

K-3 Reading Screener   
**APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF OTHER K-3 SCREENERS**

In accordance with Mississippi Code § 37-23-16, each local school district shall use screeners in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade. Screeners shall be locally selected and approved by the Mississippi Department of Education.

For the 2018-2019 school year, the following screeners have been approved for use:

* FAST: Adaptive Reading, CBMReading, and earlyReading English (three screeners administered as a suite)
* Istation Indicators of Progress (ISIP)
* Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Growth, Measures of Academic Progress
* i-Ready
* mCLASS Reading 3D
* STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading

#### **If planning to use a screener not listed above for the 2018-2019 school year,** districts must submit required minimum evidence of administration, content, and technical criteria as included in this application packet. Approval requests are due on or before **May 15, 2018,** for the 2018-2019 school year.

#### NOTE: Beginning in the Spring of 2019, the approval request must be submitted on or before April 15 to be considered for the upcoming school year.



K-3 Reading Screener   
**APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF OTHER K-3 SCREENERS**

#### **SECTION A**

#### DISTRICT INFORMATION

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School District** |  | **School Year** |  | | |
| **Contact Person** |  | **Contact Position** | | |  |
| **Contact E-mail** |  | **Contact Phone** | |  | |

#### SCREENER INFORMATION

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Screener Name** |  | | **Vendor** |  |
| **Link to view screener** | |  | | |

#### **SECTION B**

#### SELECTION OF A SCREENER NOT CURRENTLY APPROVED FOR LOCAL USE

If a school district is interested in using a screener that is not currently approved, the district   
must submit evidence demonstrating the minimum technical, administration, and content criteria outlined below to the Mississippi Department of Education at [screeners@mdek12.org](mailto:screeners@mdek12.org) on or before **May 15, 2018,**to be considered for use in the upcoming school year. Districts will be notified of approval on or before July 1. Once a screener has been approved for use in a single district, it will be approved for use in all districts.

Use the checklists below to determine if a screener being considered is likely to meet minimum criteria for consideration. **For each requirement, evidence must be provided.**

1. **K-3 Reading Screener Administration Criteria**

Screeners must be designed to be administered at least three times annually (beginning-of-year, middle-of-year, and end-of-year)

**Administration Criteria Evidence Provided** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):



1. **K-3 Reading Screener Content Criteria** – [International Dyslexia Association guidance](https://dyslexiaida.org/universal-screening-k-2-reading/)

**K-3:** alignment to Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards; focus in PK and K on foundational skills that lead to early reading success in grades 1 to 3

**Kindergarten:** phonological awareness, including phoneme segmentation and blending; letter naming fluency; letter-sound association; listening comprehension (recommended); vocabulary (recommended)

**1st Grade:** phoneme manipulation, segmentation, and blending; letter naming fluency; letter-sound association; phonological memory; vocabulary (recommended); word recognition fluency (accuracy and rate); oral reading fluency (accuracy and rate)

**2nd Grade:** word identification (real and nonsense words); oral reading fluency; reading comprehension; vocabulary (recommended)

**3rd Grade:** word identification; oral reading fluency; reading comprehension; vocabulary

**Content Criteria Evidence Provided** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):



1. **K-3 Reading Screener Technical Criteria** – based on the Center for Response to Intervention at American Institutes for Research [Screening Tools Chart Rating System](https://rti4success.org/resources/tools-charts/screening-tools-chart/screening-tools-chart-rating-system).

*(See the* ***K-3 Reading Screener Technical Criteria Rating System*** *on pages 4-6 to provide evidence needed in determining if the screener being considered meets appropriate technical criteria.)*

**Classification Accuracy:** partially convincing evidence *or* convincing evidence

**Generalizability:** moderate low, moderate high, *or* broad

**Reliability:** partially convincing evidence *or* convincing evidence

**Validity:** partially convincing evidence *or* convincing evidence

**Disaggregated Reliability, Validity, and Classification Data for Diverse Populations (recommended, but not required):** partially convincing evidence *or* convincing evidence

**K-3 Reading Screener Technical Criteria Rating System**

*Adapted from American Institutes for Research Center on Response to Intervention Screening Tools Chart Rating System*

The chart below includes questions related to screener technical criteria that must be addressed for a screener to be considered for approval.

**CLASSIFICATION ACCURACY**

The classification accuracy indicates the extent to which a screening tool is able to accurately classify students into “at risk for reading/math disability” and “not at risk for reading/math disability” categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical Standard 1: Classification Accuracy** | |
| **RATING** | **RATING DEFINED** |
| **Convincing Evidence** | Area Under the Curve (AUC) > 0.85 ***and*** All of Q1 – Q4 rated as YES |
| **Partially Convincing Evidence** | Area Under the Curve (AUC) > 0.85 ***and*** 1 of Q1 – Q4 rated as NO ***or*** 0.75 < Area Under the Curve (AUC) < 0.85 ***and*** 3 or more of Q1-Q4  rates as YES |

**Q1.** Was an appropriate external measure of reading (or math) used as an outcome?

**Q2.** Were the children in the study only involved in general classroom instruction (i.e., they were not involved in a specialized tutoring program)?

**Q3.** Was risk adequately defined within an RTI approach to screening (e.g., 20th %-tile)?

**Q4.** Were the classification analyses and cut-points adequately performed?

**Classification Accuracy Evidence Provided** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):



**GENERALIZABILITY**

Generalizability refers to the extent to which results generated from one population can be applied to another population. A tool is considered more generalizable if studies have been conducted on larger, more representative samples.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical Standard 2: Generalizability** | |
| **RATING** | **Rating defined** |
| **Broad** | Large representative national sample with cross-validation |
| **Moderate High** | Large representative national sample or multiple regional/state samples with no cross-validation ***or*** One or more regional/state samples with cross-validation |
| **Moderate Low** | One regional/state sample with no cross-validation,  ***or***  one or more local samples |

**Generalizability Evidence Provided** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):



**RELIABILITY**

Reliability refers to the consistency with which a tool classifies students from one administration to the next. A tool is considered reliable if it produces the same results when administering the test under different conditions, at different times, or using different forms of the test.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical Standard 3: Reliability** | |
| **RATING** | **RATING DEFINED** |
| **Full Bubble**: Convincing evidence | The type of reliability reported is appropriate given the purpose of the tool            and 2 or more of Q1-Q4 rated as YES |
| **Half Bubble**: Partially convincing evidence | The type of reliability reported is appropriate given the purpose of the tool           and 1 of Q1-Q4 rated as YES |

**Q1.** Was convincing split-half reliability evidence (if appropriate) presented (greater than .8)?

**Q2.** Was convincing coefficient alpha reliability evidence (if appropriate) presented (greater than .8)?

**Q3.** Was convincing test-retest reliability (including alternate form) evidence (if appropriate) presented (greater than .8)?

**Q4.** Was convincing inter-rater reliability evidence (if appropriate) presented (greater   
than .8)?

**Reliability Evidence Provided** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):



**VALIDITY**

Validity refers to the extent to which a tool accurately measures the underlying construct that it is intended to measure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical Standard 4: Validity** | |
| **RATING** | **RATING DEFINED** |
| **Full Bubble**: Convincing evidence | All of Q1 – Q3 rated as Yes |
| **Half Bubble**:  Partially convincing evidence | 1 of Q1 – Q3 rated as NO |

**Q1.** Was convincing evidence supporting content validity presented?  
**Q2.** Was convincing construct validity presented (correlations above .70)?  
**Q3.** Was convincing predictive validity presented (correlations above .70)?  
  
**Validity Evidence Provided** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):



**D****ISAGGREGATED RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND CLASSIFICATION DATA FOR DIVERSE POPULATIONS**

Data are disaggregated when they are calculated and reported separately for specific   
sub-groups.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Technical Standard 5: Disaggregated Reliability, Validity, and Classification Data for Diverse Populations** | |
| **RATING** | **RATING DEFINED** |
| **Full Bubble**:  Convincing evidence | At least two of the three types of data (classification, reliability, and validity) are disaggregated for at least 1 group AND meet the criteria for convincing or partially convincing. |
| **Half Bubble**:  Partially convincing evidence | One of the three types of data is disaggregated for at least 1 group AND meets the criteria for convincing or partially convincing. |

**Disaggregated Reliability, Validity, and Classification Data for Diverse Populations** **Evidence Provided (recommended, but not required)** (include links or attach PDF documents as needed):