Update on Iowa Department of Education Reviews of Technical Adequacy for Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring Measures Validated for Use within a Response to Intervention (RtI) Framework

During the 2011-2012 school year, the lowa Department of Education completed extensive reviews of universal screening and progress monitoring tools in reading across grades K - 6. The primary goal of the reviews was to identify a valid and reliable universal screening tool and a progress monitoring tool that will be supported at the state level within a Response to Intervention (RtI) framework. A secondary goal was to share the results of all tools reviewed so that lowa's schools could understand which tools had sufficient evidence of technical adequacy to be considered valid for universal screening or progress monitoring in reading.

The list of tools reviewed was compiled from a survey sent to every elementary school building in Iowa in the spring 2011. The survey asked respondents to name the universal screening tools and progress monitoring tools currently being used in the building. The survey results reflect responses from 334 schools in 175 districts.

Tools were included for review if they were identified on the survey as being used by at least two schools. Many of these tools were reviewed as both universal screening tests and measures for progress monitoring; however, a number of tools were reviewed for just one purpose. Additional tools for review were added based on information from the National Center on Response to Intervention. Table A summarizes the universal screening tests reviewed, while Table B summarizes progress monitoring tools that were reviewed. *Presence of an assessment tool on this list does not represent an endorsement or judgment of the technical adequacy of the measure for universal screening or progress monitoring.*

The criteria that were applied to review each tool were developed with the assistance of national experts from the National Center on Response to Intervention. The review process included a vetting group and an assessment workgroup. The vetting group consisted of members from various educational stakeholder groups (Area Education Agencies, local schools, institutes of higher education, administrators, assessment experts, Department of Education consultants and administrators from all bureaus). The vetting group reviewed and informed the process of how to review the tests, and made recommendations on managing communication resulting from the reviews.

The assessment workgroup, a subset of the vetting group that consisted of experts in evaluation, research, measurement, core content, and assessment, also worked with the National Center on Response to Intervention to develop a rigorous review protocol. This workgroup contacted test publishers for information, conducted the reviews, and compiled results.

In July of 2012, the workgroup met with the vetting group to share preliminary results. The feedback from the vetting group was that the process used to conduct the reviews was sound and the work to

date was aligned with the task of the group. In the original planning, the next step was to share the results with the field in Summer of 2012. However, after consulting with the vetting group it was determined that additional work needs to be conducted before results can be released. It is now anticipated that the results will be shared with lowa's educators in the Fall or Winter of 2012.

The Department understands many schools and Area Education Agencies had anticipated learning the results of the reviews this summer to inform practice and plan for professional development. The Department encourages schools to continue to use existing screening and progress monitoring tools to make informed decisions to meet the needs of all students. Schools are also encouraged to proceed with caution if considering purchasing a universal screening or progress monitoring tool. It would seem prudent for schools to consider waiting until the results of this process are made public before investing in a new tool/system.

We look forward to sharing more information as we move into this school year.

If you have additional questions please contact Dr. Martin Ikeda, Chief, Bureau of Learner Strategies and Supports, at (515) 281-5735, marty.ikeda@iowa.gov

Tools identified as being used by at least 2	Tools added from National Center on Response t
schools listed by greatest frequency to	Intervention tools chart
least frequency	
DIBELS or DIBELS Next	Easy CBM
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI)	Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST
MAP/NWEA	Edcheckup
Fountas and Pinnell	
Phonological Awareness Test (PAT)	
Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)	
Iowa Assessments	
STAR Reading	
Marie Clay Observation Survey	
Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)	
AIMSWeb	
Other Curriculum-Based Measures (CBM)	
Gates McGinitie	
Qualitative Spelling Inventory (QSI)	
Ekwall/Shanker Reading Inventory	

Table B. List of Progress Monitoring Tools for Reading K-6 reviewed by the assessment workgroup convened by the Iowa Department of Education	
schools listed by greatest frequency to	Intervention tools chart
least frequency	
Other Curriculum-Based Measures	Easy CBM
DIBELS or DIBELS Next	Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST)
AIMSWeb	Ed Checkup
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI)	Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)
Marie Clay Observation Survey	
MAP/NWEA	
Phonological Awareness Test (PAT)	
Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)	
STAR Reading	
Fountas and Pinnell	
Accelerated Reader	
Gates McGinitie	
Qualitative Spelling Inventory (QSI)	