

National Center on Student Progress Monitoring Webinar Transcript

Title: The ABCs of Progress Monitoring in Reading

Date Recorded: March 19, 2007

Presenter: Dr. Michelle K. Hosp, Assistant Professor at the University of Utah

Good afternoon, I am Rebecca H, I am pleased to welcome you to the second Webinar on the national conference on student progress monitoring, a technical assistance center funded by the office of special education programs, to provide assistance to state and districts, regarding practices proven to work through grades K through 5. We hope you find this online learning opportunity to be fruitful and relevant to your work. We are fortunate to have \$R Dr. Michelle Hosp to present on the abc's of progress monitoring in reading. She received her PhD from van -- at this point it's my pleasure to turn things over to Dr. HoSP.

Welcome all and thank you for joining us today. I am assuming everyone can hear me fine. If you can't please type that into the question and we will try too take care of that technicality for you.

I am going to be moving the slides on your screen, so the first thing that will help us today is if you guys can just take a quick moment and answer this general question for us. We like to poll who we have in the audience. It will help me determine who to gear it toward and what additional things I might want to mention or bring up. Let's take a couple seconds.

Okay, we can see the results, looks like the majority of you us are school psychologist. I I congratulate the school psychologist for showing up. It's a large part of my background, and the reading specialists, extremely important in implementing progress monitoring. Kudos to the administrators who are here. Without them we can't get any of our work done. In addition to special Ed teachers and others. Maybe we can find out who these others are at the end.

Let's go through. I want to address the objectives for this afternoon. First is to have you have an understanding of progress monitoring, particularly curriculum based measurement, cbm, understanding how it's different from other types of assessments. This is critical because lots of times I hear in trainings people say but I am already doing something like this. Why can't I just use x instead. We will address should of those reasons why measures should be used as they are. Understanding the different types of progress monitoring measures in reading. There are a lot of different measures out there. I want to review those for you, and to gain knowledge about how to use these measures, as far as what is the criteria, what type of behavior, or reading expectation do we have for kids when we use progress monitoring?

Also, using this data to write IEP goals and optatives, slides to share, great way to monitor progress on annual goals on IEPs. Some of you on your slides may be seeing the number 10 in the circle. If you do, actually, we can make a joke that means let's give it a 10, but there seems to

be technicality with the version I was using in PowerPoint, transferring the technology. 10 is just supposed to imply a circle.

The other thing that will help us is if you could take a moment and answer how familiar you are with progress monitoring meaning cbm or dibbles or other type of progress ss monitoring measures.

It looks like the majority of you are just starting to use progress monitoring, some heard about it, never used it. At least one percent never heard of or used progress monitoring and some people used it in the past but aren't now. This will be helpful. Even if you have been use integrity for years, I have been using progress monitoring materials over 10 years and I still, every time I give a presentation or work with colleagues I still am informed, learn something new.

First thing I want to discuss is talking about where progress monitoring, in particular curriculum based measurement came from. Lots of times we hear about things but don't necessarily know background. The first thing I want to share, curriculum based measurement was actually developed at the University of Minnesota min with Stan Den owe and Phyllis Mirk in in the late 70s and early 80s. It's been around a long time. Exangz of a system called the database program modification model. This model was based on mastery measurement. We will talk more about that.

Some of the -- and why they chose to change that. They decided they really needed some type of assessment techniques that could be very efficient for teachers. One of the things that I always say, not only to student eachers, but anybody who participates in any trainings or workshops. If you don't know what to do, then teach. You should only do -- if you have a purpose for collecting data. In a best case scenario assessment should be quick, efficient, so the majority of our time can be spent on instructing, and assisting students.

One of the things that Stan and Phyllis really focused on, wanted to come up with measures that were extremely efficient for teachers and take sure they were reliable, valid, make sure the information could help teachers make instructional decisions. Instead of collecting data not knowing what to do with it, sticking it in your drawer, going on with your day, they wanted to focus on having assessment data that teachers could really use to inform their instruction. Also, one of the key things about progress monitoring and curriculum based measurement, it provides information about student growth within an instructional program. To say it another way is how well is the student learning reading and gain nothing gaining in reading skills given the instruction we are providing.

The research on CBM has been going on over 25 years. There are literally hundreds and hundreds of studies that have been conducted on curriculum based measurement. Just to give you a little idea, that although we are focusing on reading, curriculum based measurement is also available for math, writing and spelling. It covers much more content than reading. One of the things that the research has been clearly able to demonstrate is that when teachers use progress monitoring measures to make instructional changes, their students learn more, the decisions the

teachers make in regards to how to improve student academic performance, it really increases as well, because now they are using data to drive their instruction, and the students themselves become much more aware and involved in their performance. One of the things we have found very effective when we collect progress centering data, it has to be graphed, and one of the things that has been helpful for us is we share those graphs with the students, so that the student becomes not only invested, but they get to see their progress over time. When I show you some of these charts you will get to see, for some students who have really struggled with reading, this is a really nice way for them to actually see growth where they may not have been able to see it before.

So I want to turn to how CBM is different from other types of assessments. The first thing I want to address is how CBM is different from traditional assessments. I am talking here about large-scale norm reference assessments, typically like the Iowa tests of basic skills, the Stanford achievement tests, the type of assessment most schools use on a yearly basis. One thing we know about these assessments is they are very lengthy, given over multiple days. They are not administered on a regular basis, 94 were they meant to be, and teachers don't receive immediate feedback. We use the Iowa test of basic skill and that's administered in the fall. Sometimes teachers don't receive feedback until close to the winter break. That doesn't really help inform them instructional-wise. We know students' scores are based on national averages, and sometimes a classroom may be quite different from the national sample we are looking at.

One of the things that CBM does, compared to traditional assessments, instead of having something very long they CBM is something that can be given, provides a quick and easy method for gathering student progress. One of the things on one of the first slides we looked at, they wanted something efficient for teachers to use. CBM does that. Teachers can analyze the students' scores, adjust programs. Using something like the WoodJohnson achievement, or Wya TTA achievement test, we hope the students can -- if we are monitoring on a weekly basis we can make instructional changes, change students' goals more frequently than having to wait until the end of the year to decide whether or not the student has benefitted from the instructional program they are receiving.

The other thing helpful is the data can be compared to the teacher's classroom, school district data, so it's a nice way to look at classrooms, grades, schools, and then across districts or schools across districts.

The other thing I want to mention, there's often lots of confusion between curriculum based assessments and CBM, that's a question that often comes up. I want to take a brief moment and clarify that. Curriculum based assessment is actually a term, it's a broader umbrella. A term that Tucker in 1987 had a really nice article, interestingly, the title from 1987 was curriculum based assessment is not a fad look how long ago the term was published. What he talked about, it was a broad umbrella that meant the measurement material aligned directly with the school curriculum, so we were testing what we were teaching, that the measurement was frequent, not a one-time or pre/post type of assessment. And the assessment information is used to formulate instructional decisions, so the data was reliable, valid, could really offer teachers an opportunity to make

changes for the student's instructional programs. CBM is one type of curriculum based assessment. We will talk about those types.

The different types of curriculum based assessment, that larger umbrella can be broken down into mastery measurement or judicial outcome measures, or referred to as GOMs.

The salient features of mastery measurement is that the curriculum is taken, broken down into very specific subskills or short-term instructional objectives. Then you assess those specific skills being taught. An example in reading might be for if you were teaching a scoping sequence in decoding, you might teach short vowels, then long, then rr-controlled vowels. Example in math might be you start with single digit addition without regrouping, then move to double digit addition without regrouping, then start adding in summary grouping skills. It's a hierarchy of skills you are teaching. The skills are assessed using teacher-made tests or still today a lot, they have mastery measurement types of assessments we use.

Let's look at what that would look like if we were using mastery measurement, the scope and sequence of collecting data, graphing, how that might help inform our educational decision making. Example, we will use fourth grade math, computation curriculum. You see numbers one to 10. That means it represents the first thing you would be teaching owl the way down to maybe the last thing you would be teaching.

This would be example of a math test that would be given, that corresponds with, go back to the slide, the first skill, multidigit addition with regrouping. Here we have a math test that we would give our students that actually accesses multidigit with regrouping. We would plot how accurate they are on each of these tests over time. Up at the top, or on the left-hand side of your screen, the y axis is numbered from 100 to zero. We set criteria for having students 90% accurate, they say have mastered that skill. They have tablingen taken an assessment similar to this, tapping the same skills, and we calculate how accurate they are on each of the measures until they have reached the criteria of 90%. Once they reach that we go back to our curriculum, scope and sequence, see multidigit subtraction with -- the next skill to teach. We start assessing them on math tests that actually have that specific skill. Again, we will go back, each time they take a math test we will calculate how accurate they are at that particular skill, until they have reach the criteria of 90% accuracy.

One of the problems that I want to point out about this, and I am keeping this slide up a second. It represents to me, students who struggle, we assess them, see them getting better on specific skills, climbing to the top of the mountain, we say to them, you did great. Now jump. Because we're going to start all over and you are going to learn a whole new skill. Where that might be appropriate sometimes, I think for kids who really struggle it can be really defeating for them. This is just one representation of why looking at this particular skill, one at a time, graphing that out, can be problem tinfnlght let's problematic. Let's talk about one of the things mastery measurement is based on, a skill hierarchy. That means there's an assumption that some skills should be taught before other skills and there's an accumulation of skills required. This may seem to make sense logically, lots of times this is based on theory, not actual empirical evidence.

We don't know if kids should be learning these skill necessary this particular order. You look at - they all come with their own scope and sequence. They pretty much follow a similar scoping sequence, but are not exactly aligned together. They have their own views, ideas of skill sets to be taught and built upon. The other problem with a lot of mastery measurements, the reliability and validity are often unknown. Lots of times that's because they are either teacher-made tests or come from the curriculum, however they haven't been tested out in the field so we actually know if they are reliable, which means they are actually measuring what they say they are measuring; or they are valid, meaning the student would continue to score similarly on different days or over time. The other thing that really speaks to this, the retention and generalization is never looked at, once we have -- we start assessing the student on multi-digit subtraction with multigroup, lots of times we never go in to see if the student retained or generalized the skill we taught. That is, in effect, also problematic.

The other thing is the measurement is on short-term instructional objectives, meaning we are just looking at very discrete skills at one point in time, and that measurement shifts occur making it difficult to monitor overall progress because these skills are measured at different points in time and the skills are often not in equal difficulties. We get an awkward kind of climbing up the cliff, jumping off, climbing up, jumping, some will reach the mastery much faster than others, but we never get to see their overall in this case it would be overall math health. Meaning how well they are able to retain and use all of those skills throughout the whole year.

So there are difficulties that go with mastery measurement. That's not to say you would never use it, but I want to turn now to looking at progress monitoring and curriculum based measurement. CBM is not typically mastery measurement. It is, however, more often used as a general outcome measure. We will talk about those. There are some CBM measures that actually do look like mastery measurement, and in particular some of the early reading measures that focused on letter sounds or segmenting, those are really more of mastery measurement, really looking at very discrete skills, not at a broader picture of reading. Same would be true for math. There are some math CBM measures that look at just maybe you have a whole page that looks at addition. There are some CBM measures categorized under mastery measurement. All of this remain says under the umbrella of curriculum based assessment. The term Tucker talked about.

Again, curriculum based assessment means the material and the measurement you are using aligns with the curriculum, that you are frequently monitoring student performance, and then you are using that information to make some type of instructional decision.

Let's look at some of the salient features to general outcome measures and curriculum based measurement.

... makes no assumptions about -- because there's no underlying assumption that this skill should be taught before another skill, has to be a layering effect, that means CBM could fit with any type of instructional approach. The other critical thing, that means there are no measurement shifts. No longer do the kids have to climb up the mountain and jump off. They will see

continuous -- let's look a little more, and I will provide a visual of a graph I think will help pull it together.

Some of the other salient features of general outcome measurement, it incorporates automatic retention, generalization. You are no longer testing just one specific skill. You are testing skills that go across the year. That's really important for the teacher to see, did what I teach in the beginning of the year, has that been maintained with the student and are they continuing to grow in that skill?

One thing that people often say to me is, Dr. Hosp don't you think that's misleading? Using math as example, give a student in the beginning of the year a math probe, a sheet with problems you don't expect them to know because you are not going to teach that until the end of the year. One thing I say is, yes, but as a teacher it's my job to say to the students I know that you are not going to know all of this, I haven't taught it to you yet. You are not expected to, just do your best and over time, over the course of this year, you will learn more and more and see yourself get better to all of these skills. It's important, a lot of times, we knee know it will be difficult, but it's important to put it out, acknowledge their frustration, but that you will work on it together and they will see themselves get better at it.

That addresses the generalization and retention, being able to capture that, from the beginning of the year, all the way through, because actually what you accessed them on in the beginning of the year covers the curriculum you will cover that whole year. That make its a general outcome measure. It incorporates everything that will be covered throughout the whole year. The other thing about curriculum based measurement, it uses standardized procedures, meaning standardized direction and scoring, allows you to access performance on the long-term goal and the reliability and validity across the years has held extremely strong, so we can use the measures knowing they do access what they say they do, and that they are valid.

What are some of the down sides? Because nothing is perfect. That is true. There are down sides, but I do think they are very minimal and I do think that they in no way, shape or form downplay the extreme benefits that we get from using progress monitoring, text materials, particularly curriculum based measurements. It often lacks information on specific skills. If I am always accessing the general curriculum sometimes I don't know the particular problem a student is missing, I am not focusing on a particular specific skill. That's when, if you are interested in identifying specific skills, maybe a general outcome measure isn't what you are using for that reason. But you could give a mastery measure or something more did I -- diagnostic.

The other thing, fidelity of implementation is important. Because the procedures, curriculum based measurements -- have clear direction, time limits on most of them, very clear, very specific ways to score them. One of the things I see people doing, they break those, say I know -- instead of giving the student three seconds to read a word, give them five and I know he will do t. you are not now going to be able to compare your data to everything there, vu broken the standardization and we don't quite know what it means as far as the data collected. Educators get frustrated, there are fine nuances between types of assessments, what's an error, what isn't.

One thing I say, you have to treat it as it's either correct or incorrect, no gray area. There are very clear guidelines on -- correct or incorrect. Important to stick with that, otherwise the information we collect won't be very helpful or useful. The other point there is I think you have to remind people you have to separate assessment from teaching. When we are assessing, it's not the time to ask about background knowledge, prime them for something they will be doing. Assessment is something they come to without assistance to see how they perform. We have to remind ourselves this isn't a teaching tool, it's an assessment. Here's an example of what this would look like if we went back and used the example of math. We took the same fourth-grade math curriculum and we had on the y axis, 25, number of weeks, we have taken that curriculum and have math problems on there that represent the whole year. The student is being assessed on the general outcome issue, what they are expected to learn in math the whole year. Instead of counting problems correct or incorrect, we count how many they did get correct, more sensitive to student improvement. We graph over time and there's a line drawn between week 8 and 9. You need to make instructional change at any point you have four data points that are consecutive, they have to be consecutive, below the goal line, the line from the 5 up to close to the 25. That would be the diagonal line is our goal. You can see in weeks 5, 6, 7, 8, there were four consecutive data points, meaning that student is not on track to meet their goal. That's when we can step in as their instructors, say what's the student missing that needs to be beefed up?

That represents some of the differences between CBM and other types of assessment. Let's talk about generally, progress monitoring, monitors throughout the school year, students are given reading probes or math probes or whatever type of probe. Every time I say the word probe I have to laugh. Lots of people are annoyed or bothered by using that. It just means a test. Insert the word test or sheet, every time you see the word probe. It's the terminology used 25 years. We are going to be given students reading sheets, math tests, spelling tests, whatever, weekly, bi-weekly or monthly, depending on the need of the student. The teacher will use the data to determine long and short-term goals the student needs to meet so they can learn the whole curriculum by the end of the year, the end-of-year goal. And we can use the information to estimate the rate of student - and rate how much progress a student should be making. I will share that later in the presentation.

Some of the basics, they are brief, easy to administer. Again, there is no other type of assessment procedure out there with the research behind it, that is reliable, valid, easy to administer and score, and brief. So that means I can get good data quickly, I can get back to my job of teaching, the most important thing. We should be testing less, teaching more, or as I like to say, testing smart, teaching better. All tests are different. So when the student takes a math test, reading passage, letter sounds, it's not the same words, same order, it's the same difficulty, though, so you are capturing basically the same skills every time you assess the student, scores are graphed so teachers can make decisions about the program and method for each student. Meaning every student has their own database for the teacher to look at to make informed decisions about what instructional support that student may or may not need. It also identifies students who are not demonstrating adequate progress. No longer do we have to wait until the end of the year to find the kids who haven't made good progress to say Oh gosh, we should have done something. We can be continuously looking at students, making changes as we go along.

What are we looking for? Students whose scores are going up, indicating they are becoming better, whether reading, math, writing, spelling, and students whose scores are flat. That indicates they are not profiting or benefitting from the instructional program and they probably require some type of comainch change in their instructional program.

This would be example of graph for a student on words read correctly in second grade. Across time we can see her goal line and that she's making good progress. This student, however, compared to goal line, it's a flat liner, the student that needs to be resuscitated, helped right away. As we know, from all of the research, we cannot wait for students to catch up. We have to intervene quickly and smart, and using good instructional techniques early as possible to close the gap for students who fall behind.

At this point the I would like to take a quick break, ask people if there are any questions you have about progress monitoring or curriculum based measurement in general, to go ahead and type those in. Then we will move to looking specifically at progress monitoring in reading.

Pause.

You guys are typing in great questions. Some of these we will actually get to later on, about how to establish goal lines, and what is the aim. How to access specific skill necessary reading, skill necessary reading, we will talk about that.

You guys have great question, some of the technical questions, the staff will be addressing, and then we will, if we don't get to all of the questions we will be responding to you at some point, might be after today. Some people might receive a response directly from me or people at the center.

Keep the questions coming, I am anything to move on, and I want to talk about progress monitoring in reading.

One of the things I wanted to highlight is what do the different types of progress monitoring measures look like by grade. On the left-hand side of are screen you can see it says CBM-R. Reading. Here we have in kindergarten, curriculum based measurement procedures, letter sound fluency. In the first semester of Grade I, first entering first grade, a CBM measurement, word identification fluency. Grades 1 through 8, there are massages referred to as oral reading fluency, passage reading fluency, called multiple things. One confusion is people think oral reading fluency is referring to one of the big five areas the national reading panel addresses. That is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about an assessment procedure we use as general outcome that taps all types of reading skills, an overall indicator of reading. Then we all vs in grades 1 through 8, maze massages, like closed passages. I will show you each of these. One thing I want you to notice, after grades 1 through 8 above oral reading fluency, you will see one through 3. And 4 through 8. That indicates oral reading fluency or passage reading fluency is

probably a good overall outcome measure for grades 1 through 3. Doesn't necessarily have to be, talking about kids who are performing, have reading skills equivalent in grades 1, 2 or 3.

Mazes are typically recommended for grades 4 and up, tends to be an overall measure related to reading. I want to focus on the right-hand side of the screen, and that list, all of the dibbles measures. In kindergarten, there's letter naming, phoneme segmentation and initial sound fluency. In Grade 1 they continue with letter naming, phoneme segmentation, nonsense words fluency, in grade two nonsense in the fall, then dropped, oral reading fluency continued throughout. That's the same for grades three through 6.

I am going to show you quickly what each of the measures look like. Some people using CBM for a while are not familiar with the other measures, like word identification fluency, which is a really nice measure.

This is letter sound fluency, an example of what the student copy would look like, have in front of them. The letters at the top are practice letters, student is asked for one minute to produce the sound of each letter on the page. One thing I like about this measure is that in contrast to letter naming fluency, letter sound fluency is a much more direct link to decoding and reading words. It's a very nice measure. It's given individually, and given for 60 seconds. Again, you see it's efficient, easy to give.

This is what the form would look like for examiner, person administering letter sound fluency. You mark the sound the student makes with a slash, getting through all of them in a minute their score is adjusted.

Another progress monitoring measure is word identification fluency. This is what it would look like for the student. They would have the sheet in front of them and actually read down the column of the words. These are words, many of you will look, say yes, these look familiar. Words that came from the Dolch list and the Fry list, the most common 500 words, randomly selected on multiple sheets, to monitor progress. Students, every time a student is shown, given a sheet, doesn't have the same words. May have some of the same words, but in different order, still coming from the same pool, making it a general outcome measure. These are words most kids will know by the end of first grade.

This is the sheet the examiner is scoring, marking a 1 or zero.

This is what a reading fluency or passage reading fluency sheet or passage looks like. This is what the student would have copy in front of them, the administrator or teacher has a copy, what's nice is these, I started doing this over 10 years ago I remember sitting, counting every word in a line.

The student is given one minute to do the task, the total is calculated. One of the things that is also nice about the measures, not only do they assess real nicely students overall general reading

performance, but they also are very predictive of how students will be performing down the road. They have done predictive validity studies that not only looked at how students will do beginning of the year, but how well will they do from beginning of first grade to when they have to take -- you insert the test, a criteria reference or national norm test, it's very predictive of those kids on track, look like they will be successful down the road. It's a nice way, if you know that up front, can monitor the progress, really make some adjustments, you are really sitting in the driver's seat to get that student closer to being a successful reader, someone successful in math by intervening along the way. This is an example of a maze passage. If you can see, about every seventh word is replaced. Instead of a closed passage, a blank to write in, say what the word is. There are three choices for the student, one is correct. One is close, but not quite. One is quite far off. In some ways that gives you good information. If you have a student doing this, but always circling or underlining the word really far off there are probably bigger issues to look at. Mazes can be given to a group, all of the other measures we looked at previously, all are administered individually. Mazes can be administered to a group. The student reads aloud two and a half, three minutes, depending on the scoring, the teacher scores afterwards. One of the scoring rules necessary this is a s in this, after three mistakes it's implying the student is not proficient enough at the skill to keep considering. It's like the ceiling effect on the standardized norm reference test. Say I won't count anything after that. People are not using that procedure, it will really help make the scores much more meaningful.

One of the things I would like ask folks at this point, how many people in the audience are currently using one or more of these measures?

Looks like the majority of you are using at least one of these. Please know that letter sound fluency, and word identification fluency are excellent progress monitoring procedures to be using as well. I want to quickly walk you through some of the dibbles measures, so you know what they look like.

Which begins with the sound -- this is an example of phonic segmentation fluency. Nothing is in front of the student, it is given orally, as the examiner you sit, say tell me the sounds you hear in the word hat. And the student would have to break up the sounds. The student receives one point for each sound they are able to segment.

This is the nonsense word fluency, the student has a page of nonsense words to read.

They have 60 seconds to read the page, instructions are to read nonsense words as quickly, carefully as possible, sound by sound or read the whole word. They are given practice words, Sim and lust, to understand the task.

How many of you in the audience are using one or more of the DIBELS measures?

Looks like the majority are using DIBELS. That's helpful. One of the things I want to talk about, questions posted asked how do I know the -- goal should be. A couple of ways to do this. I want

to talk briefly about ways this can be conducted. You can say well, what is a good goal, also sometimes referred to as benchmark, by the end of the year, students should be able to perform on this test that would lead us to say they are really growing in their reading skills? So for the CBM measures these are some of the criteria that come from -- research.

In kindergarten they found 40 correct letter sounds per minute on the letter sound fluency test would be a goal for all kindergarten students to achieve. Lots of times people look at goals, benchmarks, where my typical or good reader should be. No, these are bare minimum criteria we want all students to achieve to be on track for being good readers. I look at it as, refer to it as getting your drivers license. You take the drivers test, it's a reference test. You have to perform so many correctly to say you have your license to read. Doesn't matter how the neighbor performs, only matters, based on criteria, predictive of later success, where we want all students to be achieving. This isn't a high bar to set. It's where we want all students achieving at end of the year.

In first grade if we continue the to use word identification it would be 60 words per minute correct. Passage reading, same as oral reading fluency, then the expectation would be 50 words correct from text, then you can see from second grade, 75 words correct from text per minute, and third grade, 100 words correct. In fourth, fifth, sixth, switches to how many correct replacements or restorations of correct word in the passage do students need to get, based on two and a half minute timing, by the end of the year for us to say looking good.

In fourth grade it's 20 replacements per fx in two and a half minutes, and sixth grade it's 30. Disble one of the things that you will want to know, though, what does it look like in the fall? How do I know when the red siren should be going off, this kid is in trouble? Based on where they are starting from it will be pretty hard to get them to the benchmarks by the end of the year. These are some criteria from Lynn and Doug -- research rchtion signs of kids at risk who need to be looked at closely, right away and intervention implemented. In kindergarten, if in the fall you have kids who are providing 10 or fewer letters in that minute, correct letter sounds, those are students you would be worried about. In Grade I, producing less than 15 words per minute, those are kids to worry about.

do not have enough skill to give good indication of good over all reading health in the beginning of first grade by reading a passage. Lots of times we get much better information using a word list, some other way to look at over all reading ability, than if we were to give them a passage. By the middle of first grade, that's when most people say students have enough skills to exhibit, perform enough that we can use that to make some instructional decisions. That is why the fall of first grade passive reading fluency is not listed.

In second grade we have words read in text below 15. Third grade below 50, and for mazes in grades four, five and six.

DIBELS does not have maze passages, I don't know if they plan to. All of their criteria looks at using oral reading fluency from grade 1 on.

Here are some of the risk indicators, the same thing I shared for progress monitoring CBM measures. Some of these indicate winter. For example, kindergarten, segmentation fluency isn't administered until the winter. In the winter of kindergarten if a student is providing less than seven phone name segment per minute they are considered at risk. For Grade I, nonsense word fluency, what the risk indicators are in the fall. Because these materials are so efficient to use, if you can screen everybody you can quickly identify those kids who need assistance and possibly look at grouping also, not only within a classroom, possibly across classroom and across grades. The other way, they just want to mention. One way to say what would be a good goal, if I were going to monitor a student's progress, what's a good goal to use. Those are benchmarks or goals that could be appropriate. Another way to do it, people ask the typical rate of growth a student should be performing on some of these measures. This comes from Lynn and Doug Fuchs, you can see rates of growth, for the grade 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, oral reading fluency, synonymous with passage reading. The two stands for two additional words a week the student will increase by. Does not mean the student will not learn two new words a week, means the student is improving to the point where they go to read connected text or passage they are able to read two additional words each week. Those rates of growth relate to words increased by week.

Then you can see, starts dropping, makes sense, because where the bulk of the reading growth occurs is in those earlier grades, hopefully the skills are obtained and maintained where the student is then able to read for meaning instead of learning to read.

Then for mazes, typical growth is .40, regardless of your grade. .40, correct additional restorations or completed words per week.

What would it look like if that's what they're growth is supposed to look like, it's also nice to take a look at how far below that would kids have to be in order for us to say they're at risk or we need to intervene somehow. So in kindergarten, on letter sound fluency f they have less than one increase per week. This comes from Lynn and Doug If fuchs research, if growing at less than 1.8 words in a minute on word ID fluency, that means they are not making enough progress, and there's something that needs to be done to intervene.

You can apply these rules, overlay them, ways to calculate the growth line. I wanted to bring to your attention there are lots of norms out there. CBM, progress monitoring is a criteria reference test, meaning there are specific criteria set up saying this is the performance, based on the score we want students to be able to do in order for to us say we have learned, have maintained, growing in their reading skills. However there are lots of people who because progress monitoring materials have been out there quite a while, people have been collecting, what does it look like normatively across the country. This is information from Aims Webb are, the 90th percentile, typical performance in all, winter spring. The interesting thing, if you look at these, even DIBELS has similar norms, if you compare they all look pretty similar. I myself conducted norming in a couple of states, one in the southwest, and one in the Southeast, the students looked the same, the numbers. It was amazing. It's nice to have norms to say what does it tippically look like. Those are the norms up through sixth, seventh and eighth grades.

At this point I would also like to take a quick break, let people type in additional questions they might have about any of the CBM or DIBELS measures that we quickly reviewed, or any of the criteria or growth rates or benchmarks or goals. Let's take a quick couple minutes, let people type in some questions.

There is one question I actually want to address right now, if people are thinking about this a little more. One of the questions is, is CBM a tool or way to monitor progress?

That's a great question.

It's interesting, and I will refer this back, people will say if it's been around over 25 years why hasn't it caught on or just starting to? Part of it is because it wasn't something you could go buy. It was an assessment procedure you overlaid, applied to your curriculum. Originally people made their own passages. We developed our own passages, probes, did the work ourselves. There were clear guidelines about how to do that. It is a way to monitor progress, but now, because people have packaged the materials, it's also a tool, I would say.

I hope that helps answer that.

Keep typing in questions. I am going to move on. One thing I want to address real quickly and we will open it up for other questions, using the CBM material to help you write IEPs, if some of you have on the screen the number 10, for behavior the R has dropped down, the R isn't behaving well. That should show up. These are things we want to look at when we are talking about IEP goal and objectives. I want to review them and show you how monitoring can be used over time. One of the things, they tear ya we want in there is the time. How much time are we looking at monitoring, working with this student for?

We also want to mention who the student is, the learner. The behavior, the specific skill the student is going to demonstrate. The level, what grade the con10 is content is from, what is the student learning about? What is the material that we're going to be using, what is the criteria. One of the things I want to mention about criteria, often I see people want to write in four out of five times the student will master this or 80% accuracy. Those are really not great ways to look at how a student is performing. One of the things under cri criteria that should be expected is time and accuracy. That way we are addressing how fluent or automatic the student is. We retained the skill to perform in a certain amount of time, and accuracy. I want to, and often one or the other of those is left off. I want to kind of walk you through why that's problematic. Think to yourself. You have student A and student b, both second graders. On a connected text reading passage both read with 100% accuracy. Think to yourself, they the same readers? Do they possess the same type of reading skills?

Now I will give you another piece of information. Student A read 50 words correctly in a minute, student B read 100 words correct per minute. Notice go back and think to yourself are these the

same students? No. Student B, not only accurate, but reading quickly, more fluently, it will take student A twice as long to get through reading materials. Those are not the same type of student, just by having accuracy information we are missing half the picture. I want to know how accurate and in what time frame were they able to produce that skill.

Then I want to flip it. We have student A and student B, fifth graders. Student A read 140 words read correctly per minute, typical, good. Student B read 140 words correct per minute, the same number of words correctly. However, student A is 98% accurate. Student B is 80% accurate. Student B is making many many more errors when reading. One thing I urge you to do, if you are going to monitor progress, it's not enough to just look at how many correct they are getting within the time frame, but you need to be looking at their errors. If they are growing in words read correctly per minute on connected text passage reading, growing on words correct per minute but increasing errors they are not really increasing as a reader. Grow them together, on the same graph, so I can see words read correct going up and I want a nice flat low line of errors at the bottom. I want to make sure they are becoming better in overall reading, improving, but also not making more errors as they are doing that.

When you write goals and objectives you basically, the same principles, goals are written for a year out and objectives are much shorter time frame. What this would look like if we were using oral reading fluency and mazes.

This is what it would look like as objective. Please note it's not the accuracy you decrease, it's the total number of correct. So for Edgar, on the oral reading fluency goal, we were expecting 90 word necessary 90s if one minute, but we would only expect 50 words in increments, but still want the accuracy. It's not the accuracy that changes, but total performance on how many words correctly we expect him to read.

So one thing I want to know from people, how many of you who are doing IEPs are using progress monitoring data when you write goal and objectives.

There are fewer people doing it, almost half. That's great. If you haven't been, I really encourage you to do so.

One of the things people want to know if I am going to be doing progress monitoring, how often. People talk about benchmarking, screening which you would do with all students at least three times a year. That helps you check-in, the measures are short, efficient, give you good information, allow you to check-in with all students in the system, three times a year to see if they remain on track, and find the kids who are not exhibiting or demonstrating skills showing they are on a good trajectory to be a strong reader, math or whatever progress materials you are using.

If you have kids who seem to be more at-risk, you could use previous year's benchmark, look at kids, monthly, current year, not quite reaching goals we expect, don't seem to be so at risk to

change a lot, those are kids you probably not to check-in more frequently than three times a year, just to make sure they are continuing to grow, and might need a bump here and there. Additional instruction. The kids most at risk you stay on top of weekly. I have people say but Michele I have 30 kids in my class, you can't possibly expect me, and 30 kids at risk. That's a reality. You can't possibly expect me to monitor every week. And I say yes, I do, this is how you do it. What I found that works well, it's a material and organizational issue. If you have notebooks set up with all the materials in it, graphing by hand or on a computer, you have that set up as well, then you find those little chunks of time that seem to be a little down. Good points I have found, a lot of free time, first thing in the morning when kids are coming back from eating breakfast, a quiet seat assignment they are supposed to be busy doing, 10 minutes there I could test five kids. If I did that every day, we found that kids get used to on minute, I go right after Bobby, they check-in themselves, because if you are showing them the graphs, using the data, to help them improve, they see themselves improving, they come to you, "Is it my turn to read?" becomes part of the routine, imaginable, short, efficient. Not like doing some of the other assessments that take up to 30 minutes per student. There are ways to do that.

In sum, I want to briefly touch on some of these, curriculum based monitoring, used to identify students who need additional support; help general educators plan more effective instruction; and help special educators design more effective instruction for student who is don't respond to general -- but also to share that information as well.

To document student progress for accountability purposes, IEPs, communicate with parents or other prrl professionals about student progress.

One question was where can I get materials? Off the -- place I can go down load? Various places to get materials. The first thing I list is a book we jus put out. We talk about graphing, all that. A nice resource. As far as information on getting CBM materials already made, there's AIMSweb, DIBELS online, off the web. There's Edcheck up, M cGraw-Hill has some, most of these you have to purchase, there's a cost. There's a website, intervention central.org, all one word. It's a gentleman, Jim Wright in Syracuse, New York, who does not sleep. He has fabulous materials you can get. Great resource for you. And last but not least -- the national center on student progress monitoring, who is put Thanksgiving on today, the research student on progress monitoring, at the University of Minnesota. Chris and Terry Wallace are the principle investigators, they have fabulous information on the website and are doing really great studies on progress monitoring material and looking at content materials for older grades, appropriate materials for kids with more severe reading difficulties. That's a website worth going to, to look at some additional information as well.

At this point we have finished with the PowerPoint presentation, have about nine minutes left to take questions.

If you want to ask a question you can unmute your phone by pressing star 7 on your telephone.

Hello?

My question, what research is available, what are we saying about math and writing in terms of assessment instruments, how reliable? My understanding is there isn't a lot of research with regard to curriculum based measurements for math and writing.

Yes and no. There are actually some really good studies and research on math, Lynn and Doug Fuchs, and strong research on math, things out of the University of Minnesota through the research institute on progress monitoring. I agree it's probably behind where we are in reading, because reading took the forefront, but they are working on it. There really is, as far as a general outcome measure in math there are really good assessment, CBM assessments out there to do that. As far as writing, it's a little trickier, needs to be worked on. Some great -- but also interesting research looking at punctuation to get good information about writing skill necessary a s in a more efficient way. I agree there's less behind it, but good math information out there.

Do you have the resources for that? You said you know of good assessment instruments in math? Do you know --

If you e-mail -- Lynn and Doug Fuchs have a fabulous math program. And yearly progress pro.

That I think pro-ed publishes, does a skills analysis. It will kind of -- it's somewhat diagnostic, tell you during the math problems the student always misses regrouping or where there's a zero. Math is sometimes much easier to did I ag nose diagnose.

Do you have the e-mail for the Fuchs?

No, if you google, Lynn or Doug Fuchs you will be able to e-mail them or you could go through the Center.

Thank you very much.

Other questions?

I have a question, Marlin in Kodiak Alaska. Anybody working with progress monitoring for students acquiring English? To speak another language, I would like to progress monitor student necessary that area.

Yes, there are people who looked add English as second language, some of those, Scott Baker, University of Oregon, probably others. A good resource would possibly be if you go to the research sfiewt institute on the second to last slide, they have a really nice database of research articles on progress monitoring. You could probably go through their database, find articles specifically related to your issues.

Thank you very much.

You're welcome.

Any other questions?

We would like to thank Dr. Hosp for sharing her program today. We hope you enjoyed today's event and plan to join us in the future. If you would like to print a copy of the PowerPoint slides you may do so. They will be available on the student progress monitoring center's website. Student progress.org. We appreciate your feedback about today's session, please take a few minutes to fill out the evaluation form on the screen. Thank you for participating we hope you found the experience worthwhile and look forward to meeting you online again.

I want to make one comment. Someone actually put in a question, yearly progress prois the McGraw-Hill, I apologize, it's not Pro-Ed. It's McGraw Hill.

Thanks, Michele.

call ends.