

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 Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd Grade. Screeners shall be locally selected and approved by the Mississippi Department of Education.

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,** districts must submit required minimum evidence of administration, content, and technical criteria as included in this application packet. 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 **April 15th**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 (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):