



Dyslexia Screening and the use of Acadience Reading K–6

Dyslexia is a learning disorder characterized by significant difficulty with skills involved in accurate and fluent reading and spelling. While there is no single definition of dyslexia that is used universally, educators, researchers, and policy makers generally agree that the defining characteristic of dyslexia is a severe deficit in word reading. There is also general agreement that, to be diagnosed with dyslexia, children must have adequate vision and hearing acuity along with adequate cognitive skills to be able to learn to read (Elliott, 2020; International Dyslexia Association, 2002).

Increasingly, experts in the field of reading research point to multifactorial models of dyslexia, wherein risk factors interact with protective factors and the risk of dyslexia is increased or reduced (Catts & Petscher, 2018; Pennington et al., 2012). There is, in fact, evidence to suggest that risk for dyslexia may be reduced through early identification and intervention on the essential early literacy and reading skills (e.g., Foorman & Torgesen, 2001; O'Connor et al., 2005). In prevention models, effective instruction of essential skills becomes a critical protective factor.

Consistent with the definition of the International Dyslexia Association and current research within a prevention-oriented framework, dyslexia, then, is a significant and persistent difficulty with the skills involved in accurate and fluent reading despite having adequate cognitive and perceptual skills and access to effective reading instruction.

## Indicators and Features of Dyslexia

According to most definitions of and research on dyslexia, the core difficulties exhibited by individuals with dyslexia are word recognition and spelling (Catts & Hogan, 2021; Elliott, 2020; Wagner et al., 2019). Within a prevention-oriented framework, the impact that dyslexia has on readers is variable depending on the severity of the reading disability and the effectiveness of instruction or intervention received.

## Thus, the manifestation of dyslexia as a reading disability results from a combination of:

- (1) difficulty with the essential early literacy and reading skills involved in accurate and fluent word reading and
- (2) a sustained lack of adequate progress in learning the essential early literacy and reading skills
- (3) when provided with generally effective instruction

Essential early literacy and reading skills include phonological processing and phonemic awareness, phonics skills and understanding of the alphabetic principle, word reading and decoding, accuracy and fluency in reading connected text, and comprehension. Other factors associated with risk for dyslexia include difficulties with word retrieval as assessed by measures of Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN), spelling, oral language, and/or a family history of reading difficulties (e.g., Carroll et al., 2014; Catts et al., 2005; Norton, 2020).

It is important to note that the essential early literacy and reading skills, and the associated risk factors, are developmental in nature. That is, earlier skills provide a foundation for later skills which build on and integrate over time as students master them. For example, prior to formal reading instruction, early alphabetic knowledge, specifically fluency in naming letters, is exceptionally predictive of later reading difficulties along with early phonological awareness skills such as rhyming or identifying initial sounds in words. Through the kindergarten and first grade years, phonemic awareness remains predictive and alphabetic knowledge moves beyond letter naming to basic phonics skills and an understanding of the alphabetic principle. By the end of first grade and beginning of second grade, accuracy and fluency in reading connected text becomes a strong predictor and remains a robust predictor throughout the school years.

Difficulties in acquiring the essential early literacy and reading skills contribute to, or directly result in, a number of negative consequences including academic failure and poor overall school performance and social-emotional and behavioral problems (Daniel et al., 2006; McArthur et al., 2020). Thus, it is critical to identify students at risk for reading disabilities, including dyslexia, as early as possible.

# Importance of Early and Periodic Screening

## **Screen Early**

Within a prevention-oriented model, we conduct screening early and periodically. We screen early so that we can intervene early, when we have the greatest likelihood of preventing future difficulties and before reading problems become a greater challenge for intervention efforts.

## **Screen Periodically**

We conduct screening periodically across the school year because of the developmental nature of the acquisition of essential early literacy and reading skills. Periodic screening throughout the school year, not just at a single time point, enables us to check on the progress of students' acquisition of the critical skills over time. Periodic screening also allows us to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional supports that are being provided both for individual students and at a systems level (e.g., school, district).

Our definition of dyslexia implies that screening for a reading disability, including dyslexia, occurs within a prevention-oriented, early intervention model.

#### We must:

- identify students at risk for reading disabilities early
- o provide instructional support targeted to individual student needs
- monitor student progress and response to instruction over time
- make adjustments to instruction as needed to ensure adequate progress toward important early literacy and reading goals
- and evaluate outcomes for individual students and at a systems level

## Focus on essential early literacy and reading skills

Screening practices, therefore, should be focused on essential early literacy and reading skills phonemic awareness and phonics, word reading and decoding, accurate and fluent reading of connected text, and comprehension—and should be conducted across the school year. Because a key indicator of dyslexia is significant and sustained difficulty in acquiring essential early literacy and reading skills despite being provided generally effective instruction, it's not enough to assess the student's skills, we must also evaluate the instruction the student is receiving.

## **Overview: Acadience Reading Assessments for Dyslexia Screening**

It is important to keep in mind that using a single test to make important, high-stakes decisions like the diagnosis of dyslexia is inconsistent with professional standards (AERA et al., 2014). With that in mind, Acadience Reading assessment suite provides a reliable, valid, and efficient method of identifying students who are at risk for reading difficulties, including dyslexia.

Acadience Reading K–6 provides quick and efficient assessments of the essential early literacy and reading skills from kindergarten through sixth grade. The Acadience Reading K–6 assessment includes a series of brief measures designed to be administered for periodic screening three times a year (beginning, middle, end) as well as for more frequent progress monitoring of students identified as at risk and needing additional instructional support. In addition, Acadience Reading Survey and Diagnostic assessments can be used to provide specific information to inform instruction for individual students as needed. There are several important features of Acadience Reading K–6 measures that make them useful tools for identifying students at risk of dyslexia and other reading disabilities.

#### These features are described below.



## Assessment of essential early literacy and reading skills

The first important feature of Acadience Reading K–6 that makes it useful for identifying students at risk for dyslexia is that Acadience Reading K–6 measures assess the essential early literacy and reading skills, that is, those skills that are known as the core component or foundational skills of reading. These skills include (a) phonemic awareness (i.e., the ability to hear and manipulate the individual sounds in words); (b) basic phonics and an understanding of the alphabetic principle that enables children to map print (letters) to speech (individual sounds) and blend those letter sounds to read words; (c) accuracy and fluency in reading connected text, and (d) comprehension. Measures of Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) and Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN) are included for students in grades K and 1 as additional indicators of risk.

## Measures as indicators

Another important feature of the measures is that they are, by design, indicators of each of the essential early literacy and reading skills. For example, Acadience Reading K–6 does not assess all possible basic phonics skills that are important to teach. Instead, the Acadience Reading measure of basic phonics, Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF), is designed to be an indicator of a student's progress toward the long-term outcome of having automaticity in applying knowledge of basic letter-sound correspondences to reading unknown words. The notion of Acadience Reading measures as indicators is a critical one. It is this feature that puts it in the class of assessments known as General Outcome Measures (more popularly known as CBMs) (Fuchs & Deno, 1991).

Table 1. Acadience Reading K-6 Measures and Skill/Risk Areas

Measure Type	Grades	Essential Early Literacy/Reading Skill	Description
First Sound Fluency	К	Phonemic awareness	Assessor says a word; student says the first sound in the word test a third line
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	K, 1	Phonemic awareness	Assessor says a word; student says the sounds in the word test a third line
Nonsense Word Fluency	K, 1, 2	Basic phonics and alphabetic principle	Student reads V-C and C-V-C nonsense words
Oral Reading Fluency	1-6	Accuracy and fluency with connected text, advanced phonics, comprehension	Student reads a passage orally and tells about what was read
Maze	3-6	Reading comprehension	Student reads a passage silently, selecting the correct word of three throughout the passage
Letter Naming Fluency	K, 1	Indicator of risk	Student names letters arrayed on a page
Rapid Automatized Naming	K, 1	Indicator of risk	Student names an array of objects, letters, and/or numbers

Note that some of the Acadience Reading K–6 measures are indicators of essential early literacy and reading skills, and others are added indicators of risk.

### The essential early literacy and reading skills are those that have evidence that they:

- (a) are predictive of reading acquisition and reading achievement
- (b) can be taught
- (c) and result in improved reading outcomes when they are taught and learned

In contrast, LNF and RAN are included in Acadience Reading K–6 as indicators of risk, not as instructional targets. For young students, fluency in letter naming is one of the strongest and best predictors of later reading ability (Adams, 1990; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008; Piasta et al., 2012). LNF is used in identifying students who may need additional support but is not used as an instructional goal. While letter naming remains a robust predictor of later reading ability, it is letter sound knowledge paired with phonemic awareness that unlocks the key to the code—the alphabetic principle.

Similarly, while RAN serves as a predictor of risk for reading difficulties and dyslexia, most researchers agree that providing students with instruction on a RAN task is not the optimal way to improve their word reading skill (Norton & Wolf, 2012).

# Research-based benchmarks and cut points for risk

Acadience Reading benchmarks and cut points for risk provide research-based levels of performance that can be used to predict risk of reading difficulties as students are acquiring early literacy skills in the early grades and to identify existing reading difficulties in later grades. Acadience Reading benchmarks are based on the predictive probability of a student achieving subsequent benchmarks and reading goals given a particular score on a measure and a point in time. Accordingly, a student's performance on a measure at any point in time at any grade level may be Above, At, Below, or Well Below Benchmark as depicted in *Table 2*. More information on Acadience Reading benchmarks is available at acadiencelearning.org/acadience-reading/k-grade6.

Table 2. Benchmark Levels and Descriptors

Likelihood of Meeting Later Reading Benchmarks		Benchmark Status	Benchmark Status Including Above Benchmark	What it Means
	>99% 95% 90%	At or Above Benchmark Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: 80% to 90%	Above Benchmark Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: 90% to 99%	For students with scores in this range, the odds of achieving subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks are very good. The higher above the benchmark, the better the odds. These students likely need effective core instruction to meet subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks. Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.
	80% 70%		At Benchmark Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: 70% to 85%	For students with scores in this range, the odds are in favor of achieving subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks. The higher above the benchmark, the better the odds. These students likely need effective core instruction to meet subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks. Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on specific component skills as needed.
	60% 55% 50% 45% 40%	<b>Below Benchmark</b> Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: <b>40% to 60%</b>	Below Benchmark Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: 40% to 60%	For students with scores in this range, the overall odds of achieving subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks are approximately even, and hard to predict. Within this range, the closer students' scores are to the benchmark, the better the odds; the closer students' scores are to the cut point, the lower the odds. These students likely need core instruction coupled with strategic support, targeted to their individual needs, to meet subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks. For some students whose scores are close to the benchmark, effective core instruction may be sufficient; students whose scores are close to the cut point may require more intensive support.
	30% 20% 10% <5	Well Below Benchmark Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: 10% to 20%	Well Below Benchmark Overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy benchmarks: 10% to 20%	For students with scores in this range, the overall odds of achieving subsequent early literacy/reading benchmarks are low. These students likely need intensive support in addition to effective core instruction, They may also need support on prerequisite skills (i.e., below grade level) depending upon the grade level and how far below the benchmark their skills are.



Finally, Acadience Reading K–6 provides a normative framework for setting individual student goals and evaluating student progress through Pathways of Progress. Pathways of Progress allows for a comparison of each student's progress to other students who started with the same level of skill. A student's progress can then be evaluated as Typical, Above Typical, Well Above Typical, Below Typical, or Well Below Typical when compared to other students with the same starting level of skill.

*Figure 1* illustrates Pathways of Progress for end-of-third-grade Acadience Reading Composite Scores for each level of initial skills based on beginning-of-year composite scores.

More information on Pathways of Progress is available at <u>acadiencelearning.org/resources/</u> pathways-of-progress



Figure 1. Pathways of Progress for Third Grade End-of-Year Acadience Reading Composite Score

# Acadience Reading within an Outcomes-Driven Model

Acadience Learning assessments were developed to provide educators with information they need to make meaningful educational decisions to prevent reading failure and improve reading outcomes for all students. The Outcomes-Driven Model is a data-based decision-making model that can be used to guide these decisions within a comprehensive, school-wide system of literacy support, such as a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS).

The Outcomes-Driven Model is based on foundational work with a problem-solving model (see Deno, 1989; Shinn, 1995) but was developed to be used within a prevention-oriented framework designed to preempt early academic difficulty and ensure step-by-step adequate progress toward outcomes that will result in established, adequate achievement (Kaminski & Good, 1998). The Outcomes-Driven Model is iterative, that is, it is a repeated process that is done to build, refine, and improve the instructional supports provided to students leading to improved outcomes. Each step is described below and illustrated in *Figure 2*.

#### Step 1

## Identify need for support

This process is also known as universal screening. Its purpose is to identify those students who may need additional instructional support to achieve subsequent benchmarks and important early literacy/reading goals. In the Outcomes-Driven Model, benchmark assessment is done with all students in a school three times a year, at beginning, middle, and end of the year.

Step 2

#### Validate need for support

Before making individual student decisions, it is best practice to consider the student data obtained during benchmark assessment in light of other available assessment information and knowledge about the student. If there is any question about the accuracy of a student's score, the step of validating need for support is done to be reasonably confident that an individual student needs or does not need additional instructional support.



#### Step 3

## Plan and implement support

Students benefit from instruction when instruction is matched to their learning needs. Within an effective MTSS approach, differentiated levels of instructional support are provided to students based on their demonstrated need. Students identified as on track for reading development are likely to benefit from evidence-based core instruction to meet their needs. Students who are identified as needing support are likely to require additional instruction or intervention in the skill areas where they are having difficulties.

#### Step 4

### Evaluate and modify support

Progress monitoring assessments provide systematic and ongoing data collection to indicate whether the instructional support being provided at any tier of instruction is effective and/ or if further modifications need to be made to address individual learning needs. Progress monitoring within an MTSS approach may occur as frequently as every 4 weeks at Tier 2, and weekly at Tier 3.

#### Step 5

## **Review outcomes**

Benchmark assessments conducted at the middle and end of the school year provide an opportunity to review outcomes and ensure adequate progress for each individual student and for all students in the school-wide system.

## Use of Acadience Reading to Identify Students At Risk for Dyslexia

As previously described, the manifestation of dyslexia as a reading disability results from a combination of **(1)** difficulty with the essential early literacy and reading skills involved in accurate and fluent word reading and **(2)** a sustained lack of adequate progress in learning the essential early literacy and reading skills **(3)** when provided with generally effective instruction.

This section provides an overview and illustration of the use of Acadience Reading data for each of the steps in assessing risk for dyslexia in a prevention-oriented model: 1) identify students who are demonstrating difficulty with essential early literacy and reading skills, 2) monitor progress of students in learning the skills and assess the adequacy of that progress, and 3) evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional support system. An appendix to this document provides a Dyslexia Screening Worksheet that corresponds to each of these steps.

## Identify Difficulty with Essential Early Literacy and Reading Skills

In the first two steps of the Outcomes-Driven Model, we identify and validate need for support both for individual students and at the systems level. For classroom teachers, reviewing data at the classroom level is an efficient way to identify students at risk for dyslexia and to target instruction to reduce risk and prevent reading failure. For example, in *Figure* 3, we see that the first two students listed (Otis and Evelyn) both have scores well below the benchmark (i.e., below the cut point for risk) on Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF) and NWF, indicating substantial difficulty with phonemic awareness, the alphabetic principle and basic phonics. These students are likely to need intensive support to make adequate progress toward attaining essential early literacy skills. In general, students who have scores below the cut point who also have low scores in LNF or RAN are at increased risk for later reading disabilities.



Figure 3. Classroom Report

At the systems level, if there is a large proportion of students identified as needing additional/ different instructional support, that is an indication that the need may need to be addressed at the systems level, for example, by strengthening the core of Tier 1 support. It is critical for students with dyslexia or who are at risk for dyslexia to master the same early literacy skills as students without reading difficulty, especially the phonological and alphabetic processes that provide the keys to the code (Seidenberg, 2017). A highquality core curriculum (Tier 1) serves as the foundation for a continuum of supports and interventions that increase in intensity based on demonstrated need (Tiers 2 and 3) (Al Otaiba et al., 2019).

## Assessment information for planning instruction

A core principle of MTSS models of service delivery is that all students can learn and achieve reading goals when they are provided with high-quality instructional support to match their needs (e.g., Deno, 2016; Stoiber & Gettinger, 2016). This has been shown to be true of students at risk for reading disabilities and dyslexia (e.g., Foorman & Torgesen, 2001; O'Connor et al., 2005). In fact, as stated by Catts and Petscher (2021), "The most notable factor that can have a positive impact on risk for dyslexia is instruction" (p. 15). Not all students who are at risk for reading difficulties, including dyslexia, have the same instructional needs, and they may receive

instructional support within any tier of instruction. Acadience Reading benchmark data provides useful information for targeting skill areas and placement into Tiers of support for all students. Acadience Reading Survey and Diagnostic assessments provide more in-depth assessment data for students for whom more specific information is needed for instructional planning. Acadience Reading Survey and Diagnostic assessments are especially useful for those students demonstrating significant and persistent difficulties with the essential early literacy and reading skills in the face of effective instruction.



# **Evaluate Adequacy of Student Progress**

The step of assessing the adequacy of a student's progress corresponds to Step 4 of the Outcomes-Driven Model and is at the heart of improving outcomes for students. Ongoing progress monitoring, both through periodic benchmark assessment and more frequent progress monitoring of individual students, provides data to identify students who are not making adequate progress in whatever tier of instruction they are receiving. It also allows us to determine whether the instructional support being provided at any tier of instruction is effective and/or if modifications need to be made to address individual learning needs or to strengthen the overall system of support for all students.

## Setting student learning goals

A critical part of examining student progress is setting student learning goals. For students who have scores below or well below the benchmark, benchmarks may be used as goals. For those students with scores below or well below the benchmark, reaching the benchmark will decrease their risk of reading disabilities and increase their likelihood of meeting future reading goals. Acadience Pathways of Progress provides a normative framework for individual goal setting. For example, it may not be attainable for students in later grades with very low early literacy/reading skills, to reach the grade level benchmark. Thus, we recommend considering both the Acadience Reading benchmarks and Acadience Pathways of Progress to select individual student learning goals that are meaningful, ambitious, and attainable. Information about Acadience Pathways of Progress is available at acadiencelearning.org/resources/pathways-of-progress. Setting student learning goals provides a framework for evaluating student progress that specifies where students are, where they need to get to, and what path they need to follow to get there.

## Ongoing progress monitoring

Ongoing and frequent progress monitoring provides checkups on students' progress toward their goals in time to make a change in instruction. We can determine not only if students are not making progress toward goals, but how severe the lack of progress is by examining the data relative to Acadience Pathways of Progress. Figure 4 shows Evelyn's student learning goal for basic phonics skills and the alphabetic principle as measured by NWF Correct Letter Sounds. Evelyn's goal is set just above the benchmark. The Pathways are designated by the lines that fan out from the beginning of year to the end of year. For Evelyn to attain her goal, she will need to make Above Typical progress compared to other students who began with the same initial level of skills. In reviewing Evelyn's ongoing progress monitoring data, we see that she is making Well Below Typical progress, even with changes to instruction to meet her needs.



**Note:** Dashed vertical lines indicate changes to instructional support.

If a student's low skills are followed by sustained lack of adequate progress in spite of instruction that has been generally effective with other students who have similarly low initial scores, the student is experiencing significant difficulty learning to read as associated with dyslexia or other reading disabilities. Thus, it is important to also examine the effectiveness of the instruction that Evelyn is receiving.



# **Examine Instructional Effectiveness**

A lack of adequate progress is an indication of risk for dyslexia when the student has been provided with generally effective instruction. Consequently, one of the most important supports that we can provide to students with dyslexia or students who are at risk for dyslexia is an effective school-wide system of support. The school-wide system includes both the core instruction provided to all students, as well as the different levels of intervention based on individual learning needs that is provided to students who are at risk for or are experiencing reading difficulties.

Ensuring an effective multi-tiered system of support for students with dyslexia or students who are at risk for dyslexia is important for meeting their individual student learning needs. Acadience Reading provides information about the effectiveness of the school-wide system, including core instruction (Tier 1), supplemental support (Tier 2), and intensive intervention (Tier 3). Acadience data also provides evidence of instructional effectiveness at various levels beyond the individual student level including: (a) the intervention group in which the student is receiving instructional support; (b) the classroom; (c) the grade level at the school; and (d) the grade level at the district.

## Grade within School/District

Intervention programs are most effective in the context of effective core instruction, so evaluating the system of instruction begins with examining the effectiveness of core instruction at each grade level. We do this by examining the proportion of students with scores at or above, below, or well below the benchmark at each time period (beginning, middle, and end of the year). If the majority of students within a grade level score Below or Well Below Benchmark, they may be having difficulty due to a lack of effective core instruction rather than dyslexia.

We can further evaluate the effectiveness of our instructional support across core, strategic and intensive systems by examining the change in student benchmark status from either beginningof-year to middle-of-year, or from middle-of-year to end-of-year. Core systems of support are considered effective when 95% or more of students who began the year At Benchmark have scores At or Above Benchmark at middle-of-year. Strategic and Intensive systems of support are considered effective when they reduce student risk for 80% or more students. For students in the strategic support group, reducing risk means moving students from strategic to benchmark. For students in the intensive support group, reducing risk means moving from intensive to either strategic or to benchmark.

## Classroom

At the classroom level, Acadience Reading progress data can be summarized by documenting the proportion of students in the classroom making Typical progress or above. This classroom level data is interpreted using a normative comparison of all other classrooms in the Acadience Reading data management system. For example, a classroom in which 85% of students are making Typical progress or better demonstrates above average classroom reading progress compared to other classrooms. These data provide strong evidence of generally effective instruction.

## Intervention Group

Acadience data also allow educators to examine the effectiveness of the specific intervention in which the student participates. This is important because it is the level of analysis that is most proximal to the student. When examining the progress of students in Evelyn's intervention group, we see that all of them are making progress except for Evelyn (see *Figure* 5), providing strong evidence that the group is generally effective for students with similar initial instructional needs.





Across the various system levels of analysis, when there is strong to moderate evidence of generally effective instruction, but the student is experiencing sustained and serious learning difficulties, this strengthens the evidence that the difficulty is not due to poor quality instruction or the lack of instruction, and it strengthens the concern about dyslexia or severe reading disability. If one cannot show evidence of generally effective instruction, then it is hard to argue that the student's difficulties are due to dyslexia or other reading disabilities.

## Summary

All students should be provided with good, systematic, explicit core instruction. Any student identified as at risk for dyslexia or other reading difficulties should also be placed immediately into an appropriate evidence-based intervention that is matched to their specific areas of need. From there, it is imperative to monitor progress, modify instruction at a formative level as needed, and provide ongoing feedback to teachers and parents. When students continue to struggle with literacy skills despite receiving additional high-quality, systematic, explicit instruction, further assessment may be warranted.

It is important to note that tests do not diagnose dyslexia but are tools used in a process that informs a diagnosis. Most often, the process involves individual assessment provided by a multidisciplinary team of qualified professionals (see International Dyslexia Association, 2017). This multidisciplinary team may elect to obtain additional assessment information for selected students who continue to struggle with literacy skills to help determine whether they have dyslexia.



For additional information visit our website at <u>www.acadiencelearning.org</u> or email us at info@acadiencelearning.org

## References

Adams, M. J. (1990). Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning about print. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: AERA Publications.

Al Otaiba, S., Allor, J. H., Baker, K., Conner, C., Stewart, J., & Mellado de la Cruz, V. (2019). Teaching phonemic awareness and word reading skills: Focusing on explicit and systematic approaches. Perspectives on Language and Literacy, 45(3), 11-16.

Carroll, J. M., Mundy, I. R., & Cunningham, A. J. (2014). The roles of family history of dyslexia, language, speech production and phonological processing in predicting literacy progress. Developmental Science, 17, 727–742. doi: 10.1111/desc.12153.

Catts, H. W., Adlof, S. M., Hogan, R., & Weismer, S.E. (2005). Are specific language impairment and dyslexia distinct disorders? Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 48(6), 1378–1396. doi: 1044/1092-4388(2005/096).

Catts H. W., & Hogan T. (2021). Dyslexia: An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of diagnosis. The Reading League Journal, 2, 6–13. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/nvgje

Catts, H. W., & Petscher, Y. (2021). A cumulative risk and resilience model of dyslexia. Journal of Learning Disabilities, https://doi. org/10.1177/00222194211037062

Daniel, S. S., Walsh, A. K., Goldston, D.B., Arnold, E.M., Reboussin, B. A., & Wood, F. B. (2006). Suicidality, school dropout, and reading problems among adolescents. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39(6), 507–514.

Deno, S.L. (1989). Curriculum-based measurement and special education services: A fundamental and direct relationship. In M. R. Shinn (Ed.) Curriculum-based measurement: Assessing special children. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Deno, S. (2016). Data-based decision making. In S. Jimerson, M. Burns, & A. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), Handbook of Response to Intervention: The science and practice of mulit-tiered systems of support (pp. 9–28). New York, NY: Springer.

Elliott, J.G. (2020). It's time to be scientific about dyslexia. Reading Research Quarterly, 55(1), 61-75. doi: 10.1002/rrq.333.

Foorman, B. R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical elements of classroom and small-group instruction promote reading success in all children. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 16(4), 203–212.

Fuchs, L. S., & Deno, S.L. (1991) Paradigmatic distinctions between instructionally relevant measurement models. Exceptional Children, 57, 488–500

International Dyslexia Association (2002). Definition of dyslexia. https://dyslexiaida.org/definition-of-dyslexia/

Kaminski, R. A., & Good, R. H. (1998). Assessing early literacy skills in a problem-solving model. In M.R. Shinn (Ed.) Advanced applications of curriculum-based measurement. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

McArthur, G. M., Filardi, N., Francis, D. A., Boyes, M. E., & Badcock, N. A. (2020). Self concept in poor readers: A systematic review and metaanalysis. PeerJ 8:e8772 http://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8772

National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). Developing early literacy. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy.

Norton E. (2020). What educators need to know about Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN). Learning Difficulties Australia Bulletin, 52(1), 25-28

Norton, E. S., & Wolf, M. (2012). Rapid automatized naming (RAN) and reading fluency: Implications for understanding and treatment of reading disabilities. Annual Review of Psychology, 63, 427–452. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-1207-100431

O'Connor, R. E., Harty, K. R., & Fulmer, D. (2005). Tiers of intervention in kindergarten through third grade. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38(6), 532–538

Pennington, B. F., Santerre-Lemmon, L., Rosenberg, J., MacDonald, B., Boada, R., Friend, A., Leopold, D., Samuelsson, S., Byrne, B., Willcutt, E.G., & Olson, R. K. (2012). Individual prediction of dyslexia by single vs. multiple deficit models. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 121(1), 212–224. doi: 10.1037/a002582c

Piasta, S. B., Petscher, Y., & Justice, L.M. (2012). How many letters should preschoolers in public progams know? The diagnostic efficiency of various preschool letter-naming benchmarks for predicting first-grade literacy achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(4), 945–958.

Seidenberg, M. (2017). Language at the speed of sight: How we read, why so many can't, and what can be done about it. Basic Books.

Shinn, M. (1995). Best practices in curriculum-based measurement and its use in a problem-solving model. In J. Grimes & A. Thomas (Eds.), Best practices in school psychology (Vol. 3, pp. 547–568). Silver Spring, MD:

National Association of School Psychologists.

Stoiber, K.C., & Gettinger, M. (2016). Multi-tiered systems of support and evidence-based practices. In S. Jimerson, M. Burns, & A. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), Handbook of Response to Intervention: The science and practice of mulit-tiered systems of support (pp. 121–142). New York, NY: Springer.

Wagner, R. K., Edwards, A. A., Malkowski, A., Schatschneider, C., Joyner, R.E., Wood, S., & Zirps, F.A. (2019). Combining old and new for better understanding and predicting dyslexia. New Directions in Child Adolescent Development, 165, 11–23.

Appendix

# Dyslexia Screening Worksheet



# Dyslexia Screening Worksheet

© Acadience Learning Inc. / March 29, 2021

Student Name: \_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date of Completion: \_\_\_\_\_ Person Completing & Role: \_

#### Definitive indicators of risk for dyslexia and other reading difficulties include a combination of information from the following three areas:

1. Difficulty with essential early literacy and reading skills on measures of reading comprehension, accurate and fluent reading, word reading and decoding, and especially phonological processing including phonemic awareness and phonics, and ...

(	Evidence of <b>severe</b> difficulty	Evidence of <b>some</b> difficulty	No evidence of difficulty	Not applicable	Essential early literacy and reading skill
					Phonemic Awareness
					Phonics and Alphabetic Principle
					Word reading and decoding accuracy
					Fluent Reading
					Reading Comprehension

2. Sustained lack of adequate progress in learning the essential early literacy and reading skills, ...

Evidence of <b>severe</b> lack of adequate progress	Evidence of <b>some</b> lack of adequate progress	No evidence of lack of adequate progress	Not applicable	Lack of adequate progress in an essential early literacy and reading skill
				Phonemic Awareness
				Phonics and Alphabetic Principle
				Word reading and decoding accuracy
				Fluent Reading
				Reading Comprehension

#### 3. When provided with generally effective classroom instruction.

Strong evidence of generally effective instruction	Moderate evidence of generally effective instruction	No evidence of generally effective instruction	Not applicable	Generally effective instruction on essential early literacy and reading skills
				The intervention group is generally effective for students with similar instructional needs
				The classroom is generally effective in supporting adequate progress
				The grade level has generally effective core support
				The grade level has generally effective strategic support
				The grade level has generally effective intensive support
				The school is generally effective in improving outcomes

#### Other indicators of risk:

Evidence of substantial difficulty	Evidence of <b>some</b> difficulty	No evidence of difficulty	Not applicable	Risk Indicator
				Rapid Automatized Naming (RAN)
				Spelling
				Family history of reading difficulty