

Drake University

EDDL295

Reading Assessment and Diagnosis: Instructional Interventions

Credit Hours: 3

Instructional Resources

Textbooks

Barr, R., Blachowicz, C., Bates, A., Katz, C., & Kaufman, R. (2007). *Reading diagnosis for teachers: An instructional approach* (5th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Leslie, L., & Caldwell, J. (2006). *Qualitative rReading inventory-4*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Caldwell, J., & Leslie, L. (2005). *Intervention strategies to follow informal reading inventory assessment: so what do I do now?* Boston: Pearson Education.

Recommended Resources

Frank, C., Grossi, J., & Stanfield, D. (2006). *Applications of reading strategies within the Classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gunning, T. (2006). *Assessing and correcting reading and writing difficulties*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johns, J., & Lenski, S. (2001). *Improving reading*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Video Series

Pearson Professional Development. (2009). *Reading assessment and diagnosis: Instructional interventions* [Flash video]. Glenview, IL: Pearson Education.

SkyLight Training and Publishing (Producer). (2001). *Best practices in teaching: Reading interventions* [DVD]. Glenview, IL: Pearson Education.

Online Readings

Barr, R., C.L.Z. Blachowicz, R. Buhle, J. Chaney, C. Ivy, & S. G. Sourez (2002). *Illinois Snapshot of Early Literacy*. Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education. Retrieved January 29, 2009 from <http://www.isbe.net/ils/ela/reading/html/isel.htm>

English Language Arts—A Curriculum Guide for the Elementary Level. (2002). *Assessment and Evaluation*. Retrieved January 29, 2009 from <http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/ela/assessment/assessment02.html>

Scholastic. (1996–2009). *Student Interest Inventory*. Retrieved January 29, 2009, from <http://printables.scholastic.com/printables/detail/?id=35571>

Course Description

This course emphasizes the application of theory and research in developing diagnostic skills. It is designed to help you analyze the process by which students gain meaning from text. You will be able to use knowledge and theory from research to support you in recognizing, diagnosing, and addressing reading difficulties students experience within the classroom. Understanding the mental process involved as a reader reads is vital to becoming an effective reading teacher. The experience within this practicum is three-fold: First, you will plan student assessment sessions, score, and analyze test results. Next, you will apply a diagnostic model to target a specific area of student reading problems. Finally, you will create and implement a plan of instruction based on student strengths and concerns to facilitate effective student reading. You will need a volunteer student for assessment and corrective instruction during Weeks, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Keep in mind that you have the option to assess the student with in small groups that you may already use in your classroom. You will close student sessions with targeted assessments to determine progress, and write a summary of the case study and practicum with suggestions to support future reading and learning. Sharing instructional data and learning suggestions with the student, parents, and other professionals who work with the student are an important piece of discourse clarifying expectations in support of future learning.

Key Questions and Ideas

This practicum in diagnosis and instruction allows you to use a variety of assessment tools to plan and improve literacy instruction fostering emergent and developing literacy skills, as you diagnostically address print awareness, phonemic awareness, word recognition, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and/or writing concerns. The course considers the following key questions:

- ∞ Which assessment tools can diagnosticians use to assess literacy growth and needs?
- ∞ How can you use assessment data to remediate student emergent literacy?
- ∞ As you implement your 4-week plan for instructional intervention, how will you use the results of student assessment to help plan a direction for instruction?
- ∞ In what ways can you implement effective literacy instruction based on assessment of student strengths and concerns?
- ∞ How will you incorporate the use of strategies into your instructional setting for ongoing student learning?
- ∞ What part might minilessons play in remediation?
- ∞ What recommendations to teachers and parents are appropriate to accelerate a struggling learner's ongoing literacy?
- ∞ In what ways will you promote self-monitoring for learners?
- ∞ How can you use the results of student assessment to help plan an ongoing literacy development program?

Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of this course is for you to understand the role of assessment and to implement data analysis effectively in the planning and delivery of on target reading instruction for diverse learners.

The Course Objectives align with IRA/NCATE Standards for Reading Professionals (available online at http://www.reading.org/resources/community/ncate_standards.html).

As a result of viewing the video segments, completing and reflecting on the assigned readings, engaging in the related discussions, and completing the weekly activities, you will be able to do the following:

As a result of completing the course, you will be able to

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the foundations of literacy assessment

- 1.1 Demonstrate knowledge of linguistic, social, cultural, cognitive, and economic aspects of literacy development (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 1.2 Demonstrate knowledge of the stages of literacy development (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 1.3 Demonstrate knowledge of the competencies necessary for successful reading: comprehension, phonemic awareness, phonics understanding, word recognition, , prior knowledge, vocabulary knowledge, fluency, self-monitoring and motivation. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 1.4 Review and summarize research on major components of reading. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2).

2. Demonstrate knowledge of various assessment tools and their role within the literacy program

- 2.1 Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, administration, interpretation, and uses of ongoing literacy assessments designed for internal audiences, including running records, retellings, miscue analysis, writing samples, and spelling checks (IRA/NCATE Standards 1, 1.3, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 2.2 Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, administration, interpretation, and uses of periodic literacy assessments designed for internal audiences, including informal reading, listening, and word inventories that determine reading levels (independent, instructional, frustration). (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4)
- 2.3 Demonstrate knowledge of maintaining a portfolio of student assessments/protocols, analysis of same, instructional implications derived from data, as well as any and all data consulted for measuring students' literacy growth over time (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 2.4 Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, administration, interpretation, uses and limitations of standardized literacy assessments designed for external audiences (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 2.5 Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, administration, interpretation, uses and limitations of norm-referenced achievement and diagnostic literacy tests (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 2.6 Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, administration, interpretation, uses and limitations of criterion-referenced literacy tests (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

3. Use assessment results to improve instructional decision making

- 3.1 Understand a model of reading diagnosis that includes student proficiency with print conventions, word recognition and analysis, vocabulary and comprehension. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 3.2, Use a wide range of effective instructional strategies and practices to enhance students' learning based on the results of ongoing, and/or periodic literacy assessments designed for internal audiences (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 3.3 Implement a framework for evaluating diagnostic assessment data. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- 3.4 Research, design and implement learner instruction based on your ongoing analysis of assessment data, including student reflection to monitor student learning. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- 3.5 Engage in reflective practice by synthesizing and applying knowledge of the ongoing cycle of assessment and instructional planning within your instructional setting. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3)

4. Develop an ongoing educational plan for your struggling learner.

- 4.1 Develop a case study report on your student, noting strengths and concerns analyzed for correcting student reading problems. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 4.2 Collaborate with professionals in assessing, analyzing, researching, planning, adapting, and delivering reading instruction. (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)
- 4.3 Facilitate an ongoing learning plan, including suggestions for reading pleasure, incorporating support strategy suggestions for the student, teachers, and parents,(IRA/NCATE Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)
- 4.4 Adhere to ethical standards of professional conduct in reading education (IRA/NCATE Standards 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4)

Accountability and Grading

Each week you will read text selections, view video segments (if applicable), engage in online discussions with colleagues, and complete weekly assignments.

You will be graded and evaluated based on the **Rubrics**. Click to download the [rubric.pdf](#).
Late assignments and discussion will not be accepted unless prearranged.

Point Values

The point breakdown for all course assignments is as follows:

- ∞ Online discussion (20 questions, 10 points per question): 200 points
- ∞ Synthesize/Apply/Reflect assignments (10 assignments, 20 points each): 200 points
- ∞ Action Research Project: 195 points

Assignment 1: Planning the Inquiry

Part 1: Problem Statement	20 points
Part 2: Annotated Bibliography (draft for review)	10 points
Part 3: Advocated Solutions	15 points

Assignment 2: Implementing the Inquiry

Part 1: Implementation Plan	40 points
Part 2: Record of Progress	35 points

Assignment 3: Analyzing and Evaluating the Inquiry

Part 1: Reflective Assessment	40 points
Part 2: Annotated Bibliography (final)	20 points
Part 3: Appendix	15 points

TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE: 595

Grading Scale

- 90–100% (536–595 points) = A
- 80–89% (476–535 points) = B
- 70–79% (417–475 points) = C
- 60–69% (357–416 points) = D
- <59% (356 points or fewer) = F

Reference List

- Beaver, J., & Carter, M. (2003). *Developmental reading assessment*. Parsippany, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Bintz, W. (2000). Using freewriting to assess reading comprehension. *Reading Horizons, 40*, 205–223.
- Buly, M. R., & Valencia, S. W. (2002). Below the bar: Profiles of students who fail state reading assessments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(3), 219–239.
- Busin, R. (1997). Reading and phonological awareness: What we have learned and how we can use it. *Reading Research and Instruction, 36*, 199–215.
- Campbell, M. (2001). Inquiry into reading assessment: Teachers' perceptions of effective practices. *Reading Horizons, 42*(1), 1–20.
- Chall, J., & Popp, H. (1996). *Teaching and assessing phonics: Why, what, when, how*. Cambridge, MA: Educational Publishing Service.
- Chase, C. (2000). *Contemporary assessment for educators*. New York: Longman.

- Chen, Y., & Martin, M. (2000). Using performance assessment and portfolio assessment together in the elementary classroom. *Reading Improvement, 37*(1), 33–128.
- Clay, M. (2000). *Running records for classroom teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Davenport, R., & Lauritzen, C. (2002). Inviting reflection on reading through over the shoulder miscue analysis. *Language Arts, 80*(2), 109–118.
- Duffelmeyer, F. A., Kruse, A. E., Merkeley, D. J., & Fyfe, S. A. (1999) Further validation and enhancement of the Names Test. In S. J. Barrentine (Ed.). *Reading assessment: Principles and practices for elementary teachers* (pp. 177-188). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Durkin, D. (1978-1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 14*, 481-533.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2001). Helping teachers formulate sound test accommodation decisions for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: Research & Practice, 16*(3), 174–181.
- Gambrell, S. B., Pfeiffer, W., & Wilson, R. (1985). The effects of retelling upon reading comprehension and recall of text information. *Journal of Educational Research, 78*, 216-220.
- Goodman, Y. M., Watson, D. J., & Burke, C. L. (1987). *Reading miscue inventory: Alternative procedures*. New York: Richard C. Owen.
- Gredler, M., & Johnson, R. (2004). *Assessment in the literacy classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Graves, D. H. (1994). *A fresh look at writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Grimes, S. (2004). The search for meaning. *School Library Journal, 48*–52.
- Guterman, E. (2002). Toward dynamic assessment of reading: Applying metacognitive awareness guidance to reading assessment tasks. *Journal of Research in Reading, 25*(3), 283–298.
- Harmon, J. M. (2000). Assessing and supporting independent word learning strategies of middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43*, 518–527.
- Hill, B. C., & Ruptic, C. (1994). *Practical aspects of authentic assessment: Putting the pieces together*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Jacobs, V. A. (2002). Reading, writing, and understanding. *Educational Leadership, 60*, 3, 58-61.
- Johnston, P. H. (1992). Nontechnical assessment. *The Reading Teacher, 46*, 60-62.
- Kubiszyn, T., & Borich, G. (2000). *Educational testing and measurement: Classroom application and practice*. New York: Wiley.
- LaBoskey, V. K. (2000). Portfolios here, portfolios there: Searching for the essence of "educational portfolios." *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*, 590–595.

- Lenski, S., Daniel, M., Ehlers-Zavala, F., & Alvayero, M. (2005). Assessing struggling English-language learners. *Illinois Reading Council Journal*, 32(4), 21–30. [This article is available online to IRA members at the IRA Website (<http://www.reading.org/>).]
- Lenski, S. D., & Johns, J. L. (2000). *Improving writing: Resources, strategies, assessments*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Leslie, I., & Caldwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative Reading Inventory* (4th Edition). Allyn & Bacon.
- Liu, P., Lara, R., & Parker, R. (2001). Using standardized tests unconventionally: An adapted reading assessment. *Reading Improvement*, 38(1), 27–37.
- MacGinitie, W. H., MacGinitie, R. K., Maria, K., & Dreyer, L. G. (2000). *Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests* (5th ed.). Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing Co.
- McKenna, M. C. (1983). Informal reading inventories: A review of the issues. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 670-679.
- Miller, S. D., & Yochum, N. (1991). Asking students about the nature of their reading difficulties. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 23, 465-485.
- Rubin, D. (2002). *Diagnosis and correction in reading instruction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (2001). *Assessment*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Shellard, E. G. (2003). Using assessment to support reading instruction. *Principal*, 83(2), 40–43.
- Spritzler, J. (2000). Students, parents, and teachers say, "Take this test and shove it!" *Paths of Learning: Options for Families and Communities*, 3, 46–47.
- Stage, S., & Jacobsen, M. (2001). Predicting student success on a state-mandated performance-based assessment using oral reading fluency. *School Psychology Review*, 30(3), 407–419.
- Taylor, R. (2006). *Assessment of exceptional students: Educational and psychological procedures*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Weishaar, M. (2005). *Cases in special education assessment*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Weller, D. L. (2001). Building validity and reliability into classroom tests. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(622), 32–38.
- Yopp, H. K. (1995). A test for assessing phonemic awareness in young children. *The Reading Teacher*, Vol. 48, No. 6, 20-29.