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Acadience Learning Assessments

Acadience Reading K-6. Screening & progress monitoring
Acadience Data Management
Acadience Math K-6. Screening & progress monitoring
Acadience Reading Pre-K: PELI
Acadience Reading 7-9: CARI
DIBELS Next Survey
DIBELS Deep PA & WRD – Diagnostic Reading
Acadience Reading Diagnostic CFOL
Acadience RAN
Acadience Spelling K -1
Objectives

Understand how to interpret and use Acadience Reading benchmark data to evaluate effectiveness of support

- Systems level
  - Overview Report
  - Effectiveness of Instructional Levels Reports
  - Classroom Pathways Report
  - Summative Growth Report

Acadience Reading

Acadience Reading is a set of standardized, formative indicators of the Basic Early Literacy Skills, designed for universal screening and progress monitoring, for the purpose of preventing reading failure and improving reading outcomes for all students K-6

Acadience Reading Benchmark Goals

If a student achieves a Benchmark Goal, the odds are in favor of that student achieving later reading outcomes.

- **At/Above Benchmark**: Odds are generally 80% to 90%
- **Above Benchmark**: Odds are generally 90% to 99%
- **At Benchmark**: Odds are generally 70% to 85%
- **Below Benchmark**: Odds are generally 40% to 60%
- **Well Below Benchmark**: Odds are generally 10% to 20%
A System is A Level of Analysis Beyond the Individual Student

Community
Demographics
Social Values
Culture
Legislation

Acadience Reading is One Part of an Effective School-wide Literacy System

Acadience Reading K–6

Three Tiers of Support
Continuum of generally effective services of varying intensity to provide support for 100% of students to reach benchmark goals. Percentages are approximate and a general guide for system-wide goal setting. Boundaries are not absolute and may represent a difference in intensity rather than program.

Outcomes Driven Model
Outcomes Driven Model Steps:
- Identify need for support.
- Validate need for support.
- Plan and implement support.
- Evaluate and modify support.
- Review outcomes.
Evaluating Support at the Systems Level

The system is the context. An effective system of support is critical to effective implementation of Acadience Reading.

Key Actions to take:
1. Set system-wide goals for each grade level.
2. Have a system-wide plan for providing support to meet student needs.
3. If a large proportion of students are not making adequate progress, consider making a change in support at the systems level.

Effectiveness of Instructional Support Levels

- Provides details about the proportion of students at/above, below, and well below the benchmark at MOY or EOY by level of support
- District- or school-level report
  - School-level report
    - School level
    - Classroom level

Overview Report

Delight Valley School–First Grade EOY

Let’s take a closer look at each Tier of Instruction.

Effectiveness of Core Support

Delight Valley School–First Grade MOY

School-wide: Delight Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>Likely to Need Core Support</th>
<th>Likely to Need Strategic Support</th>
<th>Likely to Need Intensive Support</th>
<th>Total Middle of Year Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total N = 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of Year Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td>58% (n = 44)</td>
<td>16% (n = 12)</td>
<td>25% (n = 19)</td>
<td>86% (n = 60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Effective Is Our Core Support?

A core system of support is effective if it:

- Meets the needs of 80% of all students in the school
- Supports 95–100% of students who score At/Above Benchmark to achieve the benchmark goal

Effectiveness of Core Support
Delight Valley School–First Grade MOY

What proportion of students started first grade with scores at/above the benchmark on the Reading Composite Score (Likely to Need Core Support)?

- How many students?

How effective is our system of support for students who start the year scoring at benchmark?

Effectiveness of Core Support
Delight Valley School–First Grade MOY

Of the students who started first grade with scores at/above the benchmark (Likely to Need Core Support):

- What proportion scored at/above the benchmark at MOY? How many?
- Did any students score below the benchmark at MOY? How many?
- Did any students score well below the benchmark at MOY? How many?

How Effective Is Our Strategic Support?

A Strategic system of support is effective if it:

- Meets the needs of students in the school who will need more support than the core curriculum and instruction can provide
- Supports 80–100% of students who score below benchmark to achieve the benchmark goal
Effectiveness of Strategic Support
Delight Valley School–First Grade MOY

How effective is our system of strategic support for students who start the year scoring below the benchmark?

What proportion of students started first grade with scores below the benchmark on the Reading Composite Score (Likely to Need Strategic Support)?

- How many students?

How effective is our system of strategic support for students who start the year scoring below the benchmark?

Effectiveness of Strategic Support
Delight Valley School–First Grade MOY

Of the students who started first grade with scores below the benchmark (Likely to Need Strategic Support):

- What proportion scored at/above the benchmark at MOY? How many?
- Did any students score below the benchmark at MOY? How many?
- Did any students score well below the benchmark at MOY? How many?

How effective is our system of strategic support for students who start the year scoring below the benchmark?

Effectiveness of Intensive Support
Delight Valley School–First Grade MOY

How effective is our system of intensive support for students who start the year scoring below the benchmark?

What proportion of students started first grade with scores below the benchmark on the Reading Composite Score (Likely to Need Strategic Support)?

- How many students?
Effectiveness of Intensive Support Delight Valley School—First Grade MOY

How effective is our system of intensive support for students who start the year scoring well below the benchmark?

Of the students who started first grade with scores well below the benchmark (Likely to Need Intensive Support):
What proportion scored at/above the benchmark at MOY? How many?
Did any students score below the benchmark at MOY? How many?
Did any students score well below the benchmark at MOY? How many?

Effectiveness of Instructional Support Levels by Class

Students who were identified as ‘Likely to Need Core Support’ at the beginning of the year.

Students who were identified as ‘Likely to Need Strategic Support’ at the beginning of the year.

Students who were identified as ‘Likely to Need Intensive Support’ at the beginning of the year.

Sometimes Progress is More Nuanced than Green to Green (or Red to Red)
Sometimes Progress is More Nuanced than Green to Green (or Red to Red)

Pathways of Progress is a tool for:

(a) creating an individual student learning goal that is ambitious, meaningful, and attainable

(b) establishing an individual student learning goal that represents reading proficiency, including reading for meaning, at an adequate rate, with a high degree of accuracy

(c) evaluating the progress the student is making

Pathways of Progress™ Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway Descriptor</th>
<th>Pathway Number</th>
<th>Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Progress Percentile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★★★★★</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WELL ABOVE TYPICAL</td>
<td>80th percentile and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★★★</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ABOVE TYPICAL</td>
<td>60th to 79th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TYPICAL</td>
<td>40th to 59th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★★★</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BELOW TYPICAL</td>
<td>20th to 39th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★★★</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELL BELOW TYPICAL</td>
<td>Below 20th percentile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitely not adequate progress.

Progress Monitoring

ORF/Level 3 Scoring Booklet

Well Above Typical
Above Typical
Typical
Below Typical
Well Below Typical
As a classroom system, 41% of students are making below or well-below typical progress (Pathways 1 and 2).
Outcomes Driven Model

Outcomes Driven Model Steps:

- Identify need for support.
- Validate need for support.
- Plan and implement support.
- Evaluate and modify support.
- Review outcomes.

Reviewing Systems-Level Outcomes

Review Outcomes: Systems-Level Decisions

Self evaluation as a reflecting professional or group of reflective professionals

Considered by ourselves.

“How are we doing? Have we met our goals?”
“How can we improve outcomes?”
“What are our targets of opportunity?”

Opportunities for Systems-Level Improvements: professional development, curriculum focus, instructional design, group planning, resource allocation adjustments, etc.

Effectiveness Of Instructional Support
Delight Valley School–First Grade EOY

How effective is our system of support (each Tier)? How is our school doing compared to the district?

What About Edwards’ Class?

Acadience Reading K-6
School: Delight Valley
Grade: First Grade
Year: 2017-2018
Effectiveness of Instructional Support Levels
Middle of Year to End of Year
Class: Edwards Grade 1

Students who were identified as ‘Likely to Need Core Support’ in the middle of the year.

Name | Student ID | Middle | End of Year | NWF Correct | Letter Sounds | NWF Whole Words Read | ORF Words Correct
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Darla Becker | 13852014V1 | 195 | 202 | 89 | 31 | 53 |
Willie Boyd | 13752014V1 | 301 | 283 | 143 | 50 | 78 |
Nathan Cruz | 13702014V1 | 269 | 262 | 65 | 23 | 111 |
Angel Lopez | 13452014V1 | 247 | 290 | 136 | 43 | 99 |
Vicki Phelps | 13102014V1 | 218 | 222 | 87 | 29 | 65 |
Herbert Simmons | 13802014V1 | 207 | 218 | 89 | 27 | 71 |
Tyler Singleton | 13152014V1 | 215 | 229 | 80 | 27 | 70 |
Alfred Walton | 13652014V1 | 156 | 172 | 70 | 24 | 37 |
Abel Warner | 13202014V1 | 195 | 187 | 65 | 14 | 60 |

9 of 9 students stayed at/above benchmark
2 of 2 students reduced risk and are now on track
3 of 5 students had reduced risk
### BEGINNING OF YEAR
All pathways are based on the beginning-of-year composite score.

### END OF YEAR
Component score pathways are compared to other students with the same beginning-of-year composite scores.

To support overall reading proficiency, more growth is needed in a student's areas of relative weakness.

### END OF YEAR
Overall pathway is based on the student's end-of-year composite score compared to other students with the same beginning-of-year composite score.

- **Above Benchmark / Likely to Need Core Support**
- **At Benchmark / Likely to Need Core Support**
- **Below Benchmark / Likely to Need Strategic Support**
- **Well Below Benchmark / Likely to Need Intensive Support**

#### Rate of progress compared to students with similar initial skills:
- **WELL ABOVE TYPICAL**
- **ABOVE TYPICAL**
- **TYPICAL**
- **BELOW TYPICAL**
- **WELL BELOW TYPICAL**

---

#### Classroom Reading Progress Percentiles

In addition to providing a framework for evaluating the progress of individual students, Pathways of Progress™ also provides a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of instructional support at the classroom or school level.

- The percentage of students in each classroom that are making typical, above typical, or well above typical progress can be determined.

- **Generally Effective instructional support**: Evaluative framework based on the percent of students whose progress is typical, above typical, or well above typical.

---

#### Sample Classroom Reading Progress Percentiles Grade 1 (2017–2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Description (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: A different Classroom Reading Progress Percentile table is created for each grade level.

---

#### Classroom Reading Progress and DIBELS Next® SGR Descriptors

The percentage of students in each classroom that are making typical, above typical, or well above typical progress (based on their Pathway) can be determined and compared across a large sample of classrooms at the same grade level. This allows us to determine classroom reading progress percentiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>95th to 99th and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>78th to 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>25th to 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>5th to 24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>below 1st to 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

As a classroom system, 35% of students are making below or well-below typical progress (Pathways 1 and 2), but overall improvement from the middle of the year in fluent and accurate reading of connected text.
Note: A different Classroom Reading Progress Percentile table is created for each grade level.
So, Gaidos had 20 students in their classroom. 13 students (65%) made typical progress or better.

Hendon had 20 students in their kindergarten classroom. Only 9 students (45%) made typical progress or better.

The Gaidos classroom was at the 46th percentile of classroom reading progress. This means they did as well as or better than 46% of classrooms in the comparison group in supporting their students to make typical progress or better.

In contrast, Hendon’s classroom was at the 22th percentile of classroom reading progress. This means they did as well as or better than 22% of classrooms in the comparison group and 78% of classrooms did better in supporting their students to make typical progress or better.

The Gaidos classroom made Average Classroom Reading Progress compared to other kindergarten classrooms.

The Hendon classroom made Below Average Classroom Reading Progress compared to other kindergarten classrooms.
Reviewing Summative Growth Reports

We recommend educators use this information to identify strengths and targets of opportunity for grade levels and classrooms and to plan support for the following year.

Examine patterns within and across grades. Are there classrooms that are very different from others within a grade level? Consider:

- student-related issues (e.g., greater risk or other needs, degree of student transiency, absence rates)
- instructionally-related issues (e.g., amount of teaching experience at that grade level, instructional resources, use of effective instructional practices, choice of curriculum).

Identifying Strengths and Targets of Opportunity

Overall, third and fourth grade appear to be areas of strength.

Questions to Consider: Are there...
1. Differences in experience, curriculum, or approach?
2. Student differences or needs?
3. Differences in home and community support?
4. Are there targets of opportunity that are similar across classrooms?

I wonder what the Classroom Pathways of Progress report looks like for these classrooms.

Key Points about Summative Growth Reports

The Summative Growth Report provides an index of classroom-level growth that is:

1. Fair
   - Progress is compared to other students with the same initial skills

2. Accurate
   - Assess reading for meaning at an adequate rate and with a high degree of accuracy

3. Empowering
   - Inform meaningful, ambitious, and attainable goals to know what students need to achieve by when
Key Points about Summative Growth Reports

► The Summative Growth Report is designed to provide an additional piece of information to support effective instruction and enhance student learning growth.
► Evaluations of effectiveness can be used to develop district-, school-, grade-, and classroom-level improvement plans.
► Evaluation results can help inform professional development and other resource allocation decisions for instructional personnel and school administrators.

Summary: Evaluate Support at the Systems Level

The system is the context. An effective system of support is critical to effective implementation of Acadience Reading.
► Set system-wide goals for each grade level.
► Have a system-wide plan for providing support to meet student needs.
► If a large proportion of students are not making adequate progress, consider making a change in support at the systems level.

Acadience Reading Resources

Find resources on the DMG website
• https://acadiencelearning.org/
Contact DMG customer service at
• info@acadiencelearning.org
Data Management
• https://acadiencelearning.net