

Margaret H. Hill, Ed. D.
Review of the 2007 TEKS K-12
English Language Arts and Reading

Overview: The 2007 document appears to be a re-write of the English language arts and reading (ELAR) standards from the 1950's. There is little evidence that the research on learning to read, write, speak and listen is incorporated into this edition of the TEKS. Inconsistencies are pervasive throughout the document. For example, some areas such as beginning understandings of words using phonics are extensive in their specificity, while other elements of reading/writing connections and responses are non-existent. We know that as children emerge into reading and writing, their invented spelling, picture writing and symbols are critical as they transition into traditional orthography. This area has been omitted. In research from The Center for the Study of Reading we have come far in our understandings about how children emerge into literacy, how reader and writer responses are critical to the development of comprehension and writing, and how attitude, interpretation, and appreciation are vital to learning to read and write.

I would suggest a thorough reshaping of the TEKS for 2017 that incorporates the research from Texas Council of Teachers of English Language Arts (TCTELA), Texas Association of Bilingual Educators (TABE), Texas Association of Literacy Educators (TALE), Texas Association of Improvement of Reading (TAIR), Coalition of Reading and English Supervisors of Texas (CREST), the Texas Writing Projects and other professional literacy organizations. We know so much about the writing-reading-thinking process at this point in time. We know that re-reading, discussions, and deeper questioning are vital parts of the reading process. We know that emphasizing reader/writer response is critical. We know that modeling from teachers, students, and professional writers is vital to increasing the literacy abilities of each student. Finally, the media section of this document is totally inappropriate for today's techno-savvy student. How can we better prepare literacy evaluations and applications for Twitter, Facebook, U-Tube etc? Students today are blitzed with media/information from multiple sources and they must be prepared to assimilate, analyze/synthesize, sort, critique etc. These are only a few suggestions for the total revision of the next version of the Texas ELAR TEKS.

In this review of the TEKS/ELAR, I respond to the 10 questions posed by the Texas State Board of Education as well as contribute comments and questions for each grade level across the English language arts and reading standards. My biggest concern with the 2007 TEKS is that standards are confused with curriculum, rules, and even assignments. Sometimes the standards were stated, while other times, specific components were listed inferring that specific rules be learned and applied. It is at the state level where the standards are developed and applied. The individual districts and teachers within those districts take the standards and develop their instructional strategies and curriculum from those stated standards. This document confuses standards and the purpose for standards from specific curriculum and instructional strategies.

It is my suggestion for the writing team for ELAR TEKS 2017 to possess strong instructional knowledge and to study and apply the current and past research in

ELAR as well as investigate models from standards from other states such as Virginia that also does not use the Core Standards. An analysis of the SAT/ACT must also be done because that is the benchmark test for all students expecting to be admitted into college or university. Additionally, there is so much research regarding emerging literacy, modifications and instruction for students with dyslexia and related disorders, and students with limited English. As the new standards are developed, this research must be understood and applied. Fortunately, Texas professional organization members in literacy (TALE, TCTELA, Writing Projects of Texas, TABE, TAIR and CREST etc.) are well equipped to develop standards that can help teachers and districts develop curriculum and instruction that will support the new Texas standards. This is an exciting time. Texas professional teachers can take advantage of what they have learned from current research, from other states and from the past history of Texas standards as they work to develop Texas standards for English language arts and reading that are based upon research, best practices and learning theories. We have a chance to lead the nation developing exemplary standards!

Broad suggestions for the writing teams would include the following: do not work in specific grade levels but instead in primary, upper elementary, middle and high school levels; align closely with the College and Career Readiness Standards; integrate comprehension into the body of the document as this is the most important component/outcome; and work vertically and horizontally beginning at grade 12 and working down to alleviate inconsistencies.

Questions posed by the State Board of Education

1. Does each grade level or course follow a complete and logical development of English language arts and reading concepts?

No. The only continuity appears in the Figure 19 of the document showing the progression that should be present in the TEKS as readers grow more sophisticated in their reading. In the overview of Reading Comprehension I wondered why reading comprehension was pulled from the reading standards. That did not make sense. It also does not make sense to limit understandings such as inferring for some grade levels. K-1 children are just as capable of making inferential responses (orally) when the reading materials are presented at their level. For example kindergartners can certainly understand irony, humor, sadness, good and evil characters etc. Picture books read to children in K-2 pose wonderful literary examples that help children think in broad terms. In fact, young children should read the illustrations closely so they can work integrally with the text to convey meaning. Additionally, connections to real life are also important to highlight. This version of the TEKS sells the K-2 student short. Children in the primary grades are very capable of thinking, and making connections and inferences. The primary learner can listen and read a story and determine what kind of story grammar it uses (circle story, quest etc.). These archetypes are not mentioned in the current document until secondary levels. Many wonderful primary teachers have children draw the story organization (story grammar) in pictures. In fact, readers depend on their expectations around text structure and genre to support and extend meaning.

It is the lack of consistency in the current document that bothers me the most with some standards being very specific and others general. Many researchers stress the importance of few “well-learned, well-taught” comprehension strategies. Fragmenting the skills leads to piecemeal learning and rarely transfers to the performance of reading. Stating the general standards gives teachers and school districts more latitude in developing their curriculum and instruction to match their specific audiences and cultural groups.

2. Have the correct vocabulary and terminology been used throughout TEKS?

There is some consistency and a lot of repetition, but verbiage does change throughout the document. For example when speaking of archetypes of stories that are not mentioned until upper middle and high school, the primary teachers use this type of instruction from the very beginning. It is often called “story grammar” at the primary level. A terminology chart would be very helpful so that teachers and publishers know exactly what is meant. Consistency of verbiage is very important and should be consistent with current literacy research.

When readers encounter different terms for the same kind of thinking, they think there is yet one more thing to learn. The document should guide teachers so that students make smooth transitions from grade to grade. Currently the inconsistent and incoherent progressions of the document make teaching and learning processes very difficult and outcomes in reading and writing either stagnant or regressive.

3. Is the level of rigor appropriate for each grade level?

No, the level of rigor is far too compartmentalized. Rigor is the result of reader’s work around thinking within a text. This document should outline the kinds of thinking necessary within reading, writing, speaking and listening. Children in the primary grades are capable of broad thinking, making important connections and inferences. For example, some 4 year-olds can explain the theory of density in sink vs. float experiments. Given the appropriate concrete examples children can explain all sorts of truisms and write and reflect upon their theories. There should be far more emphasis upon connections, linking themes, information, sense of time period, accuracy from research, sources and reliability. Students today at very early ages as well as older children can discriminate and understand accuracy, points of view, prejudice etc. In fact, it has never been more important to focus on accuracy with the plethora of sources students encounter. Literature books are rich with examples of human truths from the fables and nursery rhymes to adult classics. Rigorous thinking can be applied at all ages.

4. Are the student expectations clear and specific?

I found mixed examples of student expectations—some clear and specific, but others very broad. The TEKS do not need to define what is a compound word. It should be assumed that teachers know this and can clearly teach the student without examples of compound words. In some cases the expectations were stated for teachers as in “class-wide” interests. Objectives for teacher and students were

confused in many places. The TEKS should be considered state standards and allow the individual districts and teachers to develop their own curriculum and instruction. The state has developed rubrics for specific areas of writing. These should be clearly included into the standards or listed in a separate appendix. Rubrics are extremely valuable for teachers and students as well as the assessment and textbook publishers. Rubrics can be used for writing outcomes, for speech outcomes as well as reading (“think alouds”) and listening (“think alouds” and explanations). In the secondary grades the mention of rubrics is included, but never are the specific rubrics based upon actual research. Another confusion was in the use of genre and text structure. Clarification throughout the document is greatly needed because confusions are pervasive.

5. Are the TEKS aligned horizontally and vertically? If not what gaps should be addressed?

There are many inconsistencies with both horizontal and vertical alignment that represent changes in terms, lack of development across the grades, lack of attention to genre and text structure, and literary understandings. For example under comprehension, alignment confuses retellings and summary. K-2 is supposed to retell important parts. But in the parallel section for grades 3-5, mention is only made to informational text. Retelling is a thorough recounting of the text and is typically used to describe narrative types of texts. Identifying and determining important ideas are the ways readers approach information and exposition. The organization used in informational texts is very different from story structure. The differences are confused in the document. It is the order and organization of informational texts that are often a challenge to students because students do not read information the same way they read a story. Often students read information by scanning and diving into different parts they want to learn. Reading with a purpose should be the paramount standard that is taught and practiced at each grade level.

6. Can all student expectations reasonably be taught within the amount of time typically allotted for the grade level or high school course prior to the end of the school year or prior to a state assessment?

If the TEKS are parsed into tiny pieces as they are in the 2007 document, the amount is overwhelming and will continue to result in depressed reading achievement across the state. However, if we take a broader view of what we truly want the outcomes to represent, then ELAR can easily be learned and digested at each grade level. I would suggest starting with very broad standards and then defining with examples of action a reader/writer can take. Readers monitor which means they make self-corrections in both words and overall meaning. Readers pay attention to text organization and genre. In the current TEKS these strategies are haphazardly broken into bits and pieces that may contribute to confusion about how and what to teach.

One example of confusion in measurement/assessment is with fluency that includes phrasing, pitch, stress and juncture. Currently fluency is defined as speed and that is totally incorrect. Teachers have been asked in many cases to

measure the words per minute a student reads orally regardless of the comprehension. Fluency is important in reading comprehension and writing but today's measurements are incorrect. The assessment does not match the important outcome—comprehension.

7. Are there student expectations that can be eliminated in order to streamline the standards?

Yes, we are basically looking at how reading, writing, listening and speaking can progress across the grade levels. Whether or not something is learned at a specific grade level is not as important as the immediate need for learning to read and write in meaningful, fluent and powerful ways. The ELAR are the tools for learning everything in the content areas. They measure students' understandings and thinking. Reading and writing are basically thinking with personal connections made through the connections that are made during reading and writing processes. With a focus on reader/writer responses, "think alouds," and strong models the standards can be both stronger, less complex, and more adaptable to different teaching and learning applications. In reading, the author's message is conveyed through style, complexity, voice and purpose. Standards can measure these connections.

8. Are there specific areas that need to be updated to reflect current research?

While the entire document should reflect current research and be brought up to date, the sections on media representations need total revisions. For example when students are creating a power point to represent his/her research on the reasons for the Civil War, much can be added to enhance the arguments pro and con from original documents, to include speech clips, and uses of art and music. Students represent and think in multi-dimensional ways. Reading and writing are not linear as we once thought but rather represent multiple ways of representing and interpreting.

In addition, in the sections that represent "group work," it is far more than the setting of rules as described in the current TEKS. Student response from colleagues must be honored and incorporated into all student work. From very early ages, students are capable of responding logically and critically to works from their peers, interacting, interpreting, evaluating etc. We now know much about how children learn to read/write and think. The 2017 TEKS must represent all that we know about the reading, writing, speaking and listening processes taking into account multiple ways of learning and knowing. Sadly, the role of talk is almost completely lacking in the document. Talk is an enormously important contributor to learning. The TEKS should include ways peer-to-peer, teacher-to-peer, and peer-to-self talk contributes to learning.

9. Are the College and Career Readiness Standards adequately and appropriately addressed throughout the TEKS?

No, the College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS) are very well written. They are constructed using best practices in the language arts. The CCRS are an excellent

model for the TEKS ELAR revision! Each standard is clearly measureable, rigorous, and lends to an alignment for the development of curriculum and instruction within each district and classroom. The CCRS are clearly applicable from beginning reading through high school levels. In fact, the piecemeal, haphazard way in which the TEKS are written and organized may contribute to students' lack of readiness to complete the kinds of critical thinking necessary in post secondary education.

10. Do you have any other suggestions for ways in which the English language arts and reading TEKS can be improved?

One of the biggest areas of omission is “appreciation.” We learn to read and comprehend because it touches our sensitivities making us laugh, cry, yell in agreement, etc. Appreciation and personal emotional connections should be the most critical parts of ELAR from K-12. Response is far more than “structure.” How are the sounds, the rhythm, and the sense of feelings like humor/sadness/reflections depicted? These are also the ways we want personal responses to be elicited from student reading and writing. It is not the listing of facts or the retellings of a story from beginning to end that are important, but rather the personal connections within each learner that endures.

Because of the lack of attention to genre, there is little to guide the teacher in differentiating the ways in which appreciation for a text occurs. For example, we read informational text to learn more about a subject and its attributes. We read a narrative poem to follow a story told in poetic form using poetic devices. We read a biography to understand the life of someone within a particular context. We read a play to imagine what the actual staged performance looks like. We read and write differently across the genre.

More importantly is the concern for lack of current research. The research on emergent literacy has largely been ignored and the treatment of phonics is haphazard—moving back and forth between synthetic and analytic phonics. As words grow longer readers are much more efficient when they pay attention to “chunks” or the onset-rime of the words rather than sound by sound.

Another area of important omission/confusion in the document is the misrepresentation of inferring. Successful reading is largely a result of readers who can monitor as they read, make connections within and across text, ask questions of both the text and themselves that may be answered by further reading to discover what the author says or implies. Thus, the entire reading/writing process in the 2007 document has been discounted and/or fragmented making teaching and learning outcomes fragmented and depressed.

Building standards that are research based, coherent, cohesive, and honor the learning process will be the task for the ELAR writing team.

Brief suggestions for each grade level

I have reviewed every part of the 2007 ELAR TEKS document from K to 12. Listed below are a few of the specific comments for each grade level.

Kindergarten:

1. Listening vs. reading is not clear.
2. Close and careful reading at kindergarten is close viewing.
3. More attention to emergent literacy skills must be included that enable children to develop voice-print match before they can learn to read.
4. Kindergarten children can have interpretative questions/understandings if the material is presented correctly and at their level. For example, a book like *Rosie's Walk* is a perfect example of the use of irony. Pictures can be interpreted in many ways both subtle and overt.
5. Confusion exists between retelling story vs. information. A totally different structure is used in exposition.
6. There should be more attention to genre and text structure that prepares students to notice how those contribute to the overall understanding of text.
7. Students are able to make connections with text evidence across pieces, linking theme, information, sense of time etc. Kindergarten students can certainly be critical listeners, readers and thinkers. Cause/effect can certainly be understood at this level.
8. Speaking and listening standards should be stronger.
9. Vocabulary enrichment is omitted. That is why reading aloud is so important.
10. Left to right progression in reading and writing is omitted.
11. Questioning and prediction is critical.
12. Media should be updated. What about cartoons? Kindergarten children can read pictures in cartoons and understand comedy, irony etc.
13. Writing can be in pictures and words/letters. Invented spellings are critical!
14. What is "class-wide interest?"
15. Some of these standards appear to be instructions for teacher confusing instruction with standards.
16. Children learn to read in many ways. Do not neglect the importance of invented spellings, the power of high frequency words, the importance of onset and rime, the need for connecting writing with reading. Some children learn to read through their writing, while others learn to write through their reading.
17. The creation of a print rich environment is key and it is omitted.

1st Grade

1. Word knowledge is critical along with an understanding of spelling patterns. There are incorrect examples shown.
2. In reading the process of sample/predict/correct or confirm is not mentioned. This is the whole process of learning to read.
3. There needs to be attention to genre and text structure to prepare students for understanding text.

4. Attention to voice-print match must be included.
5. Fluency is confused with misrepresented speed of word calling. Fluency is critical as children read silently with comprehension and changing their process depending upon the complexity of text. Oral reading is a performance skill. Timed oral reading is very detrimental to reading comprehension!
6. Where is appreciation?
7. Reader response is far more than determining structure. Children should be making personal connections, explaining, drawing conclusions.
8. Predictions should be part of the standards at all levels. Comprehension is based upon predictions and the correction/confirmation process.
9. In nonfiction reading, story order is usually not present unless it is a memoir. The focus should be upon authenticity, personal connections and understandings.
10. Media must be updated: too limited, not current.
11. Editing and revision are far more than adding or deleting a word.
12. Writing should also include peer response, sense making, and clarity.
13. Stress the importance of teacher reading aloud to students.
14. Incorporate “think alouds” throughout the reading and writing process.

2nd Grade

1. Again, the reading process of sample, prediction, correct and confirm must be inherent in all the grade levels.
2. More attention to genre and text structure.
3. The vocabulary development and spelling development are confused. Word identification in reading does not need to list all the spelling and or phonics rules. Rather in word understandings the explanation should be on the morphemic development (roots, prefixes and suffixes). Also a reminder that morphemes have meaning whereas phonemes only have sounds. The emphasis of synthetic phonics confounds the reading process. The standards confuse synthetic and analytic phonics.
4. Wording suggestions such as: appreciate, understand relevance, and context in fiction and poetry would be stronger standards.
5. Students from kindergarten through grade 12 can understand story structures (archetypes or story grammar). It is important from K-12 to discuss the organization of story: quest, circle story etc. Sebesta, Abrahamson, Teale and others have some great research on teaching story structure at all grade levels.
6. Discussion about why authors chose certain words and what effect they have is important.
7. Nonfiction has a different organizational structure from fiction: compare/contrast, cause/effect, time order etc.
8. Independent reading and re-reading are critical and should be part of the standards, as should teacher reading aloud at all levels K-12.

9. Importance of “formula” novels –a critical part of building fluency.
10. Reading exposition—a better word for order would be organization of exposition. Students read for a purpose to find information.
11. Media must not only include comprehension but also purpose and audience.
12. Revision is far more than adding or deleting a word. Students revise for meaning, clarity, organization and focus.
13. Poetry reading is far more than creating sensory details; it is about creating meaning through sensory details and other poetic devices.
14. In writing and reading a technique called “pointing” is used to demonstrate a student’s ability to identify strengths/weaknesses/confusion/connections in reading and writing.
15. In understanding the function of language students can distinguish between dialog of “person” that means first, second, or third person.
16. In discussing parts of speech, standards should include place and purpose. Dialogue is often determined by character, place and time.
17. Standard for spelling should highlight high frequency words, spelling meanings, and parts of speech.
18. Writing must have a focus. Never in any of the K-12 writing standards is focus mentioned. This is probably the most important writing requirement.
19. Oral interpretation is far more than sequencing. Response should include things like impressions, agreements, confusions, connections, extensions etc.
20. Listening with a purpose is critical.
21. Speaking and listening techniques should include organization, examples or development, focus etc.

3rd grade

1. Decoding is far more than understanding phonics patterns. Working with morphemes/phonemes is important but remember that phonics only help with 20% of the words in English. Context, sense making and high frequency words are critical at this level.
2. There must be more attention to genre and text structure to prepare students for reading to learn and enjoy.
3. Understanding words in context is missing.
4. Predictions are a vital part of comprehension. There is mention of correcting/confirming and that is good.
5. Fluency applies to both oral and silent reading. But at this level most reading should be silent while oral reading is a performance skill. Fluency is developed by lots of reading at the independent reading level, by reading materials of high interest to the reader, and by lots of repetitive patterns in plot and character.
6. Vocabulary – Word families, words in context, root families, and various shades of meaning should be stressed.
7. Spelling is different from vocabulary study. You spell words you already know. Vocabulary words are words the learner needs to understand the

- meaning and variations of the meaning. These are words the learner needs to use in writing.
8. Comprehending theme/genre. There are limited objectives in this standard as well as misrepresentations. Myths and folktales have universal settings (time and place). Example: “Long ago in a far away place...” The standard is absolutely wrong to have learner think the setting and time are defined.
 9. In poetry readings the response should include far more than drawing conclusions. With poetry it is the evocation of emotions that is usually important as well as the purpose of the poem. The standards forgot the main reasons we read poetry: appreciation, personal connections, and a personal response.
 10. Drama also requires appreciation, personal connections and a personal response. The standard should include predictions, connections, comparisons, feelings and purpose.
 11. Nonfiction/literate – The purpose and theme are critical components and these were omitted. Comprehension is far more than identifying structure. Here the author’s purpose is a critical component of comprehension.
 12. Independent reading should be part of every grade level standard. This standard should include: critique, response, re-reading for deeper meaning etc.
 13. Reading information the components should be author purpose, audience, point of view, accuracy, time frame etc.
 14. Understanding both the organization and main idea(s) are also critical in nonfiction/information reading.
 15. Media- much reshaping is needed.
 16. Writing – Focus was never mentioned yet it is the hardest and most important part of the piece.
 17. Reading/writing poetry is far more than developing sensory details. Writers should have a purpose, chose words powerfully and evoke an emotional response among readers.
 18. Writing- it is important to use consistent terminology across all grade levels. Having consistent standards that focus upon organization, development, focuses are critical. Attention to purpose and audience must always be at the heart of anything that is created.
 19. Letter writing—again focus is critical.
 20. Written responses also must have a focus.
 21. Editing standards must be focused on the purpose and audience. In a grammar study, it is important to focus on audience and purpose keeping in mind why a writer like Twain wrote as he did. Again, the reader response to writing must be used here. Does it sound right? Does it make sense?
 22. Research process must include new media measures for finding information, incorporating it into writing and clearly identifying the source.
 23. Speaking and listening – audience and purpose again must be part of standard as students listen for organization and purpose and learn to predict and question.

4th and 5th grades

1. Remember that fluency means silent reading. These are the years that lots of independent reading level materials should be available for children to read and enjoy their reading whether it is nonfiction, formula novels, or procedural materials like building rocket airplanes.
2. Include more attention to genre and text structure as readers and writers progress into more difficult materials and reading to learn.
3. Vocabulary and spelling are different because spelling is based upon those words that the writer has difficulty writing. Spelling patterns, high frequency words and Greek/Latin roots are helpful. Vocabulary is based upon the reading materials in all content areas. Here morphology and etymology should be incorporated.
4. Reading must always involve prediction. Be consistent with verbiage: speaker or narrator? Focus upon theme (s) and reader response.
5. In literary nonfiction point of view and purpose are critical.
6. Stylistic devices are important to recognize in readings and incorporated into writing. The reading/writing process must be reciprocal.
7. Because of the writing TEKS, there is great confusion in the ways in which a writer responds using both audience and purpose to guide. For example, the written text to inform may take many forms or genre. Mixing of genre with mode (narrative) is critical. Students are confused because teachers have been confused on this issue of separating mode from genre.
8. Spelling and grammar must be integrated into writing. It is part of the editing process.
9. Informational texts have a very different organization from stories: compare/contrast, time order, cause/effect etc. Understanding the structure is critical in building comprehension in information text. Setting a purpose for reading is also critical.
10. Media—again much restructuring and updating is needed here as media is used in reading, writing, speaking and listening. Standards should focus upon purpose/audience/conventions/interpretation/tone/mood/accuracy/origin/context/uses etc.
11. Writing must include a focus! The rubric for writing should be the same as the state uses for writing assessment and based upon the purpose for writing: informational text, personal-expressive, poetry, persuasive text or editorial etc. Kinneavy says there are three purposes of writing: expressive, persuasive, and information purposes.
12. Research must include analysis and synthesis of information. Reformulation genre is a standard that might be suggested so that students can understand how to use the same information in a number of ways based upon the audience and purpose.
13. Speaking and listening must include main idea, audience, purpose, organization, focus etc.
14. Always listening with a purpose.

6th through 8th grades

1. Confusion with words: “inference vs. complex inference.” Example of inconsistent verbiage.
2. Attention must focus on genre and text structures that will contribute to reading success to read to learn.
3. Confusion comes with inference and “complex inference.” The complexity is based upon the amount of textual support for the reader and the author’s lack of specificity. Inferring is misrepresented throughout the document.
4. Difficulty, background knowledge, familiarity of reader with materials, structure of language and complexity of ideas determine silent reading fluency. The key here is adjusting reading rate to materials and purpose. Re-reading is often required for deeper meaning and confirmation or correction of the predictions.
5. If oral reading fluency is mentioned it must be in the context of performance, elocution, enunciation, intonation, speed, tone etc.
6. Theme(s) should be implied or stated, multiple themes and how they relate to genre.
7. Vocabulary and spelling are based upon the reading and writing requirements. See suggestions in 4-5th grades.
8. Poetry should also include tone/mood/effects etc.
9. Drama, don’t forget the main message, connections to other writings or events. Drama is a genre or form that must be understood as a “staged” narrative.
10. Both efferent and aesthetic responses are critical.
11. Fiction should include far more than plot elements. Reading for deeper meanings, for connections and comparisons, voice and style should all be incorporated.
12. Literary nonfiction is far beyond identifying structure and patterns. It is making connections to other literature, information, and time period. Of course audience and purpose are critical here too.
13. I am not sure why reading for sensory language and history/culture are separate. They should not be. There should be only fiction, literary nonfiction, nonfiction, and poetry. The ways we read and write in these forms vary and there are specifications for each type of writing/reading.
14. Understanding persuasive writing omits the most important part of reading and understanding or writing persuasion. It is always based upon the audience and purpose. Always included are support for the argument and a counter argument.
15. Media—needs a tremendous amount of revision.
16. Writing should be based upon the state rubric.
17. Conventions do not need to be spelled out.
18. Research should be based upon a purpose. The hardest and most important part of writing research pieces is a focus. This was never mentioned.
19. Speaking and listening must include point of view, purpose and audience.
20. Note taking must be taught and reinforced at this level.

21. It is never necessary to evaluate a summary of original text unless this is a writing assignment to learn to write a summary.
22. Yes, it is important to interpret and match text to graphic materials. The process of this type of reading must be taught.
23. Writing is always done for different purposes and audiences.

High School English

1. Analogies are no longer part of the SAT/ACT. The first and most important part of English standards is to analyze the requirements for SAT/ACT. Teachers must understand that the national assessments in reading and writing are the most important assessments their students will take. Development of vocabulary, close and deep reading, questioning based upon predictions, re-reading and deeper questioning are critical.
2. Focus must be on genre and text structure and how these contribute to overall understanding of text. It is only when a reader understands a genre deeply that he/she can read across texts to find similarities and differences in themes, ideas, points of view, contradiction etc.
3. The following components must be present in the secondary level reading and writing which must always be connected.
 - a. Citing textual evidence to support an analysis
 - b. Drawing inferences and supporting with text evidence
 - c. Determining theme(s), supporting with text evidence
 - d. Comparisons across texts based upon similar themes
 - e. Analyze the impact of author's choices of words, themes, and events.
 - f. Determining the meaning of words/phrases that are used in texts with understandings of both figurative and connotative meanings.
 - g. Determining the impact of tone, mood and stylistic devices.
 - h. Analyze the author's choice of how to begin and end a piece.
 - i. Understand from authors and use in own writing devices such as satire, irony, foreshadowing etc.
 - j. Analyze and discuss different interpretations of story, drama, poetry etc.
 - k. Study forms of American, British, and World Literature
4. Writing fluency as well as reading fluency must be included. Students must write frequently in notes, journals, margins, responses to their readings, and short pieces based upon daily observations.
5. Students can only improve in reading and writing if they read and write a lot. This must be done while they are in school with lots of guided practice.
6. I favor the use of portfolio submissions for writing samples as several other states do. Students at the end of a year can submit writing samples in 4 or 5 areas representing at least 3 different genres.
7. Suggestions for secondary reading should include:
 - a. Read from a range of texts with varied purposes
 - b. Read for daily life
 - c. Read for appreciation
 - d. Read to learning

- e. Read and respond to drama, poetry and literary pieces
 - f. Always vocabulary and grammar must be an integral part of reading and writing
 - g. Study skills and note-taking must be directly taught
 - h. Deeper thinking in reading and writing
 - i. Critical analysis in reading and writing
 - j. Development of rubrics to match all objectives
8. Tremendous revision of digital literacy and media literacy
 9. Writing the college essay
 10. Writing letters for employment and the resume