Legislative Analysis

Phone: (517) 373-8080
http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa

Analysis available at
http://www.legislature.mi.gov

TEACHING LITERACY

House Bill 5819 as introduced
Sponsor: Rep. Kathy Schmaltz

House Bill 5820 as introduced
Sponsor: Rep. Jaime Greene

House Bill 5821 (proposed substitute H-1)
Sponsor: Rep. Rylee Linting

Committee: Education and Workforce
Complete to 5-20-26

SUMMARY:

House Bill 5819 would amend section 1280f of the Revised School Code to modify the deadline for public schools in Michigan to ensure that the materials used in teaching literacy comply with the provisions of this section. The requirement would take effect on July 1, 2026, at the start of the 2026-2027 school year.[1] Under current law, the appropriate materials must be in use by the start of 2027-2028 school year.

MCL 380.1280f

House Bill 5820 would change the deadline for teacher preparation programs and alternate preparation programs to include training on certain literacy practices to July 1, 2026. The current deadline is September 30, 2027, which was set by 2024 PA 147. After this date, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) would not be allowed to approve a new preparation program or alternate preparation program unless it met the requirements established in 2024 PA 146, and approval for existing programs that have not incorporated the changes would be revoked. The bill would retain the current 2027 deadline for MDE to take action against noncompliant programs.

MCL 380.1531e

House Bill 5821 would also amend section 1280f of the Revised School Code. This section now requires MDE to publish a list of evidence-based tier 1, class-wide elementary reading curricula and materials aligned to the established criteria. The bill would cap this list at not more than 15 curricula or materials. MDE has published a list of materials that it states are in accordance with 2024 PA 146, which established the January 1, 2026, deadline for publishing these materials.[2] The bill would give districts until the 2027-2028 school year to start using one or more of these curricula or materials in their reading instruction or their own locally developed literacy curriculum or literacy materials that has been approved by MDE.

[1] https://www.legislature.mi.gov/Bills/Bill?ObjectName=2023-SB-0567
[2] https://www.michigan.gov/mde/services/academic-standards/literacy/k-12-literacy-and-dyslexia-law

MDE would be required to establish a process for schools to submit their own curriculum and materials for approval. MDE would have to approve curricula or materials that it determines substantially align with evidence-based literacy practices and demonstrate effectiveness in improving student outcomes in literacy.

MDE's approval process would have to include at least all of the following:

- A standardized application and review process.
- Clear review criteria aligned to evidence-based literacy practices and the science of reading.
- An opportunity for the submitting school district, intermediate school district (ISD), or public school academy (PSA) to provide supporting materials, implementation materials, student performance data, and research supporting its curriculum.
- A timeline for MDE's review, not to exceed 90 days from the date of submission.
- Written feedback from MDE if the submitted curriculum is denied approval, including recommendations necessary for approval.
- An opportunity for resubmission of a locally developed curriculum following a denial and revisions.

MCL 380.1280f

FISCAL IMPACT:

House Bill 5819 would have no fiscal impact on the state and could increase costs for certain districts, PSAs, and ISDs.

Under the bill, certain districts, PSAs, and ISDs that do not yet comply with the requirements may incur additional costs to revise reading instruction and curriculum materials a year earlier than planned. The magnitude of the cost would depend on the number districts, PSAs, and ISDs that are not yet in compliance and the cost of purchasing access to compliant materials.

House Bill 5820 would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on public universities with teacher preparation programs. The universities may have to alter teacher preparation curriculum or apply for a waiver from MDE to meet the new requirements. The cost of the potential changes is variable and dependent on each individual university.

The bill would have no fiscal impact on the state or on districts, PSAs, and ISDs.

House Bill 5821 could create costs for the state and could increase costs for certain districts, PSAs, and ISDs.

Under the bill, MDE may incur administrative costs to review and approve locally developed or self-created curricula. The magnitude of the cost would depend on the number of curricula required to be reviewed, but any costs would likely be absorbed using existing staff time.

Due to the requirement that all reading instruction and curriculum materials used are on the list published by MDE, certain districts, PSAs, and ISDs may incur potentially significant costs if materials currently in use are not included on the list unless the materials are locally developed or self-created and approved by the department. Costs would vary depending on the number of schools

not in compliance and the size of those schools. If all districts, PSAs, and ISDs are in compliance, there would be no associated cost.

In FY 2025-26, the legislature appropriated $64.4 million to reimburse districts, PSAs, and ISDs for the costs associated with purchasing new reading instruction and curriculum materials.

Legislative Analyst: Josh Roesner
Fiscal Analysts: Noel Benson
Perry Zielak

■ This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.