K-3 Universal Screening Sub-Committee Recommendations
Approved 9/17/20

Subcommittee Members

CHAIR: Alissa Heizler-Mendoza; **MEMBERS:** Fumiko Hoeft, Bryan Kimkiewicz; **CONSULTANT:** Alycia Trakash

General Charge of Task Force

Analyze and make recommendations on issues relating to the implementation of the laws governing dyslexia instruction and training in the state.

Specific Charges

1. Determine whether the Department of Education's "*Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments*" **meets the requirements** of Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) § 10-14t.

   a. Finding - Amend "*Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments*" to meet requirements of Conn. Gen. Stat. 10-14t. Based on C.G.S. Public Act 15-17 Section 10-14t "the Department of Education shall develop or approve reading assessments for use by local and regional boards of education for the school year commencing July 1, [2014] 2016, and each school year thereafter, to identify students in **kindergarten to grade three**… and reading assessments shall (1) measure **phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension** and (2) provide opportunities for **periodic formative assessment during the school year**…".

   After review of the [CSDE Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments (July 2019)](#) and other CSDE reports, the "*Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments*": (1) includes two assessments that meet all five of the General Outcome Measures (GOM) criteria listed in the statute; (2) does not include all grade levels for each area of assessment; and (3) Section 2 (Computer Adaptive Assessments [CAA]) of the approved menu does not meet criteria as a GOM but may be noted for historical purposes. The CSDE does recommend assessment three times a year consistent with periodic formative assessment during the school year.

   Related to Section 2, a CSDE document entitled "*Special Considerations for Dyslexia*" indicates one cannot exclusively use a screener from Section 2. In addition, an email dated 7/16 from Patricia Anderson Ph. D., Education Consultant, CSDE shared: "The assessments listed in Section 2 (Computer Adaptive Assessments) are NOT appropriate to be used as screening measures for SLD/Dyslexia since they concurrently measure a number of component reading skills in comparison to the other assessments that focus on assessing specific skill areas." Furthermore, only assessments in Section 1 are appropriate for use as screening tools to assist in identifying, in whole or in part, students at risk for Dyslexia or other reading-related learning disabilities.

   Recommend: (1) A menu (such as below) to replace Section 1 of the approved menu that is categorized by areas to be assessed consistent with the current statute and research, and incorporate grade levels to be assessed that follows current research. (2) Section 2 be placed elsewhere with a note that it does not meet current statute and is included for historical reasons, as the current menu that includes this section can lead to confusion when districts are selecting assessments. (3) Combine assessments when screening to meet statute and ensure all 5 GOM criteria are measured at appropriate grades outlined in the table below to assist in identifying, in whole or in part, students at risk for Dyslexia, or other reading-related

learning disabilities.

2. Make recommendations on whether the screening assessments listed are appropriate and **represent current research** on the science of reading and assessments.

    a. Finding - Amend "*Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments*" to incorporate recommendations that represent current research. Current research (see references below) indicates additional sub-components to be added, and grade level be modified to further assist and identify, in whole or in part, students at risk for dyslexia, or other reading-related learning disabilities.

    Additional measures* (based on current state of research):
- Family history upon entry to K in order to prioritize screening
- Rapid Naming
- Phonological short-term memory (non-word repetition)
- Listening comprehension
- Phonics to explicitly mention non-word reading and sight word reading to be assessed.
- Deletion and blending to be used for phonemic awareness instead of, or in addition to initial sound and phoneme segmentation

    *See appendix table

    b. Finding - Provide guidance to the districts regarding "*Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments*". Based on evaluation of current CSDE practices and communications, additional guidance may be added to provide direction to the districts.

3. Make recommendations on the components needed to **assist and identify**, in whole or in part, students at risk for dyslexia, or other reading-related learning disabilities.

    a. Finding - Amend Statute to incorporate recommendations regarding components needed to assist and identify students at risk for dyslexia (see above). Review of current evidence based research and CSDE current practices, additional components are recommended to assist and identify, in whole or in part, students at risk for dyslexia, or other reading-related learning disabilities.

4. Make recommendations on whether **reporting screening data** for all school districts would be beneficial.

    a. Finding - Consider academia partnership and future considerations regarding reporting screening data. Partnership will focus on data collection, analyses and provide guidance to the districts and CSDE related to reporting universal screening.

Amend Menu:

1. Appendix (such as below) to replace Section 1 of the approved menu that is categorized by areas to be assessed consistent with the current statute and research, and incorporate grade levels to be assessed that follows current research.

2. Section 2 be placed elsewhere with a note that it does not meet current statute and is included for historical reasons, as the current menu that includes this section can lead to confusion when districts are selecting assessments.

3. Combine assessments when screening to meet statute and ensure all 5 GOM criteria are measured at appropriate grades outlined in the table below to assist in identifying, in whole or in part, students at risk for Dyslexia, or other reading-related learning disabilities.

4. Include a footnote in the table that English Learners require additional testing in English and/or their native

language and thoughtful considerations.

Guidance to Districts:

1. Communicate amendments to the Approved Menu of Research-based Grades K–3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments to districts to ensure understanding and accountability.
2. Provide guidance utilizing a model listed in #1 future considerations below, (1) which assessment to be used based on the district's goals, student characteristics, and resources available; and (2) student characteristics and progress; and (3) how to use data to guide prevention / early intervention.

Amend statute (consider age/grade level):

1. Specify testing should be performed three times a year: fall, winter and spring vs. periodic testing.

2. Add: Family history upon entry to K as a first stage screener until assessments can begin consistent with the research.

3. May want to consider adding sub-categories of GOM consistent with the research.

4. Changes to be made or clarified to adequately screen students based on research.

    a. May add: Rapid naming (e.g. letters, numbers, objects, and/or colors)

    b. May add: Phonological short-term memory (non-word repetition)

    c. May add: Listening comprehension

    d. Add: Family history upon entry to K as a first stage screener until assessments can begin. e.

    Clarify: Phonics to explicitly mention non-word reading and sight word reading to be assessed.

    f. May change: Deletion and blending to be used for phonemic awareness instead of, or in addition to initial sound and phoneme segmentation

Future Considerations:*

1. Leverage state universities with existing infrastructure (e.g. UConn) to establish a data center to contract out data collection, analyses, and guidance to districts and the CSDE. This would be an optimal solution for the State, Districts and Families requiring significantly less funding and labor than building out a new team at the CsDE. Tasks to be performed include (1) Track which assessments are used in each district; (2) Track for each K to 3 student, non-identifiable individual level demographic information, district name, date of assessment, and scores; and (3) Analyze data to examine whether the screening-to-prevention pipeline is effective, and to provide input to the state; and (4) Guide and support school districts. See Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR] at Florida State University as a model.
2. Cost analysis with cost and reliability/validity information so that districts can adopt a combination of assessments that meet their needs and budget.
3. Make it a requirement for publishers to have assessments output student data in a particular format for easy import into a unified database to integrate state-wide data.
4. Assessment to be added or changed to adequately screen students.
    a. Add ADHD history and gender.
    b. Use expressive vocabulary over, or in addition to receptive vocabulary.
    c. Use the NAEP's recommended oral reading fluency metric.

     d. Use open-ended reading comprehension tests and compare with listening comprehension.

5. Publish criteria used for selection of measures together with reliability, validity and classification accuracy for EACH assessment separately whenever available in an Appendix.
6. Provide guidance to districts, resources for students after screening.
7. Provide more detailed resources and concrete guidance for English Learners.

*CSDE has concerns around capacity and cost for local school districts and state department. 9/17/20

Methodology

The members of the subcommittee reviewed the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) Public Act No. 15-97 Sec. 4. Section 10-14t. The CSDE shared the "Approved Menu of Research-based K-3 Universal Screening Reading Assessments" (July 2019) and the team analyzed the protocol standards and assessments based on the general outcome measures (GOMs). A comprehensive literature search was conducted to identify current evidence-based research related to reliability and validity of screeners, general outcome measures and other relevant components such as age, ADHD and family history. A presentation was given to the Task Force on June 18th with a follow-up feedback survey emailed to the Task Force members. The subcommittee received feedback which was reviewed and is reflective in the recommendations.

APPENDIX: Potential Revised Menu of Assessment

SKILLS TO BE ASSESSED	Print Concept — Letter Name Knowledge	Phonemic Awareness* — Initial Sound	Phonemic Awareness* — Phoneme Segmentation	Phonemic Awareness* — Blending, Deletion	Phonological Memory — Non-Word Repetition	Rapid Naming — Letters, Numbers, Objects &/or Color	Phonics* — Letter Sound Knowledge	Phonics* — Word Reading	Non-Word Decoding (Phonetic Decoding)	Fluency* — Word-Level	Fluency* — Sentence-Level	Oral Language — (Receptive) Vocabulary*	Oral Language — Listening Comprehension of Sentence	Reading Comprehension* — Cloze Test / Multiple Choice	Reading Comprehension* — Open-Ended	Others — Family History
GOM — aimswebPlus	Letter Naming Fluency (K)	Initial Sound (K)	Phoneme Segmentation (K-1)				Letter Words Sound Fluency (K-1)	Word Reading Fluency (K-1)		Word Reading Fluency (K-1)	Oral Reading Fluency (1-3)	Auditory Vocabulary (K-1), Vocabulary (2-3)		Reading Comprehension (2-3)		
GOM — DIBELS 6	Letter Naming Fluency (K-1)	Initial Sound Fluency (K) (not endorsed)	Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (K-1)						Nonsense Word Fluency (K-2)		Oral Reading Fluency (1-3)	Word Use Fluency (K-3) (optional, endorsed)			Retell Fluency (1-3) (not endorsed)	
GOM — DIBELS Next	Letter Naming Fluency (K-1)	First Sound Fluency (K)	Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (K-1)						Nonsense Word Fluency (K-2)		Oral Reading Fluency (1-3)			DAZE (3) (optional, endorsed)	Retell Fluency (1-3) (not endorsed)	
GOM — DIBELS 8	Letter Naming Fluency (K-1)		Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (K-1)					Word Reading Fluency (K-3)	Nonsense Word Fluency (K-3)	Word Reading Fluency (K-3)	Oral Reading Fluency (1-3)			MAZE (2-3)		
GOM — easyCBM	Letter Names (K-1)		Phoneme Segmenting (K-1)				Letter Sounds (K-1)	Word Reading Fluency (K-3)		Word Reading Fluency (K-2)	Passage Reading Fluency (1-3)	Vocabulary (2-3)		Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension (2-3)	Common Core State Standards Reading (3)	
TIMING TO BE ADMINISTERED — Grades K	x	(x)	(x)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x
Grades 1	x	(x)	(x)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Grades 2							x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Grades 3							x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

Notes

x indicates grades when tests should be administered (and light shaded areas not)

(x): Tests that can be used to substitute the lack of other Phonemic Awareness measures.

There are Spanish versions for easyCBM and DIBELS

Dark shaded areas indicate they are not available or available but not endorsed.

* Skills currently listed in the statue