Independent Comprehension Design™

Designing for the Solo Reader: Why Text Quality Must Be Evaluated by What a Student Can Do Alone

Dr. LaChandra Fitzgerald
Founder & CEO, We Write Curriculum™
wewritecurriculum.com

A Note on This Edition

Editions of this white paper downloaded prior to this revision described a seven-component We Write Curriculum Passage Development Framework. The framework has since been expanded to eight components with the addition of Component 8: Reader Engagement and Relevance. This component formalizes reading motivation and engagement research (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992; Guthrie, Wigfield, & Perencevich, 2004) as a full, independently evaluated design standard rather than an implicit consideration folded into the other components. All references to the framework's component count in this document reflect the current eight-component standard.

Abstract

Reading passages used in K-12 assessment and curriculum contexts are evaluated primarily by quantitative measures—Lexile ranges, word counts, and sentence-length averages—that describe the surface-level difficulty of text but say nothing about whether a student can actually understand it alone. This paper introduces Independent Comprehension Design™ (ICD™), a reading comprehension research-informed framework developed by Dr. LaChandra Fitzgerald and We Write Curriculum™ that establishes a new standard for passage quality: the degree to which a passage can be understood by a student reading without a teacher, pre-teaching, or supplemental support. Grounded in Walter Kintsch's Construction-Integration model (1988, 1998), the Recht and Leslie (1988) knowledge-comprehension research, and the Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986), ICD™ identifies five comprehension barrier types that create reader dependence and provides a systematic framework for eliminating them. The implications of ICD™ differ by context—in assessment, the standard is a matter of measurement validity and equity; in curriculum, it is a matter of instructional quality and long-term reader development—but the framework is unified by a single governing question: If the teacher disappeared, could the student still build enough understanding from the text itself to demonstrate comprehension?

1. The Comprehension Gap No One Is Naming

In every K-12 classroom in the United States, something happens when a teacher hands students a reading passage: the teacher begins to help. Not because the students are incapable, but because the passage requires it. Before the first question is asked, the teacher activates background knowledge, explains an unfamiliar word, or clarifies how the text is organized. During reading, the teacher pauses to bridge a transition the passage left incomplete. After reading, the teacher provides the context the passage assumed students already had.

This is not a failure of teaching. This is a failure of passage design.

The reading passages most commonly used in K-12 contexts—in textbooks, curriculum programs, and high-stakes assessments—are developed according to standards that measure text difficulty quantitatively but do not evaluate whether the text can be understood by a student who is reading alone. Lexile scores measure the relationship between sentence length and word frequency. Flesch-Kincaid readability formulas estimate grade-level difficulty from surface text features. Neither measure tells a passage developer, a curriculum director, or an assessment professional what a student will actually encounter when they sit down with the text by themselves.

The result is a category of passage problem that has not, to the developers' knowledge, been systematically named and addressed through a practitioner-facing evaluation framework: passages that are readable but not independently comprehensible. Passages that score at grade level by quantitative standards but depend structurally on teacher mediation for a student to understand them. Passages that work in a well-taught classroom and produce invalid data on an assessment.

This paper introduces Independent Comprehension Design™ (ICD™)—a reading comprehension research-informed framework developed by Dr. LaChandra Fitzgerald and We Write Curriculum™—that names this problem directly and provides a systematic standard for solving it. ICD™ establishes that a passage's quality cannot be determined by what a skilled teacher can do with it. Quality must be evaluated by what a student can do with it alone.

> ***Independent Comprehension Design™ establishes that passage quality cannot be determined by what a skilled teacher can do with a text. It must be evaluated by what a student can do with it alone.***

2. The Research Foundation

Independent Comprehension Design™ did not emerge from editorial practice or publishing convention. It emerged from the convergence of three bodies of reading comprehension research that together establish both the nature of the problem and the design principles that solve it.

2.1 The Simple View of Reading

Gough and Tunmer's (1986) Simple View of Reading establishes that reading comprehension is the product of two variables: decoding and language comprehension. A reader who decodes fluently but lacks sufficient language comprehension will not understand what they read. The Simple View clarifies that comprehension is not an automatic consequence of accurate decoding. Students can read every word on a page and still fail to construct meaning from it.

Subsequent research has elaborated the language comprehension component of the Simple View to encompass vocabulary knowledge, background knowledge, and the capacity to construct meaning from connected text (Scarborough, 2001).

For passage developers, this has a direct implication. A passage that scores at the correct Lexile level has addressed only the decoding dimension. The language comprehension dimension—whether the passage provides the vocabulary support, conceptual context, and organizational clarity necessary for a student to construct meaning independently—is not captured by any standard quantitative measure. Independent Comprehension Design™ addresses the language comprehension dimension systematically.

2.2 The Knowledge-Comprehension Nexus

Recht and Leslie (1988) demonstrated in a landmark study that prior knowledge is a stronger predictor of reading comprehension performance than a student's general reading ability classification. Students with high background knowledge about a passage topic significantly outperformed students with low background knowledge—even when the high-knowledge readers were classified as less proficient readers on standardized assessments.

The implication for passage design is direct and consequential. When a passage assumes background knowledge that only some students possess, it is not measuring reading comprehension. It is measuring the distribution of prior experience. Students who happen to already know the content of a passage have a structural advantage that has nothing to do with reading ability. Every score difference that traces to this advantage is a measurement failure.

ICD™ operationalizes this finding through its Knowledge Access standard: no concept essential to comprehension may be assumed. If understanding an idea in the passage requires information the reader may not have, that information must be provided within the passage itself.

2.3 Cognitive Load and the Situation Model

Walter Kintsch's Construction-Integration (CI) model (1988, 1998) provides the cognitive architecture that underlies ICD™'s most distinctive features. The comprehension literature, building on Kintsch's foundational framework, describes the situation model as a mental representation of a text's content integrating five dimensions: temporal (when events occur), spatial (where they occur), causal (why they occur), character (who is involved), and intentional (why characters or agents act as they do).

When any of these dimensions is fractured, absent, or ambiguous in the text, the reader's working memory must compensate—either bridging the gap through background knowledge or abandoning the attempt to construct a coherent model altogether. In either case, cognitive load increases and the mental resources available for higher-order comprehension are reduced. The student is spending capacity on structural navigation that should be spent on thinking.

ICD™ applies the CI model directly to passage evaluation. A passage that meets the ICD™ standard provides explicit support for all five situational dimensions, ensuring that the reader's working memory is available for analysis, inference, and synthesis rather than structural reconstruction.

3. Defining Independent Comprehension Design™

Independent Comprehension Design™ is the intentional process of developing reading passages that students can understand using only the information, vocabulary support, and structural clarity provided within the text itself.

A passage meets the ICD™ standard when a student at the target grade level, reading without teacher support, can:

- Access all background knowledge necessary for comprehension from within the text.
- Understand vocabulary essential to meaning, supported by contextual resources within the passage.
- Follow the logical progression of ideas without bridging unmapped structural gaps.
- Maintain orientation throughout the text using features embedded in the writing itself.
- Construct an accurate and complete mental model of the text's central ideas and relationships.

The operational test for ICD™ is a single governing question, developed by Dr. LaChandra Fitzgerald and embedded throughout the We Write Curriculum Passage Development Framework:

> ***"If the teacher disappeared, could the student still build enough understanding from the text itself to demonstrate comprehension?"***

This question is deliberately direct because the teaching profession is correctly oriented toward instructional support. Teachers scaffold, activate, clarify, and guide. The ICD™ framework does not diminish that work. What it insists is that the passage itself cannot depend on that work for comprehension to occur.

3.1 What ICD™ Is Not

- **ICD™ is not a simplification standard.** A passage that meets the ICD™ standard is not easy. It is complete. The standard does not call for reducing vocabulary, lowering conceptual complexity, or removing analytical demand. It calls for ensuring that every structural resource a student needs is present within the text.
- **ICD™ is not a readability formula.** Lexile scores, word frequency measures, and sentence-length averages describe surface-level text features. ICD™ is a qualitative framework that evaluates whether a reader can actually construct meaning independently—a question no standard quantitative measure addresses.
- **ICD™ does not address student ability.** When a student fails to comprehend a passage that fails the ICD™ standard, that failure is diagnostic information about the passage, not the student. ICD™ insists that the distinction between student ability and passage quality be made visible and systematically addressed.
- **ICD™ is not a checklist.** It is a design philosophy with an evaluation framework. Its standards require professional judgment, documented textual evidence, and structured review against five defined barrier categories.

3.2 ICD™ as the Integrating Standard

The We Write Curriculum Passage Development Framework evaluates passages against eight components: Knowledge Access, Vocabulary Accessibility, Coherence and Connection, Comprehension Anchors, Independent Comprehension Design™, Rigor with Purpose, Knowledge Building, and Reader

Engagement and Relevance. A passage can address each component individually and still fail the ICD™ standard if those elements do not combine to produce a text that works for a student reading alone.

Component 8, Reader Engagement and Relevance, was added to the framework because motivation and engagement are independent predictors of comprehension outcome (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992; Guthrie, Wigfield, & Perencevich, 2004). A passage that satisfies the other seven components can still underperform if students have no reason to engage with it. Its key question follows the same governing logic as the rest of the framework: has this passage been positioned in a way that invites cognitive engagement?

ICD™ is the test that holds all other standards together. It is the last question asked and the one that cannot be passed by proxy.

4. The Five Comprehension Barriers

ICD™ defines passage quality not only in terms of what a text provides but in terms of what it eliminates. A passage that fails the ICD™ standard fails because it contains one or more comprehension barriers—structural features that make a student's understanding dependent on something the text does not supply. The ICD™ framework identifies five barrier types.

1 Teacher-Dependent Gap

A place in the passage where comprehension requires explanation, scaffolding, or discussion that the text does not provide. The passage expects a teacher to bridge a conceptual leap, introduce missing context, or clarify an organizational feature the writing took for granted. In assessment, teacher-dependent gaps create direct measurement failure because the support that makes the passage comprehensible is absent. In curriculum, they create instructional dependency: students learn to wait for the teacher to make the text make sense.

2 Knowledge Barrier

A gap created when a passage assumes domain-specific, cultural, or socioeconomic knowledge not provided within the text. The passage expects the reader to arrive with information they may not have: familiarity with a historical event, understanding of an institutional system, or a frame of reference for a concept the text uses without explanation.

Knowledge barriers are particularly consequential for equity. Students from different geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds bring different knowledge to the same text, and a passage that assumes shared knowledge creates structurally unequal reading conditions.

3 Vocabulary Barrier

An obstacle created when unfamiliar words, phrases, or academic language appear without sufficient contextual support. Nation and Snowling (1998) demonstrated that children with specific reading comprehension difficulties show semantic processing deficits despite adequate phonological decoding, underscoring why vocabulary accessibility is a design obligation rather than an instructional preference. Scarborough's (2001) rope model identifies vocabulary as one of several interacting language comprehension strands essential to skilled reading. When a passage includes important Tier 2 or Tier 3 vocabulary without providing the context students need to infer meaning, it does not develop vocabulary—it blocks comprehension. ICD™ requires that all vocabulary important to the passage be

supported through embedded definitions, appositives, restatements, context clues, or category examples—unless a word is designated as a protected assessment target.

4 Cohesion Barrier

A failure in the logical connections among sentences, ideas, and paragraphs. In Kintsch's terms (1988, 1998), cohesion barriers prevent the reader from constructing a coherent situation model. Transitions are missing or misleading. Causal relationships are implied but not stated. Pronoun referents are ambiguous. The reader must fill gaps the text should have filled, expending working memory on structural inference rather than comprehension. Cohesion barriers are among the most common passage failures and among the least visible to editors who already understand what the passage means.

5 Structural Barrier

An organizational problem that makes a text difficult to navigate even when individual sentences are clear. Poorly signaled topic shifts, absent or ineffective comprehension anchors, and organizational patterns that do not match the content type can make a well-written text accessible to a skilled reader and inaccessible to a student reading at grade level. Structural barriers frequently appear in texts adapted from professional or expert sources, where publishing conventions designed for adult readers do not translate to K–12 reading contexts.

The five comprehension barriers are not reading problems. They are writing problems. When students fail to comprehend a passage that contains them, the appropriate response is to revise the passage—not to remediate the reader.

5. ICD™ in Assessment: The Validity Imperative

In assessment contexts, the ICD™ standard is not a quality preference. It is a measurement requirement. The argument for it runs directly from the foundational principles of educational measurement.

5.1 Construct-Irrelevant Variance

When a student takes a reading assessment, the teacher is not present. Every resource that supports comprehension in a classroom context—teacher explanation, peer discussion, pre-teaching, prior instruction on the topic—is absent. The passage is the only resource the student has. If the passage contains comprehension barriers that depend on any of those absent supports for navigation, the assessment is no longer measuring what it claims to measure.

This is construct-irrelevant variance (Messick, 1989): the introduction of factors outside the target construct into the measurement process. When a passage creates a knowledge barrier, performance differences between students may reflect differences in background knowledge rather than reading ability. When a passage creates a cohesion barrier, performance differences may reflect differences in metacognitive strategy use rather than comprehension. In either case, the score is not a clean measure of reading comprehension. It is a measure of reading comprehension plus something else the passage introduced.

ICD™ addresses construct-irrelevant variance at its source—before a passage reaches item writers, review committees, or students. By systematically removing comprehension barriers from passage design, it reduces the factors outside the target construct that may otherwise affect performance.

5.2 Equity in Assessment

The equity implications of passage design are direct and frequently underacknowledged. Passages that assume background knowledge advantage students who already have it. Passages written for the Invisible Default Reader—the implicit cultural, socioeconomic, and regional assumptions embedded in traditionally developed texts—create structurally unequal starting conditions for students whose experiences fall outside that assumed baseline.

ICD™ requires a systematic Cultural Knowledge Audit at every stage of passage development. Writers identify and remove assumptions that create inequitable reading conditions: references to institutional systems without explanation, cultural practices treated as universally familiar, and socioeconomic contexts assumed as the norm. The audit ensures that every student, regardless of background, encounters the same textual resources when they read.

5.3 Item Integrity

When a passage meets the ICD™ standard, item writers receive a text in which every comprehension target is structurally supported. Inference items have clean textual anchors. Evidence-based questions have defensible correct answers. The passage does not create item failures downstream through structural ambiguity or missing causal logic.

ICD™ also includes a Vocabulary Item Protection Protocol that addresses the most common source of vocabulary item invalidation. When a word is designated for a vocabulary-in-context assessment item, the protocol prevents the passage from defining that word through an embedded definition, appositive, or direct restatement. The word is surrounded with calibrated contextual support—sufficient for a reader to narrow probable meaning through inference, but not sufficient to answer the item before it is asked.

6. ICD™ in Curriculum: The Instructional Opportunity

In curriculum contexts, the ICD™ standard addresses a different but equally consequential problem: the gradual delegation of comprehension work to the teacher.

6.1 The Instructional Dependency Problem

Curriculum passages are frequently developed with the assumption that teacher support will be present and available. If a passage leaves a context gap, the teacher will fill it. If a vocabulary word is difficult, the teacher will explain it. If a transition is unclear, the teacher will bridge it. This assumption produces passages that students cannot navigate independently—and, in the professional observation of practitioners working across curriculum development contexts, over years of exposure to such passages, students can develop a passive relationship with reading in which they wait for the text to be explained rather than expecting it to explain itself.

ICD™ does not reduce the teacher's instructional role. It redirects it. When a curriculum passage meets the ICD™ standard, the teacher's energy is freed from comprehension remediation and redirected toward the analytical and critical thinking work that genuinely requires expert facilitation. Rather than explaining what the passage failed to provide, the teacher can extend the ideas the passage fully expressed—moving students from comprehension into analysis, evaluation, and synthesis.

6.2 Building Independent Readers Over Time

Students learn to read by reading. The structural features of every text they encounter shape their developing schema for what text is supposed to do. When students read ICD™-designed passages consistently, they encounter writing that models how self-sufficient text is built: how ideas connect, how vocabulary is supported, how arguments are organized, how context is provided. The ICD™ framework is designed with the expectation that those structural features can become internalized—shaping habits of reading that students carry forward into increasingly complex text encounters.

Whether sustained exposure to ICD™-designed curriculum produces measurable longitudinal gains in reading independence is a question for empirical study. The theoretical grounding for that expectation is strong: if the structural features of text shape reader development, then text consistently designed to be self-sufficient gives students a different reading experience than text that depends on mediation. That difference, over time, is the framework's long-term purpose—to support the development of readers equipped for the college textbook that assumes no prior instruction, the workplace document that must be navigated alone, the journalistic or legal prose that rewards strategic reading built on accurate inference. Independent Comprehension Design™ begins as a passage standard. Its purpose is to support the development of readers who can meet any text on its own terms.

6.3 Consistent Access Across Classrooms

A curriculum passage that depends on teacher mediation for comprehension means that a student's understanding of the content is determined in part by which classroom they are in—not by what the text says. Teacher quality, instructional experience, and pre-teaching habits vary across schools and classrooms. ICD™ addresses that variability at its source.

When the passage provides everything a student needs to build meaning independently, it removes one systematic source of inequity from the reading equation—the variability introduced by passage design itself. Every student, regardless of which classroom they are in, has access to the same structural resources. That consistency is not an instructional convenience. It is an equity commitment.

7. The Independent Comprehension Test

The operational mechanism for applying the ICD™ standard is a single evaluative question applied to every passage at every stage of development and review:

> ***"If the teacher disappeared, could the student still build enough understanding from the text itself to demonstrate comprehension?"***

This question is the Independent Comprehension Test. It is not a checklist item. It is a disposition—a fundamental reorientation of how passage quality is defined and who is responsible for it. The question transfers accountability for comprehension from the student and the teacher to the text. It insists that understanding cannot be assumed, scaffolded into existence after the fact, or achieved through anything other than what the passage itself provides.

Applying the Independent Comprehension Test requires asking it specifically about each barrier type in turn, then identifying and resolving every location where the answer is no.

If the teacher disappeared, would a student…	Framework Component
…understand this concept without outside knowledge?	Knowledge Access
…understand this word from what the passage provides?	Vocabulary Accessibility
…follow how these ideas connect without filling in gaps?	Coherence and Connection
…identify what matters and maintain orientation throughout?	Comprehension Anchors
…answer every item using only what the text provides?	Independent Comprehension Design™

8. Conclusion

The reading passage is not a neutral artifact. It is a designed object, and the decisions embedded in its design determine whether a student can understand it—or whether understanding requires a teacher to be present.

Independent Comprehension Design™ names that design responsibility explicitly and provides a systematic framework for meeting it. ICD™ does not simplify text. It completes it. It does not reduce rigor. It redirects rigor from arbitrary difficulty toward meaningful intellectual demand. It does not replace the teacher. It ensures that the passage is doing its share of the work.

For assessment programs, ICD™ is a measurement obligation: the standard that separates passages which produce valid reading comprehension data from passages that introduce construct-irrelevant variance and structural inequity into every score.

For curriculum programs, ICD™ is an instructional investment: the standard that separates passages that build reader dependence from passages that build readers who can navigate complex text independently.

For students, ICD™ is equity made concrete: the commitment that every passage they encounter will give them what they need to succeed—not because the text has been made easy, but because it was designed to work for them, without anyone else in the room.

> ***Independent Comprehension Design™ begins as a passage development standard. Its purpose is to produce readers who do not need it.***

About the Author

Dr. LaChandra Fitzgerald is the Founder and CEO of We Write Curriculum™, a reading comprehension research-informed curriculum development organization serving grades 3–12. She developed the We Write Curriculum Passage Development Framework—an eight-component quality standard for reading passage development—and created Independent Comprehension Design™ as its integrating standard.

We Write Curriculum™ serves assessment companies, curriculum publishers, and educational organizations seeking passage development grounded in reading comprehension research.

wewritecurriculum.com

References

Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. Remedial and Special Education, 7(1), 6–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/074193258600700104

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research (Vol. 3, pp. 403–422). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & Perencevich, K. C. (Eds.). (2004). Motivating reading comprehension: Concept-oriented reading instruction. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. Psychological Review, 95(2), 163–182. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.163

Kintsch, W. (1998). Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition. Cambridge University Press.

Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), Educational measurement (3rd ed., pp. 13–103). American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Nation, K., & Snowling, M. J. (1998). Semantic processing and the development of word-recognition skills: Evidence from children with reading comprehension difficulties. Journal of Memory and Language, 39(1), 85–101. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1998.2564

Recht, D. R., & Leslie, L. (1988). Effect of prior knowledge on good and poor readers' memory of text. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(1), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.1.16

Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), Handbook of early literacy research (pp. 97–110). Guilford Press.

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (1992). The development of achievement task values: A theoretical analysis. Developmental Review, 12(3), 265–310.