



Regional School Unit 5
Durham · Freeport · Pownal

"Empower and equip every learner with skills, curiosity, character, and purpose to thrive and live fulfilling lives in an ever changing world"

Tom Gray, Superintendent of Schools
Kelly Wentworth, Director of Finance & Human Resources

Mandy Lewis, Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Elisha Morris, Director of Instructional Support

Curriculum and Program Development Committee
Tuesday, October 6, 2026
Minutes

Committee Members Present: Anna Child, Annie Ware, Karen Breer

Committee Members Absent: N/A

Administrators in Attendance: Mandy Lewis, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment; Tom Gray, Superintendent

Members of the public: none

The meeting started at 11:30 a.m.

Agenda:

1. Review the revised work plan.
 - a. Committee reviewed the revised work plan and agreed that we will use this plan to guide our work, recognizing that other needs may come up throughout the year.
2. Review a legislative update.
 - a. Committee reviewed the legislative updates relevant to our work.
3. Review current practices in early childhood literacy in greater depth, including objectives and goals by grade level.
 - a. Committee reviewed additional details regarding early childhood literacy using a framework created by the Committee Chair. The discussion generated questions that will be discussed at our next meeting, and building administrators will be invited to attend. Our goal will be to include one administrator who is involved in early childhood literacy and one who is involved in upper elementary literacy. Committee members reviewed a sample data set (spring grade 3 RGL and MTYA) to determine if this is a helpful way to break down data for consideration.

The meeting ended at 1:01pm.

Curriculum and Program Review Committee Work Plan 2026-2027

Board Level Presentations by Assistant Superintendent (for literacy, math, technology):

- September 23, 2026 - Landscape of current practices related to literacy, math and technology
- October 21, 2026 - Fall Data Review
- December 9, 2026 - Technology with Sam Rigby
- February 3, 2027 - Winter Scorecard

Curriculum Committee Work and Curriculum Review Cycles:

- What are grade level expectations, and how do they align with state and national standards?
- How do we know when they know it? What assessments are used at each grade level, and who reviews the data to determine action steps?
- Data review should include qualitative and quantitative, if possible.
- If evidence-based curriculum exists in this curriculum area, what academic outcome growth could we possibly expect? What could we lose?

Curriculum Committee's Workflow for Identified Priority Areas (Early Literacy, Tech, Math):

1. Honor what's currently being done
2. Understand objectives and goals by grade level as they align with state and national standards
3. Explore qualitative/quantitative data, including subgroup analysis (socioeconomic status, students with disabilities, students with 504 plans, students with ML services)
4. Learn from Principals, Teachers and other staff
5. Identify findings, questions, and recommendations to bring to the Board

September 8:

1. Discuss prioritized areas of work plan
2. Review template for literacy, math, technology landscape presentation

September 22:

1. Review draft work plan
2. Review Math Curriculum Review process

October 6:

1. Legislative update (15m)
2. Review current practices in literacy (follow-up to landscape presentation) (45m)
3. Review objectives and goals by grade level in early literacy and how they align with state and national standards. (30 min)

October 20:

1. Explore early literacy data (1.5hr)

November 6:

1. Invite instructional strategists and principals to discuss literacy data (1hr)
2. Consider additional information needed regarding literacy (survey to teachers?) (30m)

November 20:

1. Draft findings, questions, and recommendations on EL to bring to the Board (30m)
2. Meet with Sam Rigby, Technology Director regarding the presentation in December (1hr)

December 1:

1. Review technology data from Maine DOE (1hr)
2. Finalize findings, questions, and recommendations on EL to bring to the Board (30m)

December 15:

1. Invite teachers and/or school counselors to speak about technology in our schools (1hr)
2. Consider additional information needed regarding technology (30m)

January 5:

1. Review a digital citizenship curriculum review process (30m)
2. Draft findings, questions, and recommendations on tech to share with the board (1hr)

February 2:

1. Finalize findings, questions, and recommendations on tech to share with the board (30m)
2. Review objectives and goals by grade level in math and how they align with state and national standards. (1hr)

March 2:

1. Explore math data (1.5hr)

April 6:

1. Invite Instructional Strategists to share Math Curriculum Review information (1hr)

May 4:

1. Finalize findings, questions, and recommendations on math to share with board (30m)

June 4:

1. Review literacy/ELA literacy review cycle
2. MTSS structure, assessments, and grade level benchmarks

October 2026 - Legislative Updates

- **Resolve, to Study the Use of Technology in Classrooms and Study Safeguards Related to Its Use**

This resolve directs the Maine Education Policy Research Institute to develop a survey to gather and analyze information from school units, schools in the unorganized territory and private schools approved for the receipt of public funds that enroll 60% or more publicly funded students regarding the use of technology in the classroom, safety policies and procedures in place and the means employed to ensure compliance with those policies and procedures and to gather information on current guidance about best practices for safe instructional technology use for children from State and National experts. The survey parameters must include, but are not limited to, the following: amount of average instruction time per grade level spent on school-issued technology devices, safeguards undertaken before introducing new school-based technology products, policies regarding allowed use or prohibition of gamification, and more.

- **An Act To Integrate Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander History into the Statewide System of Learning Results (Ch 535, L.D. 957 - Effective: July 29, 2026)**

For the purposes of the law, instruction must include the history of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders in Maine, the region and the United States as well as the contributions of these individuals or groups in the areas of advancing civil rights, the humanities and sciences, and the cultural, economic social and political development of the United States.

- **An Act to Strengthen the Teaching of Wabanaki Studies in Maine Schools**

This new law creates the position of the “Wabanaki studies specialist” in the Department of Education to ensure the inclusion of Wabanaki studies in the parameters for essential instruction and graduation requirements in the state. Instruction in Wabanaki studies may include Social Studies, English language arts, mathematics, science and Fine Arts in accordance with this subsection.

- **Resolve, Directing the Department of Education to Review Personal Finance Course Offerings in Maine Schools and Convene a Working Group of Relevant Stakeholders**

This resolve directs the D.O.E. to administer a survey to all schools in the state to collect data and information on how those schools educate students about personal finance. This resolve signals that the D.O.E. may soon be asked to reconsider the way it directs or permits schools to incorporate personal finance into the curriculum.

- **Resolve, Directing the D.O.E. to Collect Data on Secondary School Mathematics Requirements**

This resolve requires the D.O.E. to collect data on math classes required for a high school diploma, including the number of schools that require 2 years of math or more for a diploma, the estimated cost of increasing the requirements to 3 years of math, and the number of schools that accept alternative math class credit, such as accelerated math or early college access. the resolve signals that there may be changes considered to the amount and or type of math classes required to receive a high school diploma at some point.

Per request, here is additional information regarding current RSU5 Literacy Practices

Area	Essential Components	Key clarification
Core curriculum	PK: Read, Write Inc (RWI) Heggerty Phonemic Awareness K: Units of Study: Reading (RUoS) Units of Study: Writing (WUoS) Units of Study: Phonics (PUoS) Heggerty Phonemic Awareness RWI at DCS 1: Units of Study: Reading Units of Study: Writing Units of Study: Phonics Heggerty Phonemic Awareness 2: Units of Study: Reading Units of Study: Writing Units of Study: Phonics	PK: RWI teaches letter sounds, oral blending, and decoding/blending. Heggerty provides explicit instruction in all parts of PK phonological awareness skills. K-2: See response to the question about how the classroom experience has changed.
Tier 2	UFLI	Is UFLI also used in Tier 1 anywhere? PES and MSS do not use it in tier 1 (data has not indicated a need); DCS uses UFLI in grade 2 as a supplement to (not a replacement of) Units of Study: Phonics.
Tier 3	UFLI/Orton Gillingham	
Universal screening	K-2 Acadience Reading Assessment	Acadience has been used across all early grades since 2023-2024 school year.
Special education	AIMS Web? AIMS Web (assessment) is new this year and will be used K-12 PK - AEPS being explored	Specially designed instructional tools for literacy include SPIRE and Lexia.

Reading level / observation	Fountas & Pinnell used K-2 BAS 2.0 for Spring to Spring-administered by calibrated Assessment Teams; PAST - Phonic Decoding Assessment 3-5: BAS 2.0	Which grades use F&P? K-5 For what decisions are F&P data used? K-2: BAS data is used to determine what skills a reader has developed in decoding, fluency and the three areas of comprehension when reading whole texts. Next step instructional plans are developed to support students' growing reading behaviours, comprehension skills, and fluency. This BAS is the only assessment we have at the K-2 level to determine how students' abilities to orchestrate all components of reading (decoding, fluency, comprehension) are developing. A student's F&P (BAS) score also determines the "reads on grade level" score on their report card.
Grades 3+	NWEA / Maine Through Year Assessment is used in grades 3 and above, alongside other benchmarks.	How is data used? 3-5: BAS 2.0 is used for all students as a measure of their fluency, accuracy and comprehension skills. PAST data for incoming 3rd graders informs small-group instruction in 3rd grade. Similarly, the Phonics Decoding Assessment is used for students based on demonstrated need to identify instructional interventions.

If teachers are having to add supplemental phonics, phonemics development, decoding like UFLI, because Mossflower doesn't adequately provide those components, what is Mossflower contributing that warrants keeping it as the core?

- **MSS and PES:** Educators are not supplementing core curricular elements. An instructional change was made specific to phonics. PUoS and RUoS utilized digital phonemic awareness videos, and educators felt strongly that Heggerty Phonemic Awareness was a more effective tool. Phonemic awareness is best taught through direct teacher instruction rather than video instruction.
- **DCS:** Educators are not supplementing core curricular elements. Teachers utilize UFLI when there is a skill that students have not previously mastered. PUoS is great for exposure and practice, and when there is a deficit that needs explicit instruction, UFLI has explicit, routinized instruction.
- **MLS:** Educators are not supplementing core curricular elements. Additional resources, including UFLI and Equipped for Reading Success: A Comprehensive, Step-by-Step Program for Developing Phonemic Awareness and Fluent Word Recognition (Kilpatrick), are utilized as interventions for students who have not met benchmarks through Tier 1 instruction.

How much the classroom experience has actually changed since Mossflower has revamped their Units of Study curriculum to include phonics, etc?

- **MSS/PES/DCS:** Prior to the implementation of PUoS each grade level used a different curriculum with limited success. The PUoS stood alone and while we did see a positive impact, it wasn't until we began using the revised RUoS beginning in January 2023 and WUoS beginning in September 2024 that we began to see an upward trajectory in our various data points. There are specific factors contributing to this upward trajectory that reflect not only the shift to the revised curriculums but also refinements and shifts in **instructional practices**. Several of the instructional shifts listed here began prior to the publication of the revised UoS, making the transition to the revised units more seamless and manageable for teachers.
 - **Integrated Phonics Instruction:** Phonics is integrated directly into reading and writing lessons using authentic texts, shifting from cueing with pictures to attending to print first.
 - **Shift to Decodable Texts:** Decodable texts are now the main controlled texts for instruction and independent reading, with teachers guiding text selection in K-1 using multiple data sources.
 - **Dedicated Scheduling:** Based on an instructional need, DCS introduced a dedicated phonics block for 1st and 2nd grades.
 - **Professional Learning and Word Study Shifts:** Teachers received training on reading frameworks and revised high-frequency word instruction by focusing on

decodability, utilizing Elkonin boxes for irregular words, and tracking encoding progress into writing.

- **Strengthened Practice and Alignment:** Interactive Read Alouds, Shared Reading, and Shared Writing were enhanced with explicit skill modeling, built-in skill callouts, and tighter alignment across curricula.

In summary, instructional shifts included:

- shifted away from cueing readers to use pictures for word solving, but instead to attend to the print first, using the phonics concepts they are learning to word solve
- rethinking and revision to the types of controlled texts students are reading and how students access them. Decodable texts are now the primary controlled texts used for instruction and students' independent reading
- revising the ways high frequency words are taught. The first shift was to consider which high frequency words are actually decodable and support children's learning of those words using their developing decoding skills. A second shift that was made was that when teaching irregularly spelled high frequency words teachers began using Elkonin boxes
- Interactive read aloud (IRA) was already a strong instructional practice across classrooms, but were strengthened with the revised units with more explicit instruction and modeling of the deeper comprehension skills of comparing and contrasting across a text or multiple texts
- Shared Reading & Shared Writing were already instructional practices that were being used in K-2, but with the revised units teachers have shifted their planning for these instructional blocks to incorporate additional explicit connected practice focused on the phonics skills students are working to use in their decoding and encoding of text
- learning progressions for reading comprehension

Spring Data Review 2025-2026 School Year - Powerschool reports are available for BAS with subcategory details (see additional handout).

Grade Level	BAS Composite	Reads at Grade Level	Acadience	PAST
K	103/124 = 83%	83%	91/122 = 75%	118/124 = 95%
1	97/128 = 76%	76%	94/125 = 75%	108/128 = 84%
2	79/143 = 55%	55%	90/146 = 62%	94/148 = 64%

Discuss additional data points for consideration moving forward.

Grade Level	Column 1	SubGroup	2023-2024	2024-2025	Totals for 25/26	2025-2026		**RGL available K-5
Grade 3	Reads Grade Level	Grade Level Total	48.70%	55.80%		63.60%		
		Gender-F	54.10%	65.30%		68%		
		Gender-M	43.40%	46.90%		59.20%		
		Chapter 504	100%	100%		85.70%		
		Economically Disadvantaged	17.20%	41.50%		32.10%		
		Identified Disability	16.70%	19.40%		32.30%		
		Limited English Proficiency	0%	0%		25%		
Grade 3	Maine_Through_Year_Reading	Grade Level Total	75.50%	73.20%	121/149	81.20%	State average: 62%	**MTYA available 3-8, 10
		Gender - F	78.10%	87.80%	60/74	81.10%		
		Gender - M	73%	59.50%	61/75	81.30%		
		Chapter 504	100%	100%	5/6	83.30%		
		Economically Disadvantaged	57.10%	60%	18/27	66.70%		
		Identified Disability	40.90%	43.60%	23/36	63.90%		
		Limited English Proficiency	100%	100%	1/1	100%		