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**National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)**

**The Nation’s Report Card**

**Achievement-Level Policy Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement-Level</th>
<th>Policy Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic</strong></td>
<td>Partial Mastery of prerequisite skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong></td>
<td>Solid Academic Performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced</strong></td>
<td>Superior Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Beginning Reading Core Components**

1. **Phonemic Awareness** – The understanding that individual sounds of spoken language (phonemes) work together to make words. This allows readers to hear, identify, and manipulate the individual sounds.

2. **Phonics** – The relationship between the sounds of spoken language (phonemes) and the letters representing those sounds in written language (graphemes). Skill in phonics helps students to recognize familiar words and decode unfamiliar ones.

3. **Fluency** – The skill of reading texts accurately and quickly, which allows readers to recognize and comprehend words at the same time.

---


---
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Beginning Reading Core Components

#4. Vocabulary – The ability to store information about the meaning and pronunciation of words. There are four types of vocabulary: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

#5. Reading Comprehension – Understanding, remembering, and communicating with others about what has been read. Comprehension strategies help readers to make sense of a text.


http://DIBELS.uoregon.edu

DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)

The Robin’s Nest

There was a robin’s nest outside our kitchen window. The nest was in a tall bush. The mother robin sat in the nest all day long. One day when I was watching, the mother bird flew away. I saw the eggs she was sitting on. There were four blue eggs.

I watched and watched. The eggs moved. I watched some more. The eggs started to crack. Finally, the eggs hatched. I saw four baby birds. The baby birds opened their beaks wide. I heard them peeping. Soon the mother bird came back. Then the mother robin put worms in their mouths.

Every day I watched the baby birds and their mother. Pretty soon the babies were so fat there was no room for the mother. Then one morning the nest was gone from the bush.
DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF)

Here are some more make-believe words (point to the student probe). Start here (point to the first word) and go across the page (point across the page). When I say, “begin”, read the words the best you can. Point to each letter and tell me the sound or read the whole word. Read the words the best you can. Put your finger on the first word. Ready, begin.

kik woj sig faj yis
kaj fek av zin zez
lan nul zem og nom
yuf pos vok viv feg
bub dij sij vus tos
wuv nij pik nok mot
nif vec al boj nen
yuv yig dit tum joj
yaj zof um vim vel
tig mak sog wot sav

Using an Outcomes Driven Model to Provide Decision Rules for Progress Monitoring

Outcomes Driven model: Decision making steps

1. Identifying Need for Support
2. Validating Need for Instructional Support
3. Planning and Implementing Instructional Support
4. Evaluating and Modifying Instructional Support
5. Reviewing Outcomes for Individuals and Systems


Reviewing Outcomes

Key Decisions for Outcome/Accountability Assessment:

- Does the child have the early literacy skills predictive of successful reading outcomes?
- Does the school have a schoolwide system of instruction and support so their students achieve literacy outcomes?

Data used to inform the decision:

- Evaluate individual student’s performance with respect to benchmark goals that put the odds in favor of achieving subsequent literacy goals.
- Compare school/district outcomes to goals and outcomes from previous year and to other schools in the district or region.
- Evaluate the schoolwide system (core curriculum and instruction, supplemental support, and intervention) for each step to identify strengths and targets of opportunity for improvement.
Schoolwide System of Instruction and Support

--- Core Curriculum and Instruction ---

- Not just the reading curriculum selected but also the way it is delivered.
- aka Primary Prevention or Benchmark Instruction
- **Primary Goal:** Meet the needs of 80% of students in the school. If the schools has lots of children who need strategic or intensive support, the core curriculum and instruction will need to include many feature of strategic support and intensive intervention
- **Primary Step-Goal:** Support all benchmark students to make adequate progress and achieve the benchmark goal.
- **Secondary Step-Goal:** Support 50% of strategic students to achieve the benchmark goal.

--- Supplemental Support ---

- Additional time, smaller group, more intensive, supplemental or intervention program, delivered with fidelity.
- aka Secondary Prevention or Strategic Support
- **Primary Goal:** Meet the needs of 15% of students in the school who will need more support than the core curriculum and instruction can provide.
- **Primary Step-Goal:** Adequate progress to reduce risk of reading difficulty. Support all strategic students to achieve the benchmark goal.
Schoolwide System of Instruction and Support

-- Intervention --

- Additional time, smaller group, more intensive, supplemental or intervention program, delivered with fidelity.
- aka Tertiary Prevention or Intensive Intervention
- **Primary Goal:** Meet the needs of the 5% of students in the school who will need very intensive intervention to achieve literacy goals.
- **Primary Step-Goal:** Accelerate learning and progress to support all intensive students to achieve the benchmark goal or reduce their risk of reading difficulty to strategic. If one step can get them to strategic, the next step can get them to benchmark.

---

**Steps to Achieving Reading Outcomes**

Adapted from Good, R. H., Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*, 257-288.

---

**Instructional Goals for Essential Components of Beginning Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Essential Component</th>
<th>DIBELS Indicator</th>
<th>Goal Skill Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid K</td>
<td>Phonological Awareness</td>
<td>Initial Sound Fluency</td>
<td>25-35 on ISF (and 18 on PSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End K</td>
<td>Phonological Awareness &amp; Alphabetic Principle</td>
<td>Phonemic Segmentation Fluency</td>
<td>35-45 on PSF (and 25 on NWF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid 1st</strong></td>
<td>Alphabetic Principle &amp; Fluency</td>
<td>Nonsense Word Fluency</td>
<td>50-60 on NWF with 15 words recoded (and 20 on DORF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End 1st</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency</td>
<td>40-50 on DORF (and 25% on RTF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End 2nd</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency</td>
<td>90+ on DORF (and 25% on RTF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End 3rd</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency</td>
<td>110+ on DORF (and 25% on RTF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DIBELS Steps to Reading Success**

**One Step per Semester**
**One Goal per Step**
(Keep moving in the direction of the next goal)
### DIBELS Steps During 1st Semesters

**Odd steps begin at beginning of the year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>First Grade</th>
<th>Second Grade</th>
<th>Third Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Odd steps end at middle of the year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 - PSF</th>
<th>Step 3 - NWF</th>
<th>Step 4 - ORF 1</th>
<th>Step 5 - ORF 2</th>
<th>Step 6 - ORF 2</th>
<th>Step 7 - ORF 3</th>
<th>Step 8 - ORF 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 - ISF</td>
<td>NWF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
<td>G3 ORF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIBELS Steps During 2nd Semesters

**Even steps begin at middle of the year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>First Grade</th>
<th>Second Grade</th>
<th>Third Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beg</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWF</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Even steps end at end of the year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2 - PSF</th>
<th>Step 3 - NWF</th>
<th>Step 4 - ORF 1</th>
<th>Step 5 - ORF 2</th>
<th>Step 6 - ORF 2</th>
<th>Step 7 - ORF 3</th>
<th>Step 8 - ORF 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 - ISF</td>
<td>NWF</td>
<td>G1 ORF</td>
<td>G2 ORF</td>
<td>G3 ORF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Effectiveness by School or District

- **At the beginning of the step, how many students have an Intensive, Strategic, or Benchmark Instructional Recommendation?**
- Some schools face a greater challenge for the step than others. For example, 63% of all students were Benchmark at the beginning of first grade.
What is the total number of Test District students involved in this step? Absent, move-in and move-out are not included. What percent of them ended the step with a Deficit, Emerging, or Established status in the step goal skill (NWF in this case)? For example, 67% of all students achieved established NWF in the middle of first grade.

What percent of students who start the step with an Intensive, Strategic, or Benchmark Instructional Recommendation ended the step with a Deficit Status in the step goal skill (NWF in this case)?

% of Instructional Recommendation is the most interpretable. For example, 33% of intensive students had a deficit in NWF in the middle of first grade.

What percent of students starting the step with an Intensive, Strategic, or Benchmark Instructional Recommendation ended the step with a Emerging Status in the step goal skill (NWF in this case)? For example, 17% of Benchmark students had emerging NWF in the middle of first grade.

What percent of students starting the step with an Intensive, Strategic, or Benchmark Instructional Recommendation ended the step with a Established Status in the step goal skill (NWF in this case)? For example, 46% of Strategic students achieved established NWF in middle of first grade.
### Test District (R2-8) - Beginning-of-the-Step Instructional Recommendations

1. How many 1st graders are included in this Test District report? (C5e) __________

2. How many 1st graders in the Test District at the beginning-of-the-step had Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) ______

3. What percentage of 1st graders in the Test District at the beginning-of-the-step had Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) ______

4. Which school had the lowest percentage of 1st graders with Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) ______

5. Which school had the highest percentage of 1st graders with Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) ______

6. Which school had the lowest percentage of 1st graders with Benchmark instructional recommendations? (C4a) ______

7. What could a school do to have a higher percentage of 1st graders with a Benchmark instructional recommendation at the beginning of first grade? ______

### Test District (R2-8) - Beginning-of-the-Step Instructional Recommendations

1. How many 1st graders are included in this Test District report? (C5e) 406

2. How many 1st graders in the Test District at the beginning-of-the-step had Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) 49

3. What percentage of 1st graders in the Test District at the beginning-of-the-step had Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) 12.1%

4. Which school had the lowest percentage of 1st graders with Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) Washington

5. Which school had the highest percentage of 1st graders with Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) Jefferson

6. Which school had the lowest percentage of 1st graders with Benchmark instructional recommendations? (C4a) Jefferson

7. What could a school do to have a higher percentage of 1st graders with a Benchmark instructional recommendation at the beginning of first grade? Strengthen kindergarten instruction, catch move-ins early
(R2-9) Outcomes for Intensive Students at the Beginning-of-the-Step

1. How many 1st graders in the Test District at the beginning-of-the-step had Intensive instructional recommendations? (C2a) ____

2. How many of the beginning-of-the-step Intensive students were Deficit in NWF at the end of the step? (C2b) ____

3. What percent of beginning-of-the-step Intensive students were Deficit in NWF at the end of the step? (C2b) ____

4. How many of the beginning-of-the-step Intensive students were Emerging in NWF at the end of the step? (C2c) ____

5. What percent of beginning-of-the-step Intensive students were Emerging in NWF at the end of the step? (C2c) ____

6. How many of the beginning-of-the-step Intensive students were Benchmark in NWF at the end of the step? (C2d) ____

7. What percent of the beginning-of-the-step Intensive students were Benchmark in NWF at the end of the step? (C2d) ____

8. What percent of the beginning-of-the-step Intensive students made adequate progress? ____

Adequate Progress

Not Adequate Progress

4/1/05 Atlanta, GA NASP 2005
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Test district (R2-8) - End-of-the-Step Outcomes

1. What percent of 1st graders in the Test District at the end-of-the-step were Established in NWF? (C5e) ____

2. What percent of Intensive students at the beginning-of-the-step were Established on NWF at the end of the step? (C2d) _____

3. What percent of Strategic students at the beginning-of-the-step were Established on NWF at the end of the step? (C3d) ______

4. What percent of Benchmark students at the beginning-of-the-step were Established on NWF at the end of the step? (C4d) ______

5. Which school was most effective in supporting Benchmark students at the beginning-of-the-step to achieve Established on NWF at the end of the step? (C4d) __________

6. Which school was least effective in supporting Benchmark students at the beginning-of-the-step to achieve Established on NWF at the end of the step? (C4d) __________

67%

31%

46%

82%

Washington

McKinley
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Evaluating Effectiveness

I. Outcomes Criterion – Bottom line
- 95% of all students achieve the early literacy goal.

II. Adequate Progress Criteria – are all students making adequate progress?
- Core Curriculum and Instruction: Benchmark students make adequate progress and achieve goals
- Supplemental Support: Strategic students make adequate progress and achieve goals
- Intensive Intervention: Intensive students make adequate progress and achieve goals or at least reduce risk.

I. Outcomes Criterion

Schoolwide System Strength – The schoolwide instructional system is a strength, including Core Curriculum and Instruction, Supplemental Support, and Intensive Intervention.
- Absolute Standard: 95% or more of all students schoolwide achieve the next literacy goal.
- If outcomes criterion is not met, evaluate the effectiveness of each layer of the system using the Adequate Progress Criteria, including:
  - Core Curriculum and Instruction,
  - Supplemental Support, and
  - Intensive Interventions.

II. Adequate Progress Criterion

- Benchmark Students
  - Effective core curriculum & instruction should:
    - support 95% of benchmark students to achieve each literacy goal.

- Strategic Students
  - Effective supplemental support should:
    - support 80% of strategic students to achieve each literacy goal.

- Intensive Students
  - Effective interventions should:
    - support 80% of intensive students to achieve the goal or achieve emerging or some risk status.

Absolute Standard and Relative Standard of Adequate Progress

- Absolute Standard – held constant from year to year, represents an ambitious goal that all schools could attain. Strength:
  - Adequate progress for 95% of Benchmark
  - Adequate progress for 80% of Strategic
  - Adequate progress for 80% of Intensive

- Relative Standard – Based on most recently available schoolwide norms. Represents the current state of curriculum, supplemental support, intervention.
  - Relative Strength: Upper third compared to other schools
  - Needs Support: Middle third compared to other schools
  - Needs Substantial Support: Lower third compared to other schools
### Step-by-Step: Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Core Curriculum & Instruction or Primary Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard?</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide System Outcome</td>
<td>Absolute Standard 95% of all students meet goal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Adequate Progress: Meet Goal</td>
<td>Absolute Standard 95% of Benchmark students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Upper 3rd of Benchmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Middle 3rd of Benchmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Lower 3rd of Benchmark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Needs Substantial Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step-by-Step: Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Strategic Support or Secondary Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard?</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide System Outcome</td>
<td>Absolute Standard 95% of all students meet goal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Adequate Progress: Meet Goal</td>
<td>Absolute Standard 80% of Strategic students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Upper 3rd of Strategic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Middle 3rd of Strategic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Lower 3rd of Strategic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Needs Substantial Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step-by-Step: Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Intensive Intervention or Tertiary Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Type of Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard?</th>
<th>Index of Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide System Outcome</td>
<td>Absolute Standard 95% of all students meet goal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Adequate Progress: Emerging or Meets Goal</td>
<td>Absolute Standard 80% of Intensive students</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Upper 3rd of Intensive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Middle 3rd of Intensive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative Standard Lower 3rd of Intensive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Needs Substantial Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step-by-Step Schoolwide System: Core Curriculum and Instruction, Supplemental Support, Intensive Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Step Grade, Semester</th>
<th>Core Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Supplemental Support</th>
<th>Intensive Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinder, 1st Sem: Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder, 2nd Sem: Phonemic Awareness and Phonics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, 1st Sem: Phonics and Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, 2nd Sem: Fluency and Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second, 1st Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second, 2nd Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, 1st Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, 2nd Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus on Support

- What can we do systemically to support the effectiveness of the Schoolwide System of Instruction?
- What would it take to help the school achieve literacy goals?
  - Professional development on essential components of early literacy?
  - More powerful interventions or supplemental materials?
  - Coaching to improve fidelity of implementation?
  - Additional resources to meet the needs of challenging students (e.g., ELL, high mobility)?
  - Administrative support to invest substantial time and resources to change outcomes?

Evaluating Effectiveness Example

- Test District is a real school district that has been blinded – all school names, district names, class names, and student names are fictitious.
- Focus first on schoolwide evaluation of the core curriculum and instruction.
  - Powerful and effective core enhances outcomes for all students: Benchmark, Strategic, Intensive.
- Focus step by step. A school can have effective core curriculum and instruction for one step but not another.
  - First Semester of First Grade appears nationally to be a target of opportunity to change reading outcomes.

Evaluating Effectiveness Worksheet

- First, clarify the primary instructional goal for the first semester of first grade.
  - Essential Component: Phonics or Alphabetic Principle
  - DIBELS Indicator: Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF)
  - Goal Skill Level: 50 letter sounds correct per minute with recoding
  - Timeline: by the middle of first grade.

First, Examine Schoolwide Outcomes

I. Outcomes Criterion:

- Schoolwide system of instruction and support in the first semester of first grade is a strength if 95% of students are Established on DIBELS NWF in the middle of first grade.
  - Core curriculum and instruction is effective
  - System of additional interventions is effective
First, Examine Schoolwide Outcomes

- From the previous slide:
  - McKinley: Established 44%, Emerging 44%, Deficit 13%
  - Washington: Established 82%, Emerging 12%, Deficit 7%

- Neither school meets the Outcomes Criterion for a Schoolwide System Strength in their instruction and support for the first semester of first grade.

- Next step: Are students making adequate progress in the first semester of first grade?

Next, Examine for Adequate Progress

Are benchmark students reaching goal?

- Effective core curriculum and instruction should support benchmark students to make adequate progress and achieve essential early literacy goals.

- Use Effectiveness Report
  - Focus on schoolwide summary
  - Classroom report illustrates individual classrooms and children

- For example,
  - Washington School has 95% of Benchmark students reaching the middle of first grade goal.
  - McKinley School has 67% of Benchmark students reaching the middle of first grade goal.
School-Based Norms Identify Upper Third, Middle Third, and Lower Third

Upper Third: 55% or fewer of Benchmark students achieve NWF Goal

Upper Third: 73% or more of Benchmark students achieve NWF Goal

Compare to Decision Rules and Other Schools to evaluate effectiveness

- Effective core curriculum and instruction supports 95% of benchmark students to achieve the goal.
  - Washington: Met - *Strength*
  - McKinley: Not met.
- Compared to other schools, McKinley School is in the
  - Upper Third - *Strength*
  - Middle Third – Needs Support
  - Lower Third – Needs Substantial Support

McKinley Elementary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Step Grade, Semester</th>
<th>Core Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Supplemental Support</th>
<th>Intensive Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinder, 1st Sem: Phonemic Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder, 2nd Sem: Phonemic Awareness and Phonics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, 1st Sem: Phonics and Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First, 2nd Sem: Fluency and Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second, 1st Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second, 2nd Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, 1st Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, 2nd Sem: Fluency and Comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target of Opportunity

- Identifying a classroom, schoolwide, or even district-wide step as needing substantial support is a *target of opportunity*.
- *Needs Support* or *Needs Substantial Support* means we have the knowledge, skills, curriculum, interventions to accomplish better outcomes for the instructional step and contribute to changing reading outcomes in third grade.
Use Models of Effective Core Curriculum and Instruction

- Seek models of success in the district, state, or region.
- Within the district, Washington School is an exemplar of effective core instruction in the first semester of first grade with students with similar skills at the beginning of first grade.
- How are they structuring the school day?
- How are they assigning resources?
- What curriculum are they using?
- The essential question is, How can we support McKinley to accomplish the high outcomes?

Classroom and Student Level Reports

- Classroom level reports can identify strengths and weaknesses within a school, but caution is indicated.
- Sometimes students with additional needs or challenges are grouped together in a class.
- Sometimes reading instructional groups are organized across classes.
- Sometimes student mobility impacts one class more than another.
- The most important level of interpretation and the clearest information is the schoolwide report.

Summary of Effectiveness by Student and Classroom
Themes

- Don’t lose track of the bottom line. Are we getting closer to important and meaningful outcomes?
- Review Outcomes on -- and teach -- what is important: Phonemic Awareness, Alphabetic Principle, Accuracy and Fluency with Connected Text
- *Alphabetic Principle* is an important middle-of-first grade instructional goal and target of reviewing outcomes.
- Use Effectiveness Reports to *make decisions* that *support systems* to change outcomes for children.
- Evaluating Effectiveness should be *efficient and purposeful*.
- *Start early!* Trajectories of reading progress are very difficult to change.
1. **First Semester Goal:** What is the primary instructional goal for the first half of kindergarten?
   - Core Component or Big Idea: ________________________________
   - DIBELS Measure: ________________________________
   - Goal Skill Level: ________________________________
   - Goal Timeline to Achieve: ________________________________

2. **First Semester Outcome:** In the middle of kindergarten, on ISF, what percent are:
   - Established: ______
   - Emerging: ______
   - Deficit: ______

   Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met? Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength  No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.

3. **Initial Skills:** In the beginning of kindergarten, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   - Benchmark: ______
   - Strategic: ______
   - Intensive: ______

4. **Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students:** Of the students who were Benchmark at the beginning of kindergarten, what percent achieved the ISF goal of 25 for the middle kindergarten? ______

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   - Strength – 95% to 100% of benchmark students achieve ISF goal.
   - Relative Strength – 73% to 94% of benchmark achieve ISF goal
   - Needs Support – 53% to 72% of benchmark students achieve ISF goal.
   - Substantial Support – 0% to 52% of benchmark students achieve ISF goal.

6. **Adequate Progress of Strategic Students:** Of the students who were Strategic at the beginning of kindergarten, what percent achieved the ISF goal of 25 for the middle kindergarten? ______

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   - Strength – 80% to 100% of strategic students achieve ISF goal.
   - Relative Strength – 42% to 79% of strategic achieve ISF goal
   - Needs Support – 22% to 41% of strategic students achieve ISF goal.
   - Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 21% of strategic students achieve ISF goal.

8. **Adequate Progress of Intensive Students:** Of the students who were Intensive at the beginning of kindergarten, what percent achieved ISF of 10 (emerging) or 25 (established) for the middle of kindergarten? ______

9. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   - Strength – 80% to 100% of intensive students achieve ISF emerging or established.
   - Relative Strength – 76% to 79% of intensive students achieve ISF emerging or established.
   - Needs Support – 55% to 75% of intensive students achieve ISF emerging or established.
   - Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 54% of intensive students achieve ISF emerging or established.

10. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? If so, what is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system? (Use additional pages as needed.)
**School: __________________________**

**Kindergarten Second Semester**  
*Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet*

1. **Second Semester Goal:** What is the primary instructional goal for the second half of kindergarten?
   - Core Component or Big Idea: __________________________
   - DIBELS Measure: __________________________
   - Goal Skill Level: __________________________
   - Goal Timeline to Achieve: __________________________

2. **Second Semester Outcome:** At the end of kindergarten, on PSF, what percent are:
   - Established: _______
   - Emerging: _______
   - Deficit: _______

   Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met? 
   - Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength
   - No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   **If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.**

3. **Initial Skills:** In the middle of the kindergarten, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   - Benchmark: _______
   - Strategic: _______
   - Intensive: _______

4. **Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students:** Of the students who were Benchmark in the middle of kindergarten, what percent achieved the PSF goal of 35 for the end of kindergarten? _______

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   - Strength – 95% to 100% of benchmark students achieve PSF goal.
   - Needs Support – 86% to 94% of benchmark students achieve PSF goal.
   - Substantial Support – 0% to 85% of benchmark students achieve PSF goal.

6. **Adequate Progress of Strategic Students:** Of the students who were Strategic in the middle of kindergarten, what percent achieved the PSF goal of 35 for the end of kindergarten? _______

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   - Strength – 80% to 100% of strategic students achieve PSF goal.
   - Relative Strength – 75% to 79% of strategic achieve PSF goal
   - Needs Support – 50% to 74% of strategic students achieve PSF goal.
   - Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 49% of strategic students achieve PSF goal.

8. **Adequate Progress of Intensive Students:** Of the students who were Intensive in the middle of kindergarten, what percent achieved PSF of 10 (emerging) or 35 (established) for the end of kindergarten? _______

9. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   - Strength – 80% to 100% of intensive students achieve PSF emerging or established.
   - Needs Support – 57% to 79% of intensive students achieve PSF emerging or established.
   - Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 56% of intensive students achieve PSF emerging or established.

10. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? If so, what is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system? (Use additional pages as needed.)
First Grade - First Semester
Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet

1. First Semester Goal: What is the primary instructional goal for the first half of first grade?
   Core Component or Big Idea: __________________________
   DIBELS Measure: __________________________
   Goal Skill Level: __________________________
   Goal Timeline to Achieve: __________________________

2. First Semester Outcome: In the middle of first grade, on NWF, what percent are:
   Established: _______ Emerging: _______ Deficit: _______
   Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met? Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength  No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.

3. Initial Skills: In the beginning of first grade, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   Benchmark: _______ Strategic: _______ Intensive: _______

4. Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students: Of the students who were Benchmark at the beginning of first grade, what percent achieved the NWF goal of 50 for the middle of first grade? _______

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   □ Strength – 95% to 100% of benchmark students achieve NWF goal.
   □ Relative Strength – 73% to 94% of benchmark achieve NWF goal
   □ Needs Support – 56% to 72% of benchmark students achieve NWF goal.
   □ Substantial Support – 0% to 55% of benchmark students achieve NWF goal.

6. Adequate Progress of Strategic Students: Of the students who were Strategic at the beginning of first grade, what percent achieved the NWF goal of 50 for the middle of first grade? _______

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   □ Strength – 80% to 100% of strategic students achieve NWF goal.
   □ Relative Strength – 40% to 79% of strategic achieve NWF goal
   □ Needs Support – 20% to 39% of strategic students achieve NWF goal.
   □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 19% of strategic students achieve NWF goal.

8. Adequate Progress of Intensive Students: Of the students who were Intensive at the beginning of first grade, what percent achieved NWF of 30 (emerging) or 50 (established) for the middle of first grade? _______

9. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   □ Strength – 80% to 100% of intensive students achieve NWF emerging or established.
   □ Relative Strength – 67% to 79% of intensive students achieve NWF emerging or established
   □ Needs Support – 40% to 66% of intensive students achieve NWF emerging or established.
   □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 39% of intensive students achieve NWF emerging or established.

10. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? What is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system for the first semester of first grade?
First grade - Second Semester
Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet

1. Second Semester Goal: What is the primary instructional goal for the second half of first grade?
   Core Component or Big Idea: ________________________________
   DIBELS Measure: ________________________________
   Goal Skill Level: ________________________________
   Goal Timeline to Achieve: ________________________________

2. Second Semester Outcome: At the end of first grade, on DORF, what percent are:
   Low Risk: ______  Some Risk: ______  At Risk: ______
   Is the outcome criterion (95% Low Risk) met?  
   Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength  
   No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.

3. Initial Skills: In the middle of first grade, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   Benchmark: ____  Strategic: ____  Intensive: ____

4. Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students: Of the students who were Benchmark in the middle of first grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 40 for the end of first grade? _______

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   □ Strength – 95% to 100% of benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   □ Needs Support – 89% to 94% of benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   □ Substantial Support – 0% to 88% of benchmark students achieve DORF goal.

6. Adequate Progress of Strategic Students: Of the students who were Strategic in the middle of first grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 40 for the end of first grade? _______

7. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   □ Strength – 80% to 100% of strategic students achieve DORF goal.
   □ Relative Strength – 42% to 79% of strategic achieve DORF goal
   □ Needs Support – 24% to 41% of strategic students achieve DORF goal.
   □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 23% of strategic students achieve DORF goal.

8. Adequate Progress of Intensive Students: Of the students who were Intensive in the middle of first grade, what percent achieved DORF of 20 (emerging) or 40 (established) for the end of first grade? _______

9. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   □ Strength – 80% to 100% of intensive students achieve DORF emerging or established.
   □ Relative Strength – 50% to 79% of intensive students achieve DORF emerging or established
   □ Needs Support – 26% to 49% of intensive students achieve DORF emerging or established.
   □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 25% of intensive students achieve DORF emerging or established.

10. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? What is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system for the second semester of first grade?
Second Grade - First Semester
Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet

11. **First Semester Goal**: What is the primary instructional goal for the first half of second grade?

   Core Component or Big Idea: ____________________________
   
   DIBELS Measure: ____________________________
   
   Goal Skill Level: ____________________________
   
   Goal Timeline to Achieve: ____________________________

12. **First Semester Outcome**: In the middle of second grade, on DORF, what percent are:

   Low Risk: _______ Some Risk: _______ At Risk: _______

   Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met? [ ] Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength [ ] No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.

13. **Initial Skills**: In the beginning of second grade, what percentage of students schoolwide are

   Benchmark: _______ Strategic: _______ Intensive: _______

14. **Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students**: Of the students who were Benchmark at the beginning of second grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 68 for the middle second grade? _______

15. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?

   [ ] Strength – 95% to 100% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   [ ] Needs Support – 93% to 95% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   [ ] Substantial Support – 0% to 92% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.

16. **Adequate Progress of Strategic Students**: Of the students who were Strategic at the beginning of second grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 68 for the middle second grade? _______

17. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?

   [ ] Strength – 80% to 100% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.
   [ ] Relative Strength – 48% to 79% of Strategic achieve DORF goal
   [ ] Needs Support – 28% to 47% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.
   [ ] Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 27% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.

18. **Adequate Progress of Intensive Students**: Of the students who were Intensive at the beginning of second grade, what percent achieved DORF of 52 (some risk) or 68 (low risk) for the middle of second grade? _______

19. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?

   [ ] Strength – 80% to 100% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   [ ] Relative Strength – 20% to 79% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   [ ] Needs Support – 6% to 19% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   [ ] Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 5% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.

20. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? If so, what is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system for the first semester of second grade?
Second grade - Second Semester
Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet

11. **Second Semester Goal:** What is the primary instructional goal for the second half of second grade?
   
   Core Component or Big Idea: ________________________________
   
   DIBELS Measure: ________________________________
   
   Goal Skill Level: ________________________________
   
   Goal Timeline to Achieve: ________________________________

12. **Second Semester Outcome:** At the end of second grade, on DORF, what percent are:
   
   Low Risk: ______  Some Risk: ______  At Risk: ______

   Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met?  
   [ ] Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength  [X] No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   **If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.**

13. **Initial Skills:** In the middle of second grade, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   
   Benchmark: ______  Emerging: ______  Intensive: ______

14. **Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students:** Of the students who were Benchmark in the middle of second grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 90 for the end of second grade? ______

15. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   
   [ ] Strength – 95% to 100% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   
   [ ] Relative Strength – 88% to 94% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   
   [ ] Needs Support – 78% to 87% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   
   [ ] Substantial Support – 0% to 77% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.

16. **Adequate Progress of Some Risk Students:** Of the students who were Emerging in the middle of second grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 90 for the end of second grade? ______

17. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   
   [ ] Strength – 80% to 100% of Emerging students achieve DORF goal.
   
   [ ] Relative Strength – 20% to 79% of Emerging achieve DORF goal
   
   [ ] Needs Support – 7% to 19% of Emerging students achieve DORF goal.
   
   [ ] Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 6% of Emerging students achieve DORF goal.

18. **Adequate Progress of Intensive Students:** Of the students who were Intensive in the middle of second grade, what percent achieved DORF of 70 (some risk) or 90 (low risk) for the end of second grade? ______

19. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   
   [ ] Strength – 80% to 100% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   
   [ ] Relative Strength – 14% to 79% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   
   [ ] Needs Support – 5% to 13% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   
   [ ] Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 4% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.

20. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? What is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system for the second semester of second grade?
School: ______________________________

**Third grade - First Semester**

**Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet**

21. **First Semester Goal:** What is the primary instructional goal for the first half of third grade?
   - Core Component or Big Idea: ______________________________
   - DIBELS Measure: ______________________________
   - Goal Skill Level: ______________________________
   - Goal Timeline to Achieve: ______________________________

22. **First Semester Outcome:** In the middle of third grade, on DORF, what percent are:
   - Low Risk: _______  Emerging: _______  Deficit: _______
   - Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met? Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength  No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   **If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.**

23. **Initial Skills:** In the beginning of third grade, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   - Benchmark: _______  Strategic: _______  Intensive: _______

24. **Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students:** Of the students who were Benchmark at the beginning of third grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 92 for the middle third grade? _______

25. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   - □ Strength – 95% to 100% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   - □ Relative Strength – 93% to 94% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   - □ Needs Support – 84% to 92% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.
   - □ Substantial Support – 0% to 83% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.

26. **Adequate Progress of Strategic Students:** Of the students who were Strategic at the beginning of third grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 92 for the middle third grade? _______

27. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   - □ Strength – 80% to 100% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.
   - □ Relative Strength – 29% to 79% of Strategic achieve DORF goal.
   - □ Needs Support – 13% to 28% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.
   - □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 12% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.

28. **Adequate Progress of Intensive Students:** Of the students who were Intensive at the beginning of third grade, what percent achieved DORF of 67 (some risk) or 92 (low risk) for the middle of third grade? _______

29. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   - □ Strength – 80% to 100% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   - □ Relative Strength – 22% to 79% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   - □ Needs Support – 10% to 21% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.
   - □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 9% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.

30. Do parts of the schoolwide system **Need Support** or **Need Substantial Support**? If so, what is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system for the first semester of third grade?
School: ______________________________

**Third grade - Second Semester**

_Evaluating Effectiveness of Schoolwide System Worksheet_

21. **Second Semester Goal:** What is the primary instructional goal for the second half of third grade?
   - Core Component or Big Idea: _______________________________
   - DIBELS Measure: _______________________________
   - Goal Skill Level: _______________________________
   - Goal Timeline to Achieve: _______________________________

22. **Second Semester Outcome:** At the end of third grade, on DORF, what percent are:
   - Low Risk: _______  
   - Some Risk: _______  
   - At Risk: _______

   Is the outcome criterion (95% Established) met?  
   - Yes. Schoolwide System is a Strength  
   - No. Go to 3 & evaluate progress

   **If Schoolwide System Strength you do not need to complete numbers 3 – 10.**

23. **Initial Skills:** In the middle of third grade, what percentage of students schoolwide are
   - Benchmark: _______  
   - Strategic: _______  
   - Intensive: _______

24. **Adequate Progress of Benchmark Students:** Of the students who were Benchmark in the middle of third grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 110 for the end of third grade? _______

25. How would you rate the effectiveness of the core curriculum and instruction?
   - □ Strength – 95% to 100% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.  
   - □ Relative Strength – 89% to 94% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.  
   - □ Needs Support – 80% to 88% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.  
   - □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 79% of Benchmark students achieve DORF goal.

26. **Adequate Progress of Strategic Students:** Of the students who were Strategic in the middle of third grade, what percent achieved the DORF goal of 110 for the end of third grade? _______

27. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of supplemental support?
   - □ Strength – 80% to 100% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.  
   - □ Relative Strength – 25% to 79% of Strategic achieve DORF goal.  
   - □ Needs Support – 13% to 24% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.  
   - □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 12% of Strategic students achieve DORF goal.

28. **Adequate Progress of Intensive Students:** Of the students who were Intensive in the middle of third grade, what percent achieved DORF of 80 (some risk) or 110 (low risk) for the end of third grade? _______

29. How would you rate the effectiveness of the schoolwide system of intensive intervention?
   - □ Strength – 80% to 100% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.  
   - □ Relative Strength – 33% to 79% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.  
   - □ Needs Support – 20% to 32% of Intensive students achieve DORF some risk or low risk.  
   - □ Needs Substantial Support – 0% to 19% of Intensive students achieve DORF emerging or established.

30. Do parts of the schoolwide system Need Support or Need Substantial Support? What is the plan to improve the effectiveness of the schoolwide system for the second semester of third grade?
### Schoolwide Summary of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Grade: Semester</th>
<th>Primary Instructional Goal</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Core Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Supplemental Support</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Intensive Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinder: First Semester</td>
<td>Phonological Awareness: 25 on ISF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder: Second Semester</td>
<td>Phonemic Awareness: 35 on PSF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First: First Semester</td>
<td>Alphabetic Principle: 50 on NWF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First: Second Semester</td>
<td>Oral Reading Fluency: 40 on DORF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second: First Semester</td>
<td>Oral Reading Fluency: 68 on DORF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second: Second Semester</td>
<td>Oral Reading Fluency: 90 on DORF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third: First Semester</td>
<td>Oral Reading Fluency: 92 on DORF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third: Second Semester</td>
<td>Oral Reading Fluency: 110 on DORF</td>
<td>95% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
<td>80% upper third</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
#### Summary of Effectiveness by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District: Test District</th>
<th>School: All Schools</th>
<th>Date: 2001-2002</th>
<th>Step: Beginning of Kindergarten to Middle of Kindergarten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test District</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Beginning of Kindergarten Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Mid-Year to Middle of Kindergarten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 432</td>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.9% of Total Students</td>
<td>66 Students Intensive at Beginning of K</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1% of Total Students</td>
<td>170 Students Strategic at Beginning of K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9% of Total Students</td>
<td>37 Students Benchmark at Beginning of K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.1% of Total Students</td>
<td>196 Students Benchmark at Beginning of K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4% of Total Students</td>
<td>N = 95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Adams**
- **Count**: 13
- **% of Instructional Recommendation**: 14.9%
- **% of Total**: 23.1%
  - **Intensive**: 3
  - **Strategic**: 37
  - **Benchmark**: 37
- **Deficit**: 6.9%
- **Emerging**: 49.4%
- **Established**: 43.7%

**Garfield**
- **Count**: 15
- **% of Instructional Recommendation**: 23.1%
- **% of Total**: 36.9%
  - **Intensive**: 1
  - **Strategic**: 24
  - **Benchmark**: 26
- **Deficit**: 1.5%
- **Emerging**: 35.4%
- **Established**: 43.7%

**Jefferson**
- **Count**: 12
- **% of Instructional Recommendation**: 16.9%
- **% of Total**: 21.4%
  - **Intensive**: 1
  - **Strategic**: 32
  - **Benchmark**: 32
- **Deficit**: 7%
- **Emerging**: 45.1%
- **Established**: 47.9%

**Lincoln**
- **Count**: 13
- **% of Instructional Recommendation**: 17.1%
- **% of Total**: 21.4%
  - **Intensive**: 3
  - **Strategic**: 24
  - **Benchmark**: 39
- **Deficit**: 7.9%
- **Emerging**: 47.4%
- **Established**: 44.7%

**McKinley**
- **Count**: 5
- **% of Instructional Recommendation**: 13.2%
- **% of Total**: 21.4%
  - **Intensive**: 1
  - **Strategic**: 16
  - **Benchmark**: 17
- **Deficit**: 7.9%
- **Emerging**: 39.5%
- **Established**: 52.6%

**Washington**
- **Count**: 8
- **% of Instructional Recommendation**: 8.4%
- **% of Total**: 21.4%
  - **Intensive**: 1
  - **Strategic**: 37
  - **Benchmark**: 50
- **Deficit**: 6.3%
- **Emerging**: 35.8%
- **Established**: 57.9%

---
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Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
Summary of Effectiveness by District

District: Test District
School: All Schools
Date: 2001-2002
Step: Middle of Kindergarten to End of Kindergarten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle of Kindergarten</th>
<th>Instructional Recommendation to</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on PSF in End of Kindergarten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test District</td>
<td>59 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>143 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.8% of Total Students</td>
<td>33.5% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>7 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>34 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5% of Total Students</td>
<td>41.5% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>7 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>12 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.7% of Total Students</td>
<td>20% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>25 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.5% of Total Students</td>
<td>35.2% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>9 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>20 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.2% of Total Students</td>
<td>27% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>6 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>17 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% of Total Students</td>
<td>39.5% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>14 Students Intensive at Middle of K</td>
<td>35 Students Strategic at Middle of K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4% of Total Students</td>
<td>36.1% of Total Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Summary of Effectiveness by District

**District:** Test District  
**School:** All Schools  
**Date:** 2001-2002  
**Step:** Beginning of 1st Grade to Middle of 1st Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive at Beginning of Year to Benchmark at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic at Beginning of Year to Benchmark at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark at Beginning of Year to Benchmark at Beginning of Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Effectiveness by District**

### Test District

- **Count:** 406  
- **Deficit:** 7.6%  
- **Emerging:** 25.9%  
- **Established:** 66.5%

### Adams

- **Count:** 73  
- **Deficit:** 6.8%  
- **Emerging:** 30.1%  
- **Established:** 63%

### Garfield

- **Count:** 51  
- **Deficit:** 3.9%  
- **Emerging:** 23.5%  
- **Established:** 72.5%

### Jefferson

- **Count:** 68  
- **Deficit:** 8.8%  
- **Emerging:** 23.5%  
- **Established:** 67.6%

### Lincoln

- **Count:** 72  
- **Deficit:** 6.9%  
- **Emerging:** 29.2%  
- **Established:** 63.9%

### McKinley

- **Count:** 55  
- **Deficit:** 12.7%  
- **Emerging:** 43.6%  
- **Established:** 43.6%

### Washington

- **Count:** 87  
- **Deficit:** 6.9%  
- **Emerging:** 11.5%  
- **Established:** 81.6%
## Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
### Summary of Effectiveness by District

**District:** Test District  
**School:** All Schools  
**Date:** 2001-2002  
**Step:** Middle of 1st Grade to End of 1st Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle of First Instructional Recommendation to End of First Benchmark Status on ORF</th>
<th>Intensive at Middle of Year</th>
<th>Strategic at Middle of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark at Middle of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on ORF in End of First (Totals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Risk</td>
<td>Some Risk</td>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>At Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Count | 43 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
11.1% of Total Students | 120 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
33.3% of Total Students | 239 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
55.6% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 62.8% | 37.2% | 0% | 14.2% | 47.5% | 38.3% | 0.4% | 4.6% | 95% |
| % of Total | 6.7% | 4% | 0% | 4.2% | 14.2% | 11.4% | 0.2% | 2.7% | 56.5% |
| **Adams** | 8 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
11.1% of Total Students | 24 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
33.3% of Total Students | 40 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
55.6% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| Count | 6 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 38 |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 75% | 25% | 0% | 20.8% | 58.3% | 20.8% | 0% | 5% | 95% |
| % of Total | 8.3% | 2.8% | 0% | 6.9% | 19.4% | 6.9% | 0% | 2.8% | 52.8% |
| **Garfield** | 3 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
5.6% of Total Students | 19 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
35.2% of Total Students | 32 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
59.3% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| Count | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 29 |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 66.7% | 33.3% | 0% | 5.3% | 52.6% | 42.1% | 3.1% | 6.3% | 90.6% |
| % of Total | 3.7% | 1.9% | 0% | 1.9% | 18.5% | 14.8% | 1.9% | 3.7% | 53.7% |
| **Jefferson** | 8 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
11.6% of Total Students | 25 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
36.2% of Total Students | 36 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
52.2% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| Count | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 32 |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 50% | 50% | 0% | 8% | 44% | 48% | 0% | 11.1% | 88.9% |
| % of Total | 5.8% | 5.8% | 0% | 2.9% | 15.9% | 17.4% | 0% | 5.8% | 46.4% |
| **Lincoln** | 4 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
5.7% of Total Students | 22 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
31.4% of Total Students | 44 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
62.9% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| Count | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 50% | 50% | 0% | 9.1% | 45.5% | 45.5% | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| % of Total | 2.9% | 2.9% | 0% | 2.9% | 14.3% | 14.3% | 0% | 0% | 62.9% |
| **McKinley** | 16 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
30.2% of Total Students | 17 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
32.1% of Total Students | 20 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
37.7% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| Count | 10 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 19 |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 29.4% | 47.1% | 23.5% | 0% | 5% | 95% |
| % of Total | 18.9% | 11.3% | 0% | 9.4% | 15.1% | 7.5% | 0% | 1.9% | 35.8% |
| **Washington** | 4 Students Intensive at Middle of 1st  
4.8% of Total Students | 13 Students Strategic at Middle of 1st  
15.5% of Total Students | 67 Students Benchmark at Middle of 1st  
79.8% of Total Students | | | | | | |
| Count | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 65 |
| % of Instructional Recommendation | 75% | 25% | 0% | 15.4% | 30.8% | 53.8% | 0% | 3% | 97% |
| % of Total | 3.6% | 1.2% | 0% | 2.4% | 4.8% | 8.3% | 0% | 2.4% | 77.4% |
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Summary of Effectiveness by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Total on ORF in Middle of Second Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test District</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>At Risk 90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Some Risk 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>Low Risk 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adams</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>At Risk 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Some Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Low Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garfield</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>At Risk 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Some Risk 6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>Low Risk 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jefferson</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>At Risk 85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>Some Risk 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Low Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>At Risk 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Some Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Low Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McKinley</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>At Risk 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Some Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Low Risk 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>At Risk 85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>Some Risk 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>Low Risk 7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
### Summary of Effectiveness by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School: All Schools</th>
<th>Date: 2001-2002</th>
<th>Step: Middle of 2nd Grade to End of 2nd Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Intensive at Middle of Year to End of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on ORF in End of Second (Totals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>At Risk 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Some Risk 27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Low Risk 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>At Risk 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Some Risk 23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Low Risk 63.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic at Middle of Year to End of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on ORF in End of Second (Totals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Some Risk 27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Low Risk 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>At Risk 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Some Risk 23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Low Risk 58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>At Risk 14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark at Middle of Year to End of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Instructional Recommendation</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on ORF in End of Second (Totals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills
### Summary of Effectiveness by District

**District**: Test District  
**School**: All Schools  
**Date**: 2001-2002  
**Step**: Beginning of 3rd Grade to Middle of 3rd Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test District</th>
<th>Intensive at Beginning of Year to Benchmark Status on ORF</th>
<th>Strategic at Beginning of Year to Benchmark Status on ORF</th>
<th>Benchmark at Beginning of Year to Benchmark Status on ORF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Instructional Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total Students</strong></td>
<td>95 Students</td>
<td>100 Students</td>
<td>206 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>22 Students</td>
<td>20 Students</td>
<td>28 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>19 Students</td>
<td>14 Students</td>
<td>34 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>10 Students</td>
<td>15 Students</td>
<td>29 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>12 Students</td>
<td>13 Students</td>
<td>39 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>12 Students</td>
<td>14 Students</td>
<td>25 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year At Risk</strong></td>
<td>20 Students</td>
<td>24 Students</td>
<td>51 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Some Risk</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Low Risk</strong></td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Summary of Effectiveness by District

**District:** Test District  
**School:** All Schools  
**Date:** 2001-2002  
**Step:** Middle of 3rd Grade to End of 3rd Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle of Third Instructional Recommendation to End of Third Benchmark Status on ORF</th>
<th>Intensive at Middle of Year to End of Year</th>
<th>Strategic at Middle of Year to End of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark at Middle of Year to End of Year</th>
<th>Benchmark Status on ORF in End of Third (Totals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>66 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>76 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>252 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>N = 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>16.8% of Total Students</td>
<td>19.3% of Total Students</td>
<td>64% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>At Risk 14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some Risk 24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Low Risk 60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adams</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>17 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>39 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>n = 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>18.8% of Total Students</td>
<td>24.6% of Total Students</td>
<td>56.5% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>At Risk 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some Risk 24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low Risk 60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garfield</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>10 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>45 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>n = 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>14.1% of Total Students</td>
<td>15.6% of Total Students</td>
<td>70.3% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>At Risk 14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some Risk 32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Risk 53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jefferson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>11 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>36 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>n = 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>17.5% of Total Students</td>
<td>19.3% of Total Students</td>
<td>63.2% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>At Risk 12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some Risk 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low Risk 54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>9 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>46 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>n = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>8.3% of Total Students</td>
<td>15% of Total Students</td>
<td>76.7% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>At Risk 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some Risk 13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low Risk 76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McKinley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>8 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>32 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>n = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>20% of Total Students</td>
<td>16% of Total Students</td>
<td>64% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>At Risk 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some Risk 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low Risk 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19 Students Intensive at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>21 Students Strategic at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>54 Students Benchmark at Middle of 3rd</td>
<td>n = 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Instructional Recommendation</td>
<td>20.2% of Total Students</td>
<td>22.3% of Total Students</td>
<td>57.4% of Total Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>At Risk 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some Risk 26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low Risk 56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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