

Literacy Assessments Meeting the Requirements of 279.68/ELI

for universal screening and progress monitoring
2019-2020 school year



April 2019

Table of Contents

- I. [Introduction](#)
 - A. [FastBridge Learning FAST™ assessments](#)
- II. [Review Process](#)
 - A. [Assessment and Review Criteria](#)
 - B. [Considerations](#)
- III. [Reviewed Assessments](#)
 - A. [NWEA MAP Growth Reading and MAP Reading Fluency](#)
 - B. [Lexia RAPID Assessment](#)
 - C. [Istation Indicators of Progress \(ISIP\)](#)
 - D. [Curriculum Associates i-Ready Diagnostics](#)
 - E. [Riverside easyCBM](#)
 - F. [AIMSweb Plus \(Pearson\)](#)
 - G. [Dynamic Measurement Group Acadience Reading \(formerly DIBELS Next\)](#)
 - H. [Renaissance STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy](#)
 - I. [University of Oregon DIBELS 8](#)
- III. [Preschool Universal Screening: Reviews of myIGDIs and PELI](#)
 - A. [Early Learning Labs: myIGDIs \(Individual Growth and Development Indicators\)](#)
 - B. [Dynamic Measurement Group: PELI \(Preschool Early Literacy Indicators\)](#)
- IV. [Screening for Students who are Deaf](#)

Introduction

The FastBridge Learning suite of assessments has been adopted by the Iowa Department of Education for support as the primary assessment system for ELI. K-6 literacy assessments are available at no cost to all public school districts and interested nonpublic schools that have the necessary technology to support implementation. Districts may select other approved measures at their own expense to fulfill the requirements of Iowa’s Early Literacy Implementation (ELI).

FastBridge Learning FAST™ assessments

The FastBridge Learning assessments have been adopted as the recommended and supported measures for universal screening and progress monitoring. Approved universal screening and progress monitoring are indicated by a “Y” in the reporting tables. Also consider the notes and comments that provide more information about the relative merits and weaknesses of all assessments. (Please read the **REVIEW PROCESS** section of this document for interpretation and more information about using universal screening and progress monitoring measures in local schools and districts).

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
FAST aReading		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y									FBL recommends grades 2+ (not K-1)
FAST CBMR		Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		*part of earlyReading Composite
FAST earlyReading Composite		Y	Y													

Assessment	Universal Screening						Progress Monitoring						Comments		
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3		4	5
FAST Onset Sounds								Y							
FAST Letter Names								Y							
FAST Letter Sounds								Y							
FAST Word Blending															Did not meet requirements
FAST Word Segmenting								Y							
FAST Sight Words - 50															Did not meet requirements
FAST Sight Words - 150								Y							
FAST Decodable Words								Y							
FAST Nonsense Words								Y							

The FastBridge Learning suite of assessments includes computer adaptive and individually administered assessments. Word Blending and Sight Words 50 did not meet the requirements to be approved for progress monitoring. FastBridge did not submit aReading for approval at K and does not recommend using it as a primary screener for K or 1. aReading administration time is 10-15 minutes K-5 and 20-30 minutes at 6th.

Review Process

This document contains information about assessments reviewed for use as universal screening and progress monitoring measures to meet the requirements of 279.68/ELI (Early Literacy Implementation). The review of assessments is based on criteria established in rule to support 279.68. The review process is intended to identify assessments that meet the minimum requirements, as well as provide feedback on the assessment’s ability to accurately predict future reading performance via universal screening, and to frequently and reliably measure student improvement via progress monitoring. These are requirements of ELI, as well as keys to an effective assessment system to inform a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). The present review completed in Spring 2019 is based on updated review criteria and updated information from interested vendors. Prior assessment reviews and approval are no longer applicable.

As noted above, the FastBridge Learning suite of assessments has been adopted by the Iowa Department of Education for support as the primary assessment system for ELI. FastBridge Learning K-6 literacy assessments are available at no cost to all public school districts and interested nonpublic schools that have the necessary technology to support implementation. However, any district may choose to use another approved assessment listed below. The district’s assessment selection(s) must have approved assessments at each grade, for both universal screening and progress monitoring, as indicated by a “Y” in the reporting tables. Also consider the notes and comments that provide more information about the relative merits and weaknesses of the other assessments. Districts may not use assessments to meet ELI requirements that do not meet approval criteria, but may choose to use them for other purposes in addition to an approved measure.

Assessment Review Criteria

Universal screening is typically administered three times per year to identify students who are at risk in reading. For this, the measure needs to efficiently and accurately identify students who are likely to be below

expectations on future reading outcome measures, while minimizing incorrect identifications. Area Under the Curve is one statistic used to indicate this quality, with a 1.0 indicating perfect prediction and 0.5 indicating essentially random prediction. For universal screening, Area Under the Curve and related Specificity/Sensitivity statistics needed to be provided by the vendor and at least meet a minimum standard of 0.7, with higher values preferred. The review team also expected to find developer established and recommended criteria for prediction of success/risk (i.e., benchmarks) with a reasonable, documented process for establishing the benchmarks. This is based on the expectation that the test developer, with full access to their body of research evidence, will be in the best position to recommend suitable and defensible benchmarks informed by the sensitivity/specificity statistics and other data rather than leave the task to individual users.

ELI requirements for progress monitoring state that progress monitoring must be administered weekly and the assessment used must be reliable, sensitive to change, and able to show improvement with as much consistency as possible. Reliability of Slope is a statistic used to quantify the consistency of the progress monitoring probes. More consistent or reliable sets of passages means that there's less randomness (i.e., score bounce) across probes, making the child's progress easier to discern. The review process considered a reliability of slope score of 0.60 to be the minimum acceptable score, with higher scores being more desirable. In addition, test developers need to have multiple equivalent forms available to minimize practice effects over time. The review process looked for descriptions of how the test developer went about the process of making the forms as similar as possible, as well as the number of available forms (minimum 10).

The reviewer process considered test administration time. For screening and progress monitoring measures there is a give and take between using a longer test that might produce more accurate or more detailed results, versus a shorter test that minimizes the amount of instructional time lost to testing. Computer-administered tests, especially longer ones may be difficult for young children. Most curriculum-based measures take a minute or two per test administered. Computer-administered adaptive tests take significantly longer, but allow the efficiency of testing many students at once. Some screening and progress monitoring measures were reported to be in excess of 30 minutes administration time, while others produced valid screening and progress monitoring data with 1-5 minutes of testing.

Considerations for Selecting an Assessment System

When considering options for an assessment system to be used for screening and monitoring progress, a system that contains individual and group administered measures is valuable because it offers options for implementation, as well as accommodating students who may not be a good fit for one or the other mode of administration. Teams may want to look for a coherent system - one where there are no gaps at any grade or season. The tables below are marked with "Y" where the assessment or composite met the minimum requirements for that grade. Refer to the notes column as well as comments below the table for additional details.

Consider the content measured by the screening measures. A screening system should measure phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as appropriate to the grade of the student. Curriculum based measures typically require students to produce a response in a literacy area such as phonemic awareness, phonics, or oral reading fluency, while most computer administered tests rely on auditory presentation of items, silent reading and a multiple choice response format. Both oral reading fluency and computer adaptive measures are usually general outcome indicators for overall reading and comprehension.

Other CBM measures are typically single prerequisite skills that contribute to predicting whether or not the student is on track for becoming an independent reader of connected text. Tests using a battery of different measures with a composite may provide feedback on multiple skills, as could oral reading fluency when accuracy and rate are considered. However, adaptive tests typically provide limited or no skill-specific feedback. Some students benefit from the individually administered tests for focus and attention, compared to the more independent computer adaptive measures. An assessment system with a variety of types of screening is helpful because there are often unique situations that require decision-making for individual learner characteristics. Individually administered tests provide more opportunity for monitoring and redirecting poor student attention to the tasks as compared to computer administered tests.

For either type of measure (general outcome or adaptive/single skill) additional diagnostic measures may be useful to identify the skills that need work. Individual products will vary by vendor in their predictive ability (An AUC of .90 is better than an AUC of .71- less error), however all types of approved measures are effective for minimally identifying risk. Note: some of the reviewed assessments may have reported diagnostic capabilities, but diagnostic functioning of the assessment was not covered in this review process.

There is value in an assessment system that includes opportunities to evaluate student production of various reading processes including reading out loud and demonstrating decoding skills. Several of the reviewed assessments are experimenting with computer administered and scored tests with verbal responses from students including letter names and sounds and even oral reading fluency. However, none were submitted with all of the required supporting data to be approved as an approved assessment for screening or progress monitoring. Nearly all of the individually administered assessments reviewed rely on student verbal responses. Other online administered tests rely on some form of selected multiple choice format.

ELI requirements and best practice both rely on selection of a set of assessments that support the universal screening and progress monitoring of students at-risk for reading difficulties, including students who may have dyslexia. Keep the focus on a quality assessment system to support literacy, not simply on compliance.

Reviewed Assessments

Below are the individual assessment vendor submissions and the review team’s results, indicated by “Y” for approved measures, with comments and notes that elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of each measure.

NWEA MAP Growth Reading and MAP Reading Fluency

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
NWEA MAP Growth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y									not reviewed for PM
NWEA MAP Reading Fluency																Did not meet requirements

The MAP Growth assessment is a computer adaptive test of reading with a traditional test format where the student provides a selected response to questions. MAP Reading Fluency is a newly developed computer administered test that focuses on emerging literacy skills such as phonological awareness and listening

comprehension, oral reading fluency and text comprehension using an adaptive testing approach, with computer scoring of student oral responses. It did not have sufficient data to be approved for use as a Universal Screening measure, and was not submitted for PM. MAP Growth met the minimum requirements for use as a Universal Screener, but was not reviewed for progress monitoring use. Administration times for MAP Growth are long, with an average of 20-30 minutes for K-1 and 40-60 minutes for grades 2-6.

Lexia RAPID Assessment

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
Lexia RAPID Assessment																Did not meet requirements

Lexia RAPID Assessment is a computer adaptive test measuring foundational skills of reading as well as reading comprehension. K-2 uses a mix of teacher and computer administered tasks and takes up to about 20 minutes, while grades 3+ rely on computer administered tasks only, taking 30-50 minutes. The assessments were submitted for review as a universal screener but did not include all required evidence for review and approval, including a standard setting method for risk identification.

Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP)

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
ISIP Early Reading (K-2)																Did not meet requirements
ISIP Advanced Reading (3+)																Did not meet requirements

Istation's ISIP Early and Advanced reading are computer adaptive tests. ISIP Early Reading includes a newly developed computer-delivered oral reading fluency assessment, which was not submitted for review. Progress monitoring for ISIP was typically described as monthly with the capability for a teacher to schedule "on demand" assessments. Evidence of PM reliability of slope was based on monthly 30 minute tests. No evidence of weekly on demand skill tests was provided.

Curriculum Associates i-Ready Diagnostics

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
Curriculum Associates i-Ready Diagnostics		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y								Long testing times Not approved for PM

Curriculum Associates i-Ready Diagnostics is a computer adaptive assessment for literacy. It meets all of the reviewed criteria for use as a screening measure. However, be aware that screening times are longer than many other assessments due to the more diagnostic nature of this assessment. The average student in K-1 takes between 25 and 35 minutes, with the majority completing within 45 minutes. An average student in grades 2-5 takes 40-60 minutes, with the majority completing within 80 minutes. The average 6th grade

student takes 60-75 minutes, with the majority completing within 90 minutes. i-Ready was not approved for progress monitoring because the growth monitoring is only a monthly measure, while ELI requires weekly progress monitoring.

Riverside easyCBM

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
easyCBM Reading Comprehension																30 minute administration time
easyCBM Vocabulary														Y		10-15 minute administration time
easyCBM Passage Reading Fluency												Y	Y	Y	Y	
easyCBM Word Reading Fluency									Y		Y					
easyCBM Phoneme Segmentation								Y								
easyCBM Letter Sounds								Y	Y							
easyCBM Letter Names								Y	Y							

In the easyCBM suite of assessments, none of the universal screening assessments met the requirements for use with ELI, primarily due to the lack of a defined standard setting process that would provide benchmarks established and recommended by the developer (easyCBM leaves this decision to individual users). Progress monitoring measures met requirements at some grades, but do not have established benchmarks for use as end of year outcome targets. No second grade measures met the review standards for progress monitoring.

AIMSweb Plus (Pearson)

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
AIMSweb Composite																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Written Expression																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Print Concepts																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Letter Naming Fluency																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Initial Sounds																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Auditory Vocabulary																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Letter Word Sound Fluency																Did not meet requirements

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
AIMSweb Phoneme Segmentation																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Nonsense Word Fluency																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Word Reading Fluency																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Oral Reading Fluency																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Vocabulary																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Reading Comprehension																Did not meet requirements
AIMSweb Silent Reading Fluency																Did not meet requirements

AIMSweb Plus measures did not meet review requirements for approval for either screening or progress monitoring due to missing required elements. In particular, AIMSweb does not have developer established and recommended benchmarks for identifying risk, leaving this task to individual districts. AIMSweb also does not provide reliability of slope data for progress monitoring measures.

Dynamic Measurement Group Acadience Reading (formerly DIBELS Next)

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
Acadience Composite		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y									
Acadience Oral Reading Fluency		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y						
Acadience Maze				Y	Y	Y	Y				Y	Y				
Acadience Nonsense Word Fluency - Correct Letter Sounds & Whole Words Read		Y	Y						Y	Y*						*2nd grade Fall only
Acadience Phoneme Segmentation Fluency																Did not meet requirements
Acadience First Sound Fluency								Y								

Dynamic Measurement Group (DMG) submitted the Acadience suite of measures (formerly known as DIBELS Next). Some elements of the reviewed data did not meet minimum requirements. The Composite is not approved for screening at K due to a low criterion validity score. No progress monitoring measures met

requirements at 5th or 6th grade, primarily due to Reliability of Slope data falling below the minimum acceptable level. This leaves an approved assessment system for grades 1-4 only.

Renaissance STAR Reading and STAR Early Literacy

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
Renaissance STAR Early Lit	Y	Y	Y	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y				Long PM time
Renaissance STAR Reading				Y	Y	Y	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y	Did not have evidence to review for 1-2, long PM time

Renaissance Learning submitted the STAR assessments, which met the requirements across all grades, with some caution. Administration time for progress monitoring is 10-15 minutes weekly for Star Early Literacy, and 15-20 minutes weekly for Star Reading. While Renaissance describes Star Reading as appropriate for grades 1-2, data to support approval for grades 1-2 were not submitted.

University of Oregon DIBELS 8

Assessment	Universal Screening							Progress Monitoring							Comments	
	Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	1	2	3	4	5		6
DIBELS 8 Phonemic Segmentation Fluency																Did not meet requirements
DIBELS 8 Letter Naming Fluency	Y	Y														Did not meet requirements for PM
DIBELS 8 Nonsense Word Fluency	Y	Y	Y	Y												Did not meet requirements for PM
DIBELS 8 Word Reading Fluency	Y	Y	Y	Y												Did not meet requirements for PM
DIBELS 8 Oral Reading Fluency		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y									Did not meet requirements for PM
DIBELS 8 MAZE			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y									Did not meet requirements for PM

DIBELS 8 was developed by the University of Oregon as their current revision of the DIBELS assessment family, and is not the same as Acadience/DIBELS Next. DIBELS 8 does not have a composite, relying instead on the data provided by individual tests. This presents a challenge for making screening decisions with multiple individual screening assessments that may be contradictory to each other. Because Reliability of Slope data are not yet available for DIBELS 8, none of the measures can be approved for PM at this time.

Preschool Universal Screening: Reviews of myIGDIs and PELI

Universal screening in preschool is a best practice, as part of a healthy educational system. In Iowa, preschool universal screening is complementary to the required data collection in GOLD. The primary intended purpose of GOLD is for formative decision making, to shape instructional planning to meet the needs of students.

Screening data is currently encouraged in literacy for preschool, as described in the Universal Tier Tools guide in Iowa, as well as in the Intervention Guide, with think-about for young learners experiencing a structured educational setting for the first time.

As part of the recent Request for Information in Iowa, the IGDIs and PELI universal screening assessments were reviewed. While preschool measures are not reviewed for approved use in ELI implementation, information is provided below to help users consider their usefulness for preschool.

Early Learning Labs: myIGDIs (Individual Growth and Development Indicators)

myIGDIs consists of five individually administered measures that met many of the general requirements used for ELI reviews. The domains addressed by myIGDIs are: oral language, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, and comprehension.

Area Under the Curve indicates how well the measure identifies the risk level of the student. Area Under the Curve data for myIGDIs fell just below to just above the minimum standard used at K-6, while the related sensitivity measures were all just above the minimum standard. The best use of myIGDIs data would be to identify the area(s) with which a majority of students need more learning opportunities. Early Learning Labs indicates that myIGDIs is globally aligned to the Iowa Early Learning Standards of Communication, Language, and Literacy: Language Understanding and Use (6.1) and Early Literacy (6.2).

myIGDIs has progress monitoring (PM) available and met the majority of the K-6 standards for PM, other than that PM is recommended by the vendor to occur every three weeks (ELI requires weekly PM capability, a requirement not necessarily applicable at preschool). Cost-benefit of PM for an individual student should be considered within available instructional time (where informal, natural observations of growth might be made). The vendor recommends selection of a single subtest for PM, which does reduce PM time, compared to giving all 5 measures for progress monitoring.

This submission of myIGDIs (Early Learning Labs) does not include a composite score for overall risk, which may partially explain why individual measures hover just above and below the criteria used to evaluate K-6 screeners. Composite scores tend to provide a better prediction of risk because they combine information from multiple tests. All five measures are recommended for the best summary of student performance at screening. Overall strengths of myIGDIs include multiple measures for a more comprehensive screening assessment (e.g., vocabulary, oral language-not just letter names/sounds) and adequate technical adequacy for most measures. Limitations include the absence of a composite and some subtests below the (K-6) criteria for predictive power.

Dynamic Measurement Group: PELI (Preschool Early Literacy Indicators)

PELI consists of a storybook format screening assessment. The domains addressed by PELI are: alphabet knowledge, vocabulary and oral language, phonemic awareness, and listening comprehension. The PELI met all of the technical adequacy criteria for use as a universal screener, with the caution that the 10-15 minute administration time barely met the criterion for individually administered screening assessments (the screening is untimed, but typically takes 10-15 minutes to complete). The PELI was not submitted for progress monitoring, but has materials for quick checks, used for monitoring progress between screening windows. These were not reviewed. Strengths of the PELI measure include the storybook format and sound technical

adequacy as a screening measure, while limitations include the time it takes to administer the assessment at the expense of instructional time.

Final Note on Preschool Universal Screening

Universal screening in preschool serves an important function to guide instruction aligned with the IELS. Used as an indicator, the specific assessment items should never be taught in isolation (specific vocabulary or content). Screening information should be applied to high yield, evidence-based instructional strategies such as embedded learning routines and intentional play, as described in the Preschool Building Blocks within the Universal Tier Tools guide in Iowa. For more information about universal screening in preschool, please contact Kimberly Villotti at kimberly.villotti@iowa.gov.

Screening for Students who are Deaf

Students who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing vary significantly in the degree of hearing loss and the effect their hearing loss has on their educational needs. It is ideal for students who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing to participate in the “district default” universal screening assessment, or another approved screening measure in the suite of assessments adopted by the district. However, in some unique circumstances, the educational needs of the student exceed the allowed accommodations on the district default universal screening assessment.

Avenue PM is approved for universal screening and progress monitoring for students who are Deaf, due to their unique sensory needs and the adaptation of the measurement to the critical domains of early literacy for this population. The decision to select and use Avenue PM must be discussed with the student support team, including parents/guardians, and documented in the student record. Avenue PM may be given when it is educationally necessary to use another approved measure to predict the student’s future reading performance. Avenue PM may not be given to increase the student’s score or avoid designating the early literacy support the student may need, especially if they are able to participate in the district default screening measure.

Please note the technical adequacy of this measure is still under review, however it is approved for this low incidence population because it confers the same educational benefit and attention to literacy as other approved measures, but with accommodation for the early literacy instructional needs of the deaf population. The Iowa Department of Education has statutory authority to approve alternative assessments that confer the same educational benefit for specific student populations. (IAC 281, Chapter 62). For more information about the specifics of the measure, please contact jen.adams@iowa.gov and for any additional questions about this approval, please contact thomas.mayes@iowa.gov.