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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2020</td>
<td>Building an Effective Schoolwide Multi-tiered System of Support for Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 2020</td>
<td>Highlighting Key Considerations for Literacy Screening and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2021</td>
<td>Supporting Early Literacy Instruction PreK to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2021</td>
<td>Highlighting Key Considerations for Monitoring Reading Progress and Using Literacy Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2021</td>
<td>Promoting Code-Based Literacy Skills in Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2021</td>
<td>Promoting Meaning-Level Skills in Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2021</td>
<td>Taking a Deep Dive into Professional Development Structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAESP Assessment Sessions

Both Sessions
• How to think, study, and act as leaders in literacy

Our session today
• Overview of best practices in assessment → focus on screening
• Discussion of contemporary issues in assessment implementation
• Addressing assessment in the current context (i.e., global health crisis)

Next session
• Extending previous discussion on best practices in assessment as applied to progress monitoring
• Linking assessment outcomes with instructional change
Session Objectives

• Recognize features of research-informed practices on the types and approaches for assessing literacy skills, with a focus on screening

• Describe barriers and solutions that impact screening implementation and data-based decision-making

• Identify the strengths and stretches of assessment practices within your school/district that lead to data-based decision-making
Background
Important Components of Reading

From OH Literacy Plan:
Multi-Tiered System of Support in Reading (MTSS-R)

- **Tier I: Universal Level of Prevention**
  - 80% of students

- **Tier II: Targeted Level of Prevention**
  - 15% of students

- **Tier III: Intensive Level of Prevention**
  - 3% to 5% of students

Students With Disabilities Receive services at all levels, depending on need.

Provides a structure of support for ALL students, including students with or at risk for disabilities!
Lead for Literacy Website

https://leadforliteracy.org/
Assessments

**Various** assessment data are used to inform reading instruction in important, meaningful, and actionable ways.

**Topics include**——
Assessment Systems & Screening
Questions and Discussion

• Please ask questions in the chat – we would love to hear from you!
  • There will be a few discussion points built-in throughout the presentation today

*Message Lauren Artzi privately or send your question to everyone
Assessment Foundations

• **Assessment**: a process of collecting data to make decisions

• **Screeners** are an assessment type that ideally have efficient, valid, and understandable attributes

• **Universal screening (i.e., all students) is optimal**, and individual screening is possible
“The quickest way to close the gap between actual and desired student performance is to apply principles of effective instruction.”

Assessment ≠ Instruction

Assessment informs Instruction

What is Screening Data?

• Screening data is **formal** and points to students being: (1) at-risk, or (2) not at-risk

• This formal data identifies students **at-risk for learning difficulties** in literacy

• Most importantly, **there is no sense in collecting screening data if you are not going to use it**
Sense-Making of Screening Data

• There is no one-size-fits-all solution to using screening data; literacy leaders work with their team to use screening data for instructional support.

• A systematized method of making sense of the data helps to steer team-based decisions to mutually agreed upon goals.

Schildkamp (2019)
“Assessment practices contribute to higher levels of reading achievement only when they (a) answer important questions for teachers and schools and (b) enable informed, data-based instructional decision making.”

p. 33, Coyne & Harn (2006)
Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Purpose</strong></th>
<th>Identify students who are at risk for having difficulty in their reading skill acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>ALL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools</strong></td>
<td>Brief assessments that are valid and reliable and that demonstrate diagnostic accuracy for predicting learning or behavioral problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>Administered three times per year (fall, winter, spring)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Screening Identifies Students At-Risk

### National Center on RTI (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Names</th>
<th>Letter Names</th>
<th>Consonant Sounds Task C</th>
<th>Long Vowel Sounds Task D</th>
<th>Short Vowel Sounds Task E</th>
<th>Short Vowels in CVC Words Task F</th>
<th>Short Vowels, Diagraphs, and diphthongs Task G</th>
<th>R-controlled Vowels Task H</th>
<th>Long Vowel Spellings Task I</th>
<th>Variant Vowels Task J</th>
<th>Non-regular Vowel and Spelling Task K</th>
<th>Multisyllabic Words Task L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Task A</td>
<td>Lower Task B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29/26</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>21/24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Names</th>
<th>Letter Names</th>
<th>Consonant Sounds Task C</th>
<th>Long Vowel Sounds Task D</th>
<th>Short Vowel Sounds Task E</th>
<th>Short Vowels in CVC Words Task F</th>
<th>Short Vowels, Diagraphs, and diphthongs Task G</th>
<th>R-controlled Vowels Task H</th>
<th>Long Vowel Spellings Task I</th>
<th>Variant Vowels Task J</th>
<th>Non-regular Vowel and Spelling Task K</th>
<th>Multisyllabic Words Task L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

This table provides a summary of screening results for identifying students at-risk in reading. Each column represents a different literacy skill area, and the numbers indicate the performance level in that area. The table is used to help educators identify areas where students need additional support.
Key Features of Screening

- Includes all students
- Depends on efficient tools that are valid and reliable
- Assesses educationally relevant outcomes and shows strong classification accuracy
- Occurs at least three times each year (fall, winter, spring)
- Used to identify students at-risk for poor learning outcomes
## Leaders as Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Factor</th>
<th>Application in Screening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student success as #1 priority</td>
<td>Push for <em>alterable variables</em> and <em>instructional change</em> after screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible in student settings</td>
<td>Enact <em>visible enthusiasm</em> for student literacy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participates in learning process</td>
<td>Identify and act on <em>areas of learning</em> in key features of screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work side-by-side with staff</td>
<td>Work on <em>data teams</em> for screening; engage in data use discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning More About Screening

What should screeners look like?

Literacy leaders ask: “how can I be a better critical consumer of screening practices in my school?"

Your ideal screener should have a few key attributes:

• Easy to learn; time efficient; predictive to student growth; tap basic literacy skills (e.g., letter identification); sensitive to identify students
| As a literacy leader, I am still learning about how to use screening data for educational decision-making | As a literacy leader, I feel somewhat comfortable with how to use screening data for educational decision-making | As a literacy leader, I am well experienced in how to use screening data for educational decision-making |

Pause and Process (2-3 minutes)
Literacy Screeners Described - PSF

• Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (late K – 1)
  • Break apart word into the smallest units of sound distinguishable
  • Accuracy score based on correctly segmenting units of sound within a word
  • The reverse operation of blending sounds together to make a word
  • This can be an entirely **auditory task**

Examples from DIBELS 8th Edition Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>written</th>
<th>plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/r//i//t//n/</td>
<td>/p//l//u//s/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Literacy Screeners Described – Letter ID

• **Letter Naming Fluency (K-1)**
  • Identify letters by their name (i.e., “ell” for L)
  • Accuracy score based on correct lower- and upper-case letter name identification

  ![Example: M L s y R G t]

• **Letter Sound Fluency (K-1)**
  • Identify letters by their sound (i.e., /s/ for S)
  • Accuracy score based on correct lower- and upper-case letter identification

  ![Example: C M O L]
Literacy Screeners Described - NWF

• Nonsense Word Fluency (+1)
  • Reading pseudowords (e.g., orthographically correct, but not real English words) individually
  • Helpful for distinguishing children who are memorizing words by shape from those who are decoding phonologically
  • We do not teach students how to read NWF; this is exclusively a predictive measure

Examples from DIBELS 8th Edition Measures
Literacy Screeners Described - WIF

• Word Identification Fluency (sometimes “Word Reading Fluency”; 1-2)
  • Reading real words individually
  • Ideally includes regular (e.g., “bat”) and irregular (e.g., “yacht”) sight words

Examples from DIBELS 8th Edition Measures

- detective
- wrapped
- bull
Literacy Screeners Described - ORF

• Oral Reading Fluency (sometimes “passage reading fluency”; +1)
  • Reading connected text under a time constraint
  • Not intended to be speed reading
  • A qualitative picture of reading prosody and comprehension

We used to bring the green pears home, but we don't anymore. The last time we brought some home Mom threw
Literacy Screeners Described - Maze

- Maze (+4)
  - Identifying missing words embedded in a passage
  - Indication of reading comprehension and inferential skills
  - A multiple-choice format may be used

Examples from DIBELS 8th Edition Measures
## Screening Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Recommended Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)</td>
<td>K - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letter Sound Fluency (LSF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word Identification Fluency (WIF)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maze or Maze Fluency</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IES (2009); National Center on RTI (2012)
Many screeners measure decoding skills...

...and we know that is only part of the picture
Extending Knowledge as a Critical Consumer

- I know the specific skills that literacy screeners assess, when they should be assessed, and how screening data can be used to improve instructional factors
- I can promote a sense-making process of screening data so that our data team can make meaningful decisions for our students
- I will work with our data team to continually improve our assessment system components (e.g., teacher and family communication)

I can look at administrative factors that drive implementation of literacy screening in our school
Selecting Screening Instruments

Academic Screening Tools Chart

Universal screening can be used to identify which children will need the most intensive intervention. In some cases, children with the weakest initial skills may bypass Tier 2 intervention and move directly into intensive intervention. The tools on the academic screening tools chart can be used to identify students at risk for poor academic outcomes, including students who require intensive intervention.

This tools chart has three tabs that include ratings on the technical rigor of the tools: (1) Classification Accuracy, (2) Technical Standards, and (3) Usability Features.

Last updated: July 2019. Our tools charts have a new look! Click here for a brief summary of improvements we rolled out in June 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Convincing evidence</th>
<th>Partially convincing evidence</th>
<th>Unconvincing evidence</th>
<th>Data unavailable</th>
<th>Disaggregated data available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILTER RESULTS</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>Middle School (6-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary (K-5)</td>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply Filters | Show Advanced Filters | Clear Filters
Purpose-Driven Implementation

• Building in school/grade-level assessment systems **concurrently with** state and federal assessments walks us to the line of testing capacities
  • And so we remember our guiding philosophy... **each minute a child is assessed is a minute away from instruction**

• The purpose of adding any additional assessment must be critically examined to determine how it is providing added value to your existing **instructional** systems

• Improving logistics: assessment **schedule**, short- and long-term **planning**, links to **professional learning**
  ✓ Literacy leaders look for **patterns of need** for systemic improvement
How to Use data to Make Instructional Decisions: Screening

**Screening and Identifying students at-risk for reading difficulties**

**Collect data**
3 times a year (fall, winter, spring) following school plan

**Determine:**
- **BOY**: student Tier placement
- **MOY**: students progressing on-track?
- **EOY**: students met benchmarks?

**Who uses data:**
- School data team/leaders

**Possible Questions:**
- Are students meeting grade level benchmarks?
- How can we address needs?
Screening Implementation Checklist

• Some examples of checkpoints towards success on your road to a healthy assessment system:
  - Our universal screeners assess all essential components of reading directly or indirectly
  - We have confidence that the data we collect is valid because our assessors are trained in assessment administration
  - Universal screening data are organized for use and distributed to staff members in a timely manner
    - Our assessment schedule includes timepoints for assessment administration and data use
| Our school team will **need** resources to support implementation | Our school team **may use** resources as a refresher on our existing processes/plans | Our school team is implementing assessment practices with fidelity and **we are focusing on other areas** for improvement |

---

Pause and Process (2-3 minutes)
Reminder: We **CAN** Do This Virtually

- NCII has provided guidance and video demonstrations (see last NAESP Session; Thourd, 2020)

- Emerging evidence continues to become available online (e.g., see another key resource here: [https://osf.io/wg4ef](https://osf.io/wg4ef); King et al., 2020), and we continue to balance the tension of research-informed practices with contemporary instructional demands:
  - Use brief, standardized assessments and follow guidelines from the vendor/author on protocols for remote assessment
  - Compare apples to apples (i.e., virtual assessment in fall means virtual assessment in spring)
NCII Video – Example of Virtual Screening

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Imnkw6jnkI&feature=emb_logo
Benchmarks in a Virtual Context

• We are fortunate to have the opportunity to be **flexible** with deciding **cut points for risk** (i.e., if a student doesn’t meet the benchmark, they are at-risk for not developing literacy skills)

• It may be most appropriate to make a **post-hoc decision** on screening cut points for your school or local context

• Consider **making decisions at the classroom-level**, as this is more proximal to instructional alterations
  • Note: **the cost associated is additional resources** (i.e., each teacher needs to be equipped for data-based decision-making instead of only the teachers on the assessment team)
Literacy Screening During COVID-19

• We can expect disruptions in typical routines (e.g., data reviews) this school year. Still, as a literacy leader you may want to consider the following priorities:
  • Clear communication with families about which assessments are being administered and how they link with instruction
  • Encouraging teachers to leverage expertise from the assessment team on how to use student data to guide instruction
  • Focus on alterable variables within the context of in-person, hybrid, or remote instruction.
  • Plan for flexibility in assessment cut points; determine a best fit for that resources that you have available in your local context
Barriers to Assessment Implementation

- Assessment team is newly established with *varying comfort levels* around test selection, interpretation, and decision-making.
- Our *school culture* does not promote the use of assessment for instructional improvement (e.g., anecdotal experience; testing beliefs).
- Universal screening has historically, or may be designed to, *over-identify* students at-risk and we do not have capacity to support that many students through instructional intensification.
- The pandemic has thrown off our typical assessment system; now, we have *little to no consistency* and have not been able to implement any screening.
How Leaders Address Barriers

✓ *Don’t let ‘perfect be an enemy of good’*
  ✓ Seek avenues for **continuous improvement**

✓ Remember that literacy leaders are savvy, relentless champions for student success at all levels. A few attributes to consider:
  ✓ *“empowerment, involvement, and collaboration”* – Fernandez & Shaw, 2020

✓ Use **existing resources**
  ✓ [https://leadforliteracy.org/](https://leadforliteracy.org/)
  ✓ [https://mtss4success.org/](https://mtss4success.org/)
  ✓ [https://intensiveintervention.org/](https://intensiveintervention.org/)
Resource Exploration Activity
Finding Screening Resources

• Go to: https://leadforliteracy.org/
• Search: “screening” in resources repository.
• Find 1-2 resources that you would like to explore more.
Wrapping Up
## Lead for Literacy NAESP Web Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2020</td>
<td>Building an Effective Schoolwide Multi-tiered System of Support for Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 2020</td>
<td>Highlighting Key Considerations for Literacy Screening and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2021</td>
<td>Supporting Early Literacy Instruction PreK to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2021</td>
<td>Highlighting Key Considerations for Monitoring Reading Progress and Using Literacy Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2021</td>
<td>Promoting Code-Based Literacy Skills in Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2021</td>
<td>Promoting Meaning-Level Skills in Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2021</td>
<td>Taking a Deep Dive into Professional Development Structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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