thirty-six (97.3%) respondents said they were faculty teaching literacy courses in foundational skills, and 29 (78.1%) had attended the asynchronous Course I training.

Eight respondents said the content reinforced their current practices, 17 indicated they revised their courses, including content and structure of their courses to address foundational skills and science of reading overall, and two commented on changes in the clinical experiences to address foundational skills. Three commented on the resources now available to them, one on the use of High-Quality Instructional Materials, one on the use of the modules developed at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and one shared they had made general revisions, but those were not specified. One participant commented on the noticeable shift from the previous initiative:

“It was a big shift from Read to be Ready which did not focus on foundational skills, but on text complexity. The content validated the need to refocus on an early literacy and foundational skills, rather than text complexity and close reading.”

Sixteen referred to the sample videos (of instruction and assessment) as the most effective aspects of the training. One found some of the videos helpful, and one did not find them as effective: *“The use of videos felt similar to the experience of viewing commercial ads. While this phase provided opportunity to view information, it did not provide an active learning experience.”*

Two respondents shared that the training supported consistency in use and meaning of terms as well as in materials used (because the school teachers had gone through the same training), one commented on the overall training structure, one on the provision of information to support differentiated instruction, and two shared that the training confirmed revisions they had already made. As one participant explained,

“The content [of the training] did not influence our program as we are using evidence-based practices. We also utilize videos for whole group and small-group instruction. Thus, the resources in the training did not lead to instructional shifts but rather affirmed that the approaches we use and pedagogical practices we utilize are appropriate.”

Of the 29 elementary EPP respondents who completed the ERT Course I training, 10 (34.5%) said it was “very effective,” 17 (58.6%) said it was “effective” and two (6.7%) shared that it was “neither effective or ineffective.” Those who indicated a neutral response explained the content was already familiar to them.

Those who identified the training as “effective” and “very effective” shared positive comments ($n = 8$) (e.g., *I loved the training*) and one of them explained they would have liked more opportunities for mastery and understanding. Six of them shared that the content was not unfamiliar to them and one of the responders explained,

“Much of what was presented in the Tennessee Early Reading Training was familiar to us. We considered the wide range of people who participated in the training across locations and sessions and we were aware that information contained in the training may not be so familiar to many of them.”

Two commented on the ease of accessing the content. They said the training structure used “multiple modalities” with reading, discussion, and videos ($n = 3$); 5 indicated the training was a way to confirm current practices, and 4 considered it a good review.

“
The content validated the need to refocus on an early literacy and foundational skills, rather than text complexity and close reading.
”
TRAINING PARTICIPANT

Respondents shared suggestions, requesting time to share and discuss among EPP faculty the ways they address foundational literacy skills practices in their classrooms, and one providing suggestions for revisions of the sample videos. For those who did not participate in the Course I training, responses echoed those provided in previous sections (e.g., scheduling conflicts, familiarity with the content, sickness, and prior similar alternative training).

Twenty-four elementary EPP respondents completed the Course II training and 7 (29.1%) said it was “very effective,” 14 (58.3%) rated it as “effective,” and 3 (12.5%) were neutral. Those who rated the training as effective and very effective reflected previous responses on structure and overall organization, on opportunities for practice, on the knowledge of the presenter, and on the opportunities to interact with other EPP faculty. The three EPPs who provided a neutral response indicated prior knowledge of the content and a desire to have more open dialogue about important key topics, such as phonics versus cueing system and increased emphasis on use of decodable texts.

As with Course I, respondents gave reasons for not participating; they included EPP faculty confidence to address the content, sickness (e.g., COVID-19), scheduling conflicts, and alternate similar training. One respondent indicated that their EPP faculty member responsible for accreditation attended and shared with others subsequently.

Respondents noted appreciation of the ability to interact with other EPP faculty in the Course II training, with one sharing their opportunity to collaborate with the University of Tennessee, Knoxville on the modules addressing foundational skills. Four explained there were no changes in their instruction as they had already worked in significant revisions and applications of evidence-based practices, nine commented on making changes on content, on materials (e.g., use of videos from the Tennessee Department of Education site and resources) and one shared the process of learning supported their ability to further reflect on the content:

“Participating in the ERT as a facilitator caused me to reflect on how intentional I was teaching various foundational skills concepts. In particular, I didn't feel that the Science of Reading approach to literacy was being explicitly addressed and explained. It caused me to think about opportunities for me to bring more research into my literacy courses to share with preservice teachers more about the “why” in teaching literacy specific ways.”

Three commented on changes in textbooks they use in their EPPs, with one of them naming the following, *“Know Better, Do Better by Liben & Liben, and Teaching Reading in 21st Century by Dewitz, et al.”*

Six respondents said the training they found most influential in instructional shifts was the benefit of collaborating and discussing with other colleagues from EPPs within the state. Two partners shared they had already made significant revisions in their programs and the content simply affirmed their changes and focus on evidence-based practices.

Three EPP respondents appreciated the opportunity to practice and be aware of the resources teachers would use and one addressed the opportunity to use those in their own courses. Four EPP respondents commented on the explicitness of the content and its focus on systematic instruction of foundational skills with one more respondent appreciating the focus on foundational skills. Two EPP respondents commented on the provision of strategies to address needs of different learners and one on the use of videos with sample practices and instruction.

2.4. Number of Courses and Time Allocation to Foundational Skills

Elementary (Grades K-5) EPP respondents provided information on the number of courses and amount of time devoted to teaching foundational literacy skills. Responses indicated a range from 1 to 12 courses with a range of 3 to 28 course credit hours (See Table 2.3. with number of courses).

Table 2.3. Number of Courses that Address Foundational Literacy Skills Reported by Grades K-5 Teacher Preparation Respondents

Foundational Skills	
Number of courses	EPPs
1	2
2	11
3	11
4	8
5	1
7	1
8	1
10	1
12	1
3.54	Mean
2.30	SD

Table 2.4. Number of Course Credit Hours Devoted to Foundational Skills as Reported by Grades K-5 Teacher Preparation Respondents

Foundational Skills	
Number of credit hours	EPPs
3	3
4	1
5	1
6	6
8	2
9	10
12	6
13	2
15	2
16	1
19	1
27	1
28	1
10.22	Mean
5.63	SD

Respondents reported a range from 0 to 14 courses and 0 to 24 course credit hours devoted to applied practical experience in foundational literacy skills (See Table 2.5. with number of courses addressing applied practical experience). They reported a range of number of courses combining coursework and applied in-school experience in the same course, from 0 to 35 courses and 0 to 62 course credit hours (See Table 2.6).

Table 2.5. Number of EPP Grades K-5 Courses Providing Applied Practical Experience in Foundational Literacy Skills

Applied Practical Experience/ Field Experiences	
Number of courses	EPPs
0	6
1	7
2	8
3	6
4	5
5	3
6	1
14	1
2.59	Mean
2.53	<i>SD</i>

Table 2.6. Number of EPP Grades K-5 Course Credit Hours Providing Applied Practical Experience in Foundational Literacy Skills

Applied Practical Experience/ Field Experiences	
Number of credit hours	EPPs
0	6
1	1
2	2
3	6
5	2
6	4
8	2
9	3
10	1
12	4
13	1
15	2
21	1
23	1
24	1
7.27	Mean
6.48	<i>SD</i>

Table 2.7. Number of Grades K-5 Preparation Courses Combining Course Work and Applied, In-school Experiences in Same Course

Courses that combine course work and applied, in-school work into the same course

Number of courses	EPPs
0	3
1	9
2	8
3	6
4	5
5	4
10	1
35	1
3.46	Mean
5.67	SD
Outlier Removed	
2.58	Mean
1.96	SD

Table 2.8. Number of Grades K-5 Preparation Courses Combining Course Work and Applied, in-school Experiences

Courses that combine course work and applied, in-school work into the same course

Number of credit hours	EPPs
0	3
3	7
4	2
5	1
6	6
7	1
8	2
9	4
10	1
12	4
13	1
15	1
16	1
21	1
24	1
62	1
9.14	Mean
10.46	SD
Outlier Removed	
7.67	Mean

In-class instruction

The median response from the 37 elementary EPP respondents on the time devoted to in-class instruction prior to internship or student teaching to literacy components was more than 11 hours on literacy development, writing, and reading comprehension, 9-11 hours on phonological awareness, phonics, and vocabulary, 7-9 hours on orthography and spelling, advanced decoding, fluency, high frequency words, and text complexity, and 4-6 hours on morphology.

Applied in-school practice

The median response of elementary EPP respondents on time devoted to in-school practice with the literacy components and time allocation was 9-11 hours on reading comprehension, 7-9 hours on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, orthography and spelling, fluency, high frequency words, vocabulary, and writing, 4-6 hours on advanced decoding, morphology, and text complexity.

2.5. Instructional Practices

Respondents were asked to rank the three most prominent practices used in their in-class instruction in their literacy courses. Eighteen (18) EPPs ranked first explicit instruction on foundational skills, six discussion of evidence-based practices, five modeling with instructors demonstrating live specific practices, and three lectures in which faculty present content. Two EPPs ranked first the use of flipped classrooms, and one EPP ranked first student-led presentations, one the use of assessments to ensure mastery with completion of assessments on specific reading components with practice, and one the use of cooperative groups with students collaborating to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relate to content learning.

For second most prominent practices, 13 EPP respondents ranked applied practice in class with students practicing tasks and role-playing instructional procedures (e.g., teacher candidates assume the role of the teacher), 8 ranked the use of explicit instruction in foundational skills concepts, 5 ranked the use of flipped classrooms with presentations, 4 ranked modeling with instructor demonstrating live specific practices, 3 the use of cooperative groups with students collaborating to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relates to content learning, 2 lecture, one ranked inquiry-based learning, and one discussion of evidence-based literacy practices.

Nine EPP respondents ranked third the use of applied practice in class with students practicing tasks and role-playing instructional procedures, 6 the use of modeling with instructor demonstration live of specific practices, 5 the use of cooperative groups with students collaborating to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relates to content learning, 5 the use of assessments to ensure mastery, 4 explicit instruction on foundational skills, 2 student-led presentations, one the use of flipped classrooms with presentations, one discussion of evidence based literacy practices, one lecture, and one other response that indicated “explicit actionable feedback from course instructors is provided on student presentations,

demonstrations, projects, and authentic applied practices to facilitate proficiency in literacy instruction.” Two EPP respondents did not provide a third rank.

2.6. Description of a Lesson on Foundational Skills

Respondents described a typical lesson on foundational skills. Two referred to the implementation of a flipped classroom model of instruction that provided theory and readings out of class and application during class meetings. One (as in the early childhood responses) shared in detail the structure of a lesson with a class quiz prior to any task, completion of readings, reading guides, a podcast with a lecture and activities, and a quiz at the end of the module with all information. The description addressed in-class applications with students’ reviewing content in structured activities, completing in-class activities with instructor modeling and teacher-candidate practice of whole group and small group tasks from High-Quality Instructional Materials and the TN Foundational Skills Supplemental resources. Finally, students role-playing how to communicate content-specific information that address students’ needs in parent-teacher conferences and the course ends with a question that addresses all content (exit ticket).

Seventeen elementary EPP respondents explained a lesson included lecture with teacher modeling and student implementation in small groups and independently. Five respondents commented on the use of the [Scarborough reading rope](#) as a starting point of discussions and explanations and engagement with students on assessment and instruction. Four EPPs commented on the use of videos of sample practices and instruction and one on the use of modules from the TN Foundational Skills Curriculum Supplement modules.

2.7. Pedagogical Principles of Instruction

Thirty-three (89.2%) of the elementary EPP respondents identified science of reading as a principle of teaching, 29 (78.4%) culturally responsive teaching, 24 (64.9%) structured literacy, 18 (48.6%) balanced literacy, 4 (10.8%) whole language, and 3 referred to “other” (8.1%). Regarding the “other” approaches, one shared that they focused on the sounds-first approach reflecting the influence of the summer training. Specifically, they shared,

“One example of using the sounds-first approach is using the videos shared with us during the training of the man creating games out of sounding out each word. I had my students stand up and do the games with him and then practice teaching the games to their future students. I talked about how important it was to enunciate correctly since your students would model after your pronunciations.”

Another respondent commented on several components of theory and application, “*Scarborough’s rope, differentiation, assessment for learning, theories of teaching reading, decodable and predictable text.*” A third commented on the historical literacy shifts and concluded the focus of instruction would need to be, “*Literacy instruction must be explicit, systematic, and cumulative (constructively building on prior knowledge).*”

2.8. Pedagogical Practices Expected by Candidates

All 37 (100%) elementary EPP respondents indicated they expect their teacher candidates to be able to use shared explicit instruction and modeling with practice and feedback, respectively, 35 (94.6%) identified systematic instruction, 34 (91.9%) the use of decodable texts, 33 (89.2%) flexible grouping, 31 (83.8%) culturally relevant strategies, 30 (81.1%) whole-class instruction, 18 (48.6%) writers' workshop and guided reading, respectively, 16 (43.2%) the use of predictable texts, 15 (40.5%) the application of a leveling system, 14 (37.8%) interpreting miscues (meaning, sound, visual), 13 (35.1%) implicit practices, 11 (29.7%) incidental practices, and 5 referred to "other" (13.5%): differentiated instruction based on student needs, interactive reading aloud, shared interactive writing, strategy instruction in writing, the implementation of a gradual release of responsibility, vocabulary acquisition, and vertical alignment to standards, and explicit actionable feedback.

Thirty-five (94.6%) identified practice and feedback from the five pedagogical practices in elementary education they emphasized as the most instructionally important, 34 (91.9%) explicit instruction, 30 (81.1%) systematic instruction, 19 (51.4%) flexible grouping, 17 (45.6%) culturally relevant strategies, 15 (40.5%) use of decodable texts and whole-class instruction, respectively, 6 (16.2%) guided reading, 5 (13.5%) interpretation of miscues, 3 (8.1%) use of predictable texts, one (2.7%) writers' workshop, and four (10.8%) chose "other."

Those who referred to "other" commented on "instruction that connects writing and reading (students practice decoding words, making words, writing/spelling words, reading words in context of decodable books), gradual release of responsibility model, process writing and writing to learn, and small group instruction.

2.9. Use of Materials and Curricula

Regarding use of the [TN Foundational Skills Curriculum supplement](#), 25 (67.6%) EPP respondents reported they use it, and 30 (81.1%) shared they use [High-Quality Instructional Materials](#). Respondents referred to several materials, with 12 references to CKLA, 11 to Wit and Wisdom, two to Benchmark Advanced, 2 to the TN Foundational Skills Supplement curriculum, 5 to EL education, three to Wonders, one to Journeys, one to FELS, and one to the Montessori didactic materials and Waseca for language and literacy development.

2.10. Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants

Twenty-six (70.3%) elementary EPP respondents indicated their awareness of the foundational skills integrated content grants for the Pre-K- Grade 3, K- Grade 5 EPP innovation grants and 25 (67.6%) indicated they were aware of the special education interventionist innovation grants. Thirty-six of the 37 (97.3%) elementary education respondents said they would be interested in using the course content, and 30 (83.4%) identified the Pre-K- Grade 3, K- Grade 5 EPP innovation grant work as relevant to their program while 6 (16.6%) indicated that special education content was relevant.

3.0. Special Education

3.1. Respondents’ Demographics

Of the 18 respondents for special education teacher preparation, 4 professors (22%), 2 associates (11%), 6 assistants (33%), 1 adjunct (6%), and 5 “other” responses (29%) (i.e., 1 dean, 3 directors, 1 lecturer) completed the survey. Of these 18, seven were tenured (39%), and have been a literacy instructor in an EPP for an average of 9.3 years ($SD = 9.49$), and in their EPP for 7.2 years ($SD = 6.43$). On average 4.6 faculty across the responding special education EPPs are teaching coursework on literacy ($SD = 2.59$).

3.2. Participation in Early Reading Training (Course I and 2)

Course I asynchronous training. Of the 18 special education EPP respondents, 12 (67%) reported their EPP participated in the Tennessee ERT Course I asynchronous training and 4 (22%) shared that certificates were required by their EPPs to verify participation. The reasons for lack of participation by special education EPPs are alike and different from the reasons given for Pre-K-Grade 3 and Grades K-5. For example, one special education respondent indicated special educators were not asked to be a participant by their EPP ($n = 1$) and another mentioned their EPP was given a limited number of available slots ($n = 1$). Other reasons were similar to those reported for Pre-K-3 and Grades K-5 (e.g., alternate similar training).

Attendees of Course I training. Overall, a total of 36 special education faculty from 18 EPPs completed the ERT Course I training; of these 19 were in tenure track positions: 6 administrators (17%), 4 full-time professors (11%), 4 associate professors (11%), and 5 assistant professors (14%). Seventeen non-tenure track special education EPP faculty participated: 3 lecturers (8%), 4 clinical faculty (11%), 6 adjuncts (17%), and four other faculty (11%) (e.g., instructors, other non-tenure track faculty). (See Table 3.1. with information about special education EPP participation on Course I training).

Table 3.1. Ranks and Numbers of EPP Special Education Participants in Course I of Asynchronous Early Reading Training

Rank	Number attended
Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head)	6
Professor	4
Associate Professor	4
Assistant Professor	5
Clinical (professor, associate, assistant)	4
Lecturer	3
Adjunct faculty	6
Other (e.g., instructor, full-time faculty)	4

Course II synchronous training. Ten special education EPP respondents indicated they participated in the second week (56%) of synchronous trainings. Those who did not reiterated the same reasons as for those who did not participate in the first training.

Course II training attendance. Overall, 22 faculty from special education EPPs participated in Course II of ERT synchronous training. Respondents indicated a total of 11 tenure track special education faculty participated: administrators (2, 9%); full-time professors (5, 20%); associate professor (1, 5%); and assistant professors (3, 14%). Also, 11 non-tenure track faculty participated in Course II of the ERT: clinical faculty (3, 14%); lecturers (2, 9%), adjuncts (2, 9%), and other (4, 18%). (See Table 3.2. with ranks for special education EPP participants in Course II of synchronous training).

Table 3.2. Ranks and Numbers of EPP Special Education Participants in Course II of Synchronous Early Reading Training

Rank	Number attended
Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head)	2
Professor	5
Associate Professor	1
Assistant Professor	3
Clinical (professor, associate, assistant)	3
Lecturer	2
Adjunct faculty	2
Other (e.g., instructor, full-time faculty)	4

3.3. Foundational Skills Training and Instructional Influences

Respondents ($n = 18$) were asked whether they teach literacy coursework in foundational skills and whether they, personally, attended the Tennessee Early Reading Training (Course I and Course II). Sixteen (89%) said they were faculty teaching literacy courses in foundational skills and 8 (44%) reported they attended the asynchronous Course I training.

Overall, out of the 8 who completed the training 1 (12.5%) said it was “very effective”, 6 (75%) said it was “effective” and 1 (12.5%) said it was “neither effective or ineffective”. The respondent who rated the training as “neither effective or ineffective” explained that *it was not new information*. The rest rated it as “effective” and “very effective” and commented on the ability to adapt the content for groups that had more significant learning needs (than peers), on the use of videos, and two shared that the content could have been more succinct while the content of the videos was in some instances “preachy.”

Asked to share the ways the Course I training influenced their instruction and the ways program faculty structured the literacy courses, three respondents indicated the content was not new and did not influence their instruction, rather it validated their current practices. Three commented on changes in their courses incorporating resources on foundational skills. One respondent described learning new methods of instruction for special education learners and one shared a response on the value of learning, “Context knowledge and understanding is important

Context knowledge and understanding is important because it allows students to apply learned information to solve problems and different situations.

TRAINING PARTICIPANT

because it allows students to apply learned information to solve problems and different situations.”

Four referred to the videos of sample practices and instruction as an aspect of the training they found most effective. One explained that the content affirmed their current practices, one shared it provided a good review of content and terms, and one commented positively on all aspects of the training, noting the importance of using a variety of teaching methods to engage learners.

Overall, 5 (28%) shared they completed the Course II training and 4 of them (80%) said it was “effective” and 1 (20%) said it was “neither effective or ineffective.” Regarding the explanations provided for their ratings, respondents one respondent commented on the need to address controversial topics that would open a conversation.

Two respondents indicated the training affirmed their current practices and changes they had applied, one repeated the importance of context knowledge and understanding, and one referenced the importance of foundational skills instruction and an emphasis on science of reading in relevant courses.

One respondent commented on the ability to meet and collaborate with colleagues from other EPPs at the training gone repeated that all aspects were influential, one referred to the use of sample videos of instruction and one on a shift from preparing lessons to using strong curricula. Of the special education EPP respondents who did not participate in Course II of the ERT training, again, one noted that special education faculty were not invited, others mentioned the lack of available slots, long travel time, scheduling conflicts and prior alternate training.

3.4. Number of Courses and Time Allocation to Foundational Skills

Special education EPP respondents provided information on the number of courses and amount of time devoted to teaching foundational literacy skills. Responses indicated a range from 1 to 12 courses with a range of 1 to 24 course credit hours (See Table 3.3. with information on the number of courses on foundational skills and Table 3.4. on information on course credit hours).

Table 3.3. Number of Courses that Address Foundational Literacy Skills Reported by Special Education Teacher Preparation Respondents

Foundational Skills	
Number of courses	EPPs
1	1
2	4
3	3
4	4
5	1
6	2
7	1
9	1
12	1

4.39	Mean
2.79	SD

Table 3.4. Number of Course Credit Hours Devoted to Foundational Skills as Reported by Special Education Teacher Preparation Respondents

Foundational Skills	
Number of credit hours	EPPs
1	1
6	2
7	1
8	1
9	3
12	4
13	1
15	1
18	2
21	1
24	1
11.78	Mean
5.78	SD

For the courses with applied practical experience, there was a range from 0 to 14 courses and 0 to 23 course credit hours (See Tables 3.5. and 3.6.), and a range of courses that combined coursework and applied in-school experience in the same course from 0 to 35 courses and 0 to 62 course credit hours (See Tables 3.7 and 3.8.).

Table 3.5. Number of EPP Special Education Courses Providing Applied Practical Experience in Foundational Literacy Skills Experience/ Field Experiences

Applied Practical Experience/ Field Experiences	
Number of courses	EPPs
0	2
1	5
2	2
3	4
4	2
5	2
14	1
2.94	Mean
3.17	SD
Outlier Removed	

2.29	Mean
1.61	SD

Table 3.6. Number of EPP Special Education Course Credit Hours Providing Applied Practical Experience in Foundational Literacy Skills

Applied Practical Experience/ Number of credit hours	Field Experiences EPPs
0	2
1	2
2	1
3	3
6	1
7	1
9	3
12	1
13	1
15	2
23	1

7.28	Mean
6.42	SD
Outlier Removed	
6.35	Mean
5.23	SD

Table 3.7. Number of Special Education Preparation Courses Combining Course Work and Applied, in-school Experiences in Same Course

Courses that combine course work and applied, in-school work into the same course Number of courses	EPPs
0	4
1	3
2	3
3	1
4	3
5	2
6	1
35	1

4.17	Mean
7.94	SD

	Outlier Removed
2.35	Mean
2.00	SD

Table 3.8. Special Education Preparation Courses Combining Course Work and Applied, in-school Experiences

Courses that combine course work and applied, in-school work into the same course	
Number of credit hours	EPPs
0	4
1	1
2	1
3	1
6	2
7	1
9	1
12	2
13	1
15	2
17	1
62	1

10.00	Mean
14.26	SD
	Outlier Removed
6.94	Mean
6.09	SD

In-class instruction

The median response from the 18 special education EPP respondents (one EPP selected “not applicable”) on time devoted to in-class instruction prior to internship or student teaching to literacy components was 9-11 hours spent on literacy development, on phonological awareness, on phonics, vocabulary, and reading comprehension, and 7-9 hours on orthography and spelling, advanced decoding, fluency, high frequency words, morphology, text complexity, and writing.

Applied in-school practice

The median response from the 18 respondents (2 EPPs selected “not applicable”) was 7-9 hours spent on literacy development, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension, 4-6 hours on advanced decoding, high frequency words, vocabulary, morphology, text complexity, and writing, and 1-3 hours on orthography and spelling.

3.5. Instructional Practices

Ten responding EPPs ranked first explicit instruction on foundational skills, 3 the use of lecture with faculty presenting content on a topic, and each of the following were ranked as the first choice by one EPP each: use of cooperative groups with students collaborating to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relates to content learning, flipped classrooms, applied practice in class- student practice task and may role-play instructional procedures, and one “other” identified as “assessment and intervention on phonemic awareness phonics fluency comprehension and vocabulary.”

Five EPPs ranked applied practice in class with students practicing tasks and role-playing instructional procedures (e.g., teacher candidates assume the role of the teacher), 5 ranked modeling with instructor demonstrating live specific practices, 2 flipped classrooms, 2 assessments to ensure mastery, 2 discussion of evidence-based literacy practices, and one explicit instruction in foundational skill concepts.

Four ranked third the use of applied practice in class with students practicing tasks and role-playing instructional procedures and four the use of cooperative groups with students collaborating to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relates to content learning.

Two ranked instructor demonstrations as third, and each of the following were ranked as third by one EPP: discussion of evidence based literacy practices, lecture, student-led presentations, flipped classrooms, assessments to ensure mastery, and other identified as “Case Studies of Learners with Complex Literacy Learning Needs, paired with practice in IEP development and lesson plan development, implementation (demonstrations) and reflective practice through instructional rounds activities.” One EPP skipped this question so ranks 1 and 2 sum to 17. Another EPP did not rank a third item so rank 3 sums to 16.

3.6. Description of a Lesson on Foundational Skills

The analysis of responses describing a typical lesson on foundational skills revealed one participant commenting on the use of a flipped classroom model of instruction that provided theory and readings out of class and application during class meetings. One (as in the early childhood responses) shared in detail the structure of a lesson with a class quiz prior to any task, completion of readings, reading guides, a podcast with a lecture and activities, and of a quiz at the end of the module with all information. The description addressed in-class applications with students’ reviewing content in structured activities, completing in class activities with instructor modeling and teacher-candidate practice of whole group and small group tasks from [High-Quality Instructional Materials](#) and the TN Foundational Skills Curriculum Supplemental resources. Finally, students role-playing how to communicate content-specific information that address students’ needs in parent-teacher conferences and the course ends with a question that addresses all content (exit ticket).

Eleven responders described lessons with some form of activation of background knowledge or preassessment, teacher lecture, teacher modeling (with or without think aloud), guided practice, and student applications. One commented on the use of the Scarborough rope to initiate and place the lessons

and one commented on an emphasis on development without explicit explanations on the specifics of lessons.

3.7. Pedagogical Principles of Instruction

Regarding pedagogical principles utilized in instruction of foundational skills, 16 (94.1%) identified science of reading as principle of teaching, 13 (76.5%) culturally responsive teaching, 12 (70.6%) structured literacy, 5 (29.4%) balanced literacy, 3 (17.6%) whole language as the method of teaching. Three identified “other” and their response addressed the provisions on direct and systematic instruction, or data-driven instruction, and inclusion of high-leverage practices that addressed (1) collaboration; (2) assessment; (3) social, emotional, behavioral; and (4) instructional needs. One EPP did not offer a response.

3.8. Pedagogical Practices Expected by Candidates

In reference to pedagogical practices that teacher candidates are expected to apply in their literacy practice, of the 17 responders (one EPP did not answer this question), 100% shared explicit instruction, 16 (94%) indicated systematic, flexible grouping, and modeling with practice and feedback. Fifteen (88%) identified culturally relevant strategies, 13 (77%) use of decodable texts, 10 (59%) whole-class instruction, 9 (53%) interpreting miscues, 8 (47%) use of predictable text, 7 (41%) incidental and writer’s workshop, 6 (35%) implicit, guided reading, and application of a leveling system, and 3 (18%) “others.” When referring to others, the responses included addressed formative and summative assessments, small-group instruction, and Universal Design for Learning.

When asked to identify the 5 pedagogical practices that respondents in special education emphasized the most instructionally, all 17 (100%) (one EPP did not answer this question) shared they emphasized modeling, 16 (94%) selected explicit instruction, 15 (88%) systematic instruction, 10 (59%) flexible grouping, 9 (53%) culturally relevant strategies; 5 (29%) use of decodable texts, 4 (24%) interpreting miscues, 2 (12%) whole-class instruction, guided reading, and use of predicable texts, 1 (6%) application of a leveling system, and 2 “other” that referred to small group instruction and repetition of information on Universal Design for Learning.

3.9. Use of Materials and Curricula

Six of 17 EPPs (35.3%) (note one did not respond to this item) indicated they use the [TN Foundational Skills Curriculum supplement](#), and 8 of 17 (47.1%) (one EPP did not answer this item) shared they used [High-Quality Instructional Materials](#).

3.10. Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants

Twelve of the 17 EPPs (one EPP did not answer this question) (70.6%) were aware of the EPP Innovation Foundational Skills Integrated Content grants saying they knew about the Pre-K- Grade 3, K- Grade 5 EPP innovation grants and 11 out of 17 (64.7%) that they were aware of the special education interventionist innovation grants.

Sixteen respondents out of the 17 EPPs (one EPPs did not answer this question) said they would be interested in using the content and 14 out of 16 (87.5%) identified that Pre-K-Grade 3 and Elementary K-Grade 5 special education content was relevant to them, while 2 (12.5%) that the Pre-K- Grade 3, K- Grade 5 EPP innovation grant work was relevant to their program.

Appendix A1: Survey and Definition of Terms

Figure 1.1. EPP – Survey

© Philippakos, Rocconi, Bell, 2021

Start of Block: Block 1



Q1 Dear Faculty Leader or Coordinator of Literacy courses:

To better understand how educator preparation licensure programs address foundational skills in response to our State's efforts to improve literacy performance and instruction, we request your participation in a survey. You were selected to complete this survey because of your knowledge and expertise within your program. The purpose of the survey is to explore your program's practices related to the current emphases on foundational literacy skills in the state of Tennessee and retrieve some information on your pedagogy and programming. The survey takes less than 15-25 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation and commitment to improving literacy and literacy-related performance within our state.

Please select the Licensure Program for which you are providing information.

- Early Childhood (Pre-K-K and/or Pre-K-3) (1)
- Elementary Education (K-5) (2)
- Special Education (Pre-K-3, and/or Comprehensive K-12, and/or Interventionist K-8 and/or Interventionist 6-12) (3)

End of Block: Block 1

Start of Block: Block 1

Q2 Definition of Terms

In order to assure we have a common understanding of terms referenced in the following sections, please read the definitions that follow:

Foundational Skills: The term refers to phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Phonological awareness: This is an umbrella term that refers to word awareness, syllable awareness, onset-rime awareness, phonemic awareness. Phonemic awareness refers to the ability to orally manipulate sounds (phonemes) in spoken words. Such manipulations of phonemes include deletion, addition, substitution, isolation, identification, categorization, blending, segmenting.

Phonics: Refers to learners' understanding that there is a predictable relationship between phonemes

(sounds) and graphemes (symbols), the letters that represent those phonemes in written language.

Fluency: Refers to learners' ability to read text accurately, quickly, and with prosody.

Literacy: When responding to questions that refer to *literacy*, keep in mind that the term refers to development, assessment, and instruction of reading and writing. The term literacy instructor refers to a person who specializes in the assessment and instruction of reading and writing skills. In this survey we are not referring to someone teaching discipline-specific literacy (e.g., reading in math).

End of Block: Block 1

Start of Block: Block 2

Q3 Demographics and General Information



Q4 What is the name of your institution?

▼ Aquinas College (1) ... Western Governors University (43)



Q5 What is your position?

- Professor (1)
- Associate Professor (2)
- Assistant Professor (3)
- Clinical (4)
- Adjunct (5)
- Other (please explain) (6) _____



Q6 Are you tenured?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)



Q7 How many years have you been a literacy instructor in an Education Preparation Provider (EPP)? (enter number)



Q8 How many years have you been a literacy instructor in your EPP? (enter number)



Q9 How many faculty in your program teach coursework on literacy (reading and/or writing)? (enter number)

Page Break

Q10 Participation in Early Reading Trainings (Course I and/or Course II)



Q11 Did your program participate in the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did your program participate in the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = No

Q12 Why did your program not participate in the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training?

Display This Question:

If Did your program participate in the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = Yes



Q13 Please indicate the rank/position and number of faculty from your program who participated in TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training. **Please enter a 0 if no one from the given rank participated.**

- Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head) (1) _____
- Tenure track Professor (2) _____
- Tenure track Associate Professor (3) _____
- Tenure track Assistant Professor (4) _____
- Clinical (professor, associate, assistant) (5) _____
- Lecturer (8) _____
- Adjunct faculty (10) _____
- Graduate student (20) _____
- Other (please explain) (11) _____

Display This Question:

If Did your program participate in the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = Yes



Q14 Did your program require certificates of completion for faculty who completed the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)



Q15 Did your program participate in Course II of the TN Early Reading Training?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did your program participate in Course II of the TN Early Reading Training? = No

Q16 Why did your program not participate in the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training?

Display This Question:

If Did your program participate in Course II of the TN Early Reading Training? = Yes



Q17 Please indicate the rank/position and number of faculty from your program who attended Course II. **Please enter a 0 if no one from the given rank participated.**

- Administrator (e.g., dean, associate dean, department head) (1) _____
- Tenure track Professor (2) _____
- Tenure track Associate Professor (3) _____
- Tenure track Assistant Professor (4) _____
- Clinical (professor, associate, assistant) (5) _____
- Lecturer (8) _____
- Adjunct faculty (10) _____
- Graduate student (9) _____
- Other (please explain) (11) _____

End of Block: Block 2

Start of Block: Block 3

Q18 **Foundational Skills Training**



Q19 Are you a faculty member teaching literacy coursework in Foundational Skills?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)



Q20 Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = Yes

Q21 In what ways did the content influence your current instruction and the ways you or your program faculty structure your literacy courses?

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = Yes

Q22 What specific aspects of the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training did you find most influential in instructional shifts in your program (e.g., sample videos)?

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = Yes



Q23 How would you rate the overall quality of the training?

- Very Effective (1)
- Effective (2)
- Neither Effective or Ineffective (3)
- Ineffective (4)
- Very Ineffective (5)

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = Yes

Q24 Please explain your rationale for your rating.

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training? = No

Q25 Why did you not attend the TN Early Reading Training Course I asynchronous training?



Q26 Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training? = No

Q27 Why did you not attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training?

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training? = Yes

Q28 In what ways did the content influence your current instruction and the ways you or your program faculty structure your literacy courses?

Display This Question:

If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training? = Yes

Q29 What specific aspects of the training did you find most influential in instructional shifts in your program?

Display This Question:
If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training? = Yes



Q30 How would you rate the overall quality of the training?

- Very Effective (1)
- Effective (2)
- Neither Effective or Ineffective (3)
- Ineffective (4)
- Very Ineffective (5)

Display This Question:
If Did you attend the TN Early Reading Training Course II training? = Yes

Q31 Please explain your rationale for your rating

End of Block: Block 3

Start of Block: Block 4

Q32 Time Allocation



Q33 Prior to internship or student teaching, how many courses (including field experience or practicum courses) are devoted to addressing Foundational Skills in literacy coursework for initial licensure in your program? (enter number)

	Number of courses	Number of credit hours
	# (1)	# (1)
Number of courses addressing foundational skills (7)		
Number of courses with applied practical experience / field experience (8)		

Number of courses that combine coursework and applied, in-school work into the same course (9)

Page Break-



Q35 Across your initial licensure courses on foundational skills, prior to internship or student teaching, how much time do you devote to **in-class instruction** for the following? *In order to provide an accurate response, you may consult with instructors or review syllabi.*

	less than 1 hour (1)	1-3 hours (2)	4-6 hours (3)	7-9 hours (4)	9-11 hours (5)	more than 11 hours (7)	Not Applicable (8)
Literacy Development (1)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Phonological awareness (2)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Phonics (3)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Orthography and spelling (4)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Advanced decoding (5)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fluency (6)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
High frequency words (7)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Vocabulary (8)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Morphology (9)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Text complexity (10)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Comprehension (11)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Writing (12)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•



Q36 Across your initial licensure program, prior to internship or student teaching, how much time do you devote to **applied in-school practice** for the following? *In order to provide an accurate response, you may consult with instructors or review syllabi.*

	less than 1 hour (1)	1-3 hours (2)	4-6 hours (3)	7-9 hours (4)	9-11 hours (5)	more than 11 hours (7)	Not Applicable (8)
Literacy Development (1)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Phonological awareness (2)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Phonics (3)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Orthography and spelling (4)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Advanced decoding (5)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fluency (6)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
High frequency words (7)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Vocabulary (8)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Morphology (9)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Text complexity (10)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Comprehension (11)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Writing (12)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

End of Block: Block 4

Start of Block: Block 5

Q37 Instructional Practices



Q38 Identify and rank the **three most** prominent practices (1 as the one you use the most) used in in-class instruction in your literacy courses. Please select and drag your response to place in ranking order.

Rank three most prominent practices

- _____ Discussion of evidence-based literacy practices (1)
- _____ Lecture: Faculty presents content on relevant topic (2)
- _____ Cooperative groups: Students collaborate to complete tasks either in theory or practice that relates to content learning (3)
- _____ Student-led presentations: Students present (individually and/or in groups) on specific tasks (4)

_____ Flipped classroom: Presentations, tasks, and readings are completed asynchronously out of class and in-class time is devoted to application (5)

_____ Modeling: Instructor demonstrates live specific practices (6)

_____ Applied practice in class: Students practice tasks and may role-play instructional procedures (e.g., teacher-candidates assume roles of teacher, parent(s), and students) (7)

_____ Inquiry-based learning: Learning goals set based on student generated questions and observations that serve as the anchor for learning (8)

_____ Assessments to ensure mastery: completion of assessments on specific reading components with practice (9)

_____ Explicit instruction in foundational skills concepts: systematic instruction, checking for understanding, and practice of foundational literacy skills (e.g., practice in segmenting, blending, deleting and substituting phonemes in words) (10)

_____ Other, please explain (11)

Q39 Please describe a typical lesson on foundational skills. Provide the time allocation on different tasks and a brief description of tasks and activities shared with learners and among learners.

Page Break



Q40 Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) you utilize in the instruction of foundational skills in your courses (be as descriptive as possible). Briefly explain how they are used in your practice.

- Balanced literacy (1)
- Structured literacy (2)
- Whole language (3)
- Science of reading (4)
- Culturally responsive teaching (5)
- Other (6)

Display This Question:

*If Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) yo... =
Balanced literacy*

Q41 Balanced Literacy

Display This Question:
If Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) yo... = Structured literacy

Q42 Structured Literacy

Display This Question:
If Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) yo... = Whole language

Q43 Whole Language

Display This Question:

If Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) yo... = Science of reading

Q44 Science of Reading

Display This Question:

If Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) yo... = Culturally responsive teaching

Q45 Culturally Responsive Teaching

Display This Question:

If Identify the pedagogical principles of practice (e.g., Balanced literacy, Structured literacy) yo... = Other

Q46 Other (please explain)

Page Break



Q47 Identify the pedagogical practices you expect your teacher candidates to apply in their literacy instruction with young learners

- explicit (1)
- systematic (2)
- modeling with practice and feedback (3)
- culturally relevant strategies (4)
- implicit (5)
- incidental (6)
- whole-class instruction (7)
- flexible grouping (8)
- guided reading (9)
- writer's workshop (10)
- use of decodable text (11)
- use of predictable text (12)
- application of a leveling system (13)
- interpreting miscues (meaning, sound, visual) (14)
- Other (please explain) (15) _____



Q48 Select the **five** you emphasize the most

- explicit (1)
- systematic (2)
- modeling with practice and feedback (3)
- culturally relevant strategies (4)
- implicit (5)
- incidental (6)
- whole-class instruction (7)
- flexible grouping (8)
- guided reading (9)
- writer's workshop (10)
- use of decodable text (11)
- use of predictable text (12)
- application of a leveling system (13)
- interpreting miscues (meaning, sound, visual) (14)
- Other (15) _____

Page Break

Q49 TN Foundational Skills Curriculum Supplement and High-Quality Instructional Materials



Q50 Do you currently use the TN Foundational Skills Curriculum Supplement(TNFSCS)?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)



Q51 Do you explicitly integrate use of High-Quality Instructional Materials in your literacy coursework?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:

*If Do you explicitly integrate use of High-Quality Instructional Materials in your literacy coursework?
= Yes*

Q52 Which ones?

End of Block: Block 5

Start of Block: Block 6

Q53 Foundational Skills Integrated Content Grants



Q54 Are you aware of the Foundational Skills Integrated Content Pre-K-3, K-5 EPP Innovation grants?

- Yes (1)
 - No (2)
-



Q55 Are you aware of the Foundational Skills Integrated content for K to 8 Special Education Interventionist Innovation grants?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)



Q56 The purpose of these grants is to support the development of integrated content on foundational skills that educator preparation providers can include in their licensure and literacy courses. The content is currently being developed by faculty of a TN institution of higher education and is evaluated by TN Education Preparation Programs. Will you be interested in using such content in your courses once it is made available?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Display This Question:

If The purpose of these grants is to support the development of integrated content on foundational s... = Yes



Q57 Select the one that would be relevant to your Program:

- Foundational Skills Integrated Content Pre-K-3 and Elementary K-5 (1)
- Foundational Skills Integrated Content Pre-K-3 and Elementary K-5 Special Education (2)

End of Block: Block 6

Textbox 1.1. Definition of Terms

Balanced Literacy: “A balanced literacy program includes both foundational and language comprehension instructional features, such as phonemic awareness and phonics (understanding the relationships between sounds and their written representations), fluency, guided oral reading, vocabulary development, and comprehension. An alternative interpretation of balanced literacy is that it mixes features of whole language and basic skills instruction.” from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Culturally responsive education: “The deliberate recognition and inclusion of all forms of student diversity as a pool of resources from and toward which curriculum, instruction, and all aspects of school policy should be designed. In practice, it means the alignment of curriculum and instruction with students' backgrounds, life experiences, and cultures.” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Curriculum: “The overall design of instruction or opportunities provided for learning. A curriculum may include materials and textbooks, planned activities, lesson plans, lessons, and the total program of formal studies or educational experiences provided by a teacher or school. (*Note:* Definitions of *curriculum* vary widely because of alternative perceptions held by theorists about the nature and organization of formal schooling; *adj. curricular.*)” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Fluency: Refers to learners' ability to read text accurately, quickly, and with prosody.

Foundational Literacy Skills: Phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as defined in TCA 49-1-903(3).

Literacy: “The ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, compute, and communicate using visual, audible, and digital materials across disciplines and in any context. Over time, literacy has been applied to a wide range of activities and appears as computer literacy, math literacy, or dietary literacy; in such contexts, it refers to basic knowledge of rather than to anything specific to reading and writing.” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Miscue: A response, usually oral, made by a reader to a word or phrase that varies from the expected response given the text being read. Miscues occur when readers make changes in pronunciation (letter-sound relationships), syntax (the flow of language) or semantics (meaning change). Kenneth Goodman, the originator of the term, has found that dialectical changes rarely affect meaning-change and also maintains that a reading miscue cannot be coded semantically acceptable if syntax is also not coded as acceptable, a conclusion that educators working with deaf readers have questioned. Historically, miscue analysis drew attention to the need to observe language learners closely before deciding on what instructional support to provide, a concept that unpinned the whole language movement in reading education. A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Miscue analysis: The practice of analyzing where students' oral reading does not match the printed text. These departures from text provide insight into the reading process and what cueing systems are being used by the readers. Teachers can use these miscues as the basis for determining instruction, adjusting to the strengths and weaknesses in the background experiences and language skills of students as they read. (K. Goodman, 1969). A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Modeling: A process of explaining the thinking process of completing a task and making it visible to the learner by “thinking out loud.” For instance, a teacher may model how to use skilled-reading strategies to make meaning while reading a text and think-aloud while reading the text and trying to comprehend it.

Phonological awareness: “Awareness of sounds of words in learning to read and spell. (Note: The constituents of words can be distinguished in three ways: (1) by syllables, as /boʊk/, (2) by onsets and rimes, as /b/ and /look/, or (3) by phonemes, as /b/ and /oʊ/ and /k/. (cf. **phonemic awareness**).” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Phonemic awareness: “The ability to detect and manipulate the smallest units (i.e., phonemes) of spoken language. For example, recognition that the word cat includes three distinct sounds or phonemes represents phonemic awareness. Individuals with phonemic awareness can blend phonemes to form spoken words, segment spoken words into their constituent phonemes, delete phonemes from spoken words, add phonemes, and substitute phonemes.” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Phonology: “The study of speech sounds and their functions in a language or languages.” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Phonics: “An approach to teaching reading that emphasizes the systematic relationship between the sounds of language and the graphemes (i.e., letters or letter combinations) that represent those sounds. Learners apply this knowledge to decode printed words.” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Science of reading: “A term that refers to a corpus of objective investigation and accumulation of reliable evidence about how humans learn to read and how reading should be taught” A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Simple View of Reading (SVR): A theory of reading comprehension associated with Philip Gough and William Tunmer and is represented by the formula $D \times LC = R$, which proposes that readers' comprehension of text depends on their capabilities to decode (D) and their oral language comprehension (LC). The theory indicates that if decoding and understanding of oral language are strong, readers will comprehend the text read. If either decoding or language understanding is weak, reading comprehension will be significantly reduced, and in some cases may not occur. <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Structured Literacy: “Structured literacy (SL) approaches emphasize highly explicit and systematic teaching of all important components of literacy. These components include both foundational skills

(e.g., decoding, spelling) and higher-level literacy skills (e.g., reading comprehension, written expression). SL also emphasizes oral language abilities essential to literacy development, including phonemic awareness, sensitivity to speech sounds in oral language, and the ability to manipulate those sounds." <https://dyslexiaida.org/heres-why-schools-should-use-structured-literacy/> by Dr. Spear-Swerling

Systematic instruction: "Systematic instruction in reading is a plan of instruction (e.g., scope and sequence) that takes students through an explicit sequence of learning activities." A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association

Whole language: Whole language is an educational philosophy that stresses "using children as educational informants" and building curriculum from that base. Whole language developed from studies of readers' miscues as they read whole texts as well as what young children knew about language prior to going to school. As a curricular approach, it advocates meaning making by using authentic texts such as children's literature (rather than basal texts) as the core of reading and setting aside uninterrupted time for personal writing each day. From a cross-curriculum perspective, it advocates inquiry-based learning in which students' inquiry questions become the focus of instruction and where the disciplines are seen as perspectives that students might take in exploring topics of interest. Child-centered advocates were some of the first educators who picked up on this approach to instruction and are often credited with having coined the term itself. A definition from <https://www.literacyworldwide.org/get-resources/literacy-glossary> International Literacy Association