MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Teacher Education

*Holistic Transformer:*

*Transforming and developing scholars, reflective thinkers and facilitators, and responsible professionals who will change and transform the Delta and society beyond.*

**RD 411: Reading Assessments and Intervention**

Instructor: Class Meetings- Location/Time: Office Location:

Office Phone: E-mail Address: Office Hours: Spring 2020

COURSE DESCRIPTION: Reading Assessments and Interventions (formerly Diagnostic and Remedial Reading) focuses on an introduction to assessing foundational reading skills to inform effective instruction and interventions

CREDIT HOURS: 3

PRE-REQUISITES:RD 214, RD 310, RD 315

COURSE CONTENT:

Required Text(s):

Jennings, J. H., Caldwell, J. S., & Lerner, J. W. (2014). *Reading problems: Assessment*

 *and teaching strategies.* Boston: Pearson.

Supplemental Readings/Resources:

 MS College & Career Ready Standards

 <https://districtaccess.mde.k12.ms.us/curriculumandInstruction/MississippiCurriculumFramewor> ks/ELA/2016-MS-CCRS-ELA.pdf

 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (assessment materials) https://dibels.uoregon.edu/assessment/index/materialdownload/?agree=true

 Basic and Advanced Decoding Surveys (ReallyGreatReading.org)

 https://www.reallygreatreading.com/diagnostic-decoding-surveys-beginning-and-advanced

Early Reading Assessment: A Practitioner’s Handbook (Rathvon, 2004) New York: Guilford Press

 Fundamentals of Literacy Instruction & Assessment: PreK-6 (Hougen & Smartt, 2012)

Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Reutzel, R., & Cooter, R. B. (2020). Strategies for Reading Assessment and Instruction: Helping Every Child. Boston: Pearson.

Gunning. TH. G. (2018). Assessing and Correcting Reading and Writing Difficulties. Boston: Pearson.

PURPOSE/RATIONALE: This course is designed to provide the teacher candidate with specific knowledge about foundational reading skills and how to assess reading performance through formal and informal techniques and instruments. Students will have a clear understanding of how to administer universal screeners and diagnostic instruments to assess oral language, fluency, decoding ability, vocabulary, and comprehension. Teacher candidates will be familiar with the national norms for early reading skills and how to use data to inform grade level instruction and interventions.

GENERAL COURSE GOALS: RD 411 is an undergraduate course that is performance based. Students will learn various reading assessments both formative and summative, how to interpret test results, and how to use the results to teach reading.

MATRIX: LINKAGE OF THE HTM AND THE RD 411 GENERAL COURSE GOALS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| COURSE GOALS | HTMKnowledge | HTMSkills | HTMDisposition | IDA |
| 1. Understands and explain what comprise the foundational skills of early reading.  | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | A.1, 5, C.1 |
| 2. Understands and explain the stages of language development and the sequence of phonological and phonics skills. | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | A.6, C-1.2, C-2.1; C-3.2. |
| 3. Learn how to administer, score, and interpret a variety of early reading assessments, including universal screeners and diagnostic instruments. | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | D.1, D.4 |
| 4. Identify specific competencies, strengths, and deficits in early reading through formal and informal assessments.  | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | D.2 |
| 5. Understands and apply national norms for grade level skills in early reading.  | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | D.2 |
| 6. Explain results of assessments to a variety of audiences, including parents. | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | D.5, 6 |
| 7. Plan and execute appropriate interventions to remediate specific early literacy deficits.  | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | D.4, 5 |
| 8. Understands how to progress monitor and adapt instruction and interventions as needed.  | 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4,  | 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 | 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | D.3 |

**Outcome: Content**

**Candidate Proficiencies (Knowledge)**

 **1.0 Scholar**

* 1. The candidate **synthesizes** in-depth knowledge of content in specific disciplines with

research-based practices in the teaching and learning process.

* 1. The candidate **plans** instruction and integrates technology appropriately based on best practices.
	2. The candidate **selects** reliable and valid assessments to measure student performance.
	3. The candidate **demonstrates** theoretical, historical, and philosophical knowledge of diversity and equity.
	4. The candidate **identifies** appropriate technology that supports differentiated instruction.

 **Outcome: Processes, Skills**

 **Candidate Proficiencies (Skills)**

**2.0 Facilitator and Reflective Thinker**

**2.1** The candidate regularly **reflects** on the state, national, and professional curriculum

 standards as a basis for continuously improving teaching and learning.

**2.2** The candidate **designs and implements** unit and daily lesson plans that incorporate

 rigorous instructional strategies and infuses technology appropriately to enhance

 student learning.

**2.3** The candidate **administers** formative and summative assessments to measure student

 learning outcomes and to facilitate data-based decisions about instruction.

**2.4** The candidate **develops** adaptive instruction plans to meet the educational and social

 needs of all students in collaboration with community and parental support.

**2.5** The candidate **infuses/integrates** appropriate technology into lessons to enhance

 student learning.

 **Outcome: Dispositions**

 **Candidate Proficiencies (Dispositions)**

 **3.0 Responsible Professional**

**3.1** The candidate actively **collaborates** with relevant P-20 learning communities and professional education associations as evidence of a personal commitment to professional learning and development.

**3.2** The candidate **values, respects, and promotes** learning for all students and incorporates instructional technology.

**3.3** The candidate **systematically analyzes** individual student outcomes and makes appropriate decisions for student learning.

**3.4** The candidate **models** professional, responsible, and ethical behaviors to support social justice and equity in a diverse society.

**3.5** The candidate **incorporates** new technology based resources for instruction and

professional productivity

COURSE OBJECTIVES:At the end of the semester, the teacher candidate will be able to:

A: Objective – Knowledge: Teacher as Scholar

1. Understand and explain what comprise the foundational skills of early reading (HTM 1.1, 2.1, 3.1) (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 4, 7, 10) (TIAI 1, 3, 14, 25) (CAEP K-6 1.a, 3.c, 4.c, 5.a) (TGR 1, 4, 9)
2. Understands and explain the stages of language development and the sequence of phonological and phonics skills (HTM 1.1, 2.1, 3.1) (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 4, 7, 10) (TIAI 1, 3, 14, 25) (CAEP K-6 1.a, 3.c, 4.c, 5.a) (TGR 1, 4, 9)

B: Objective – Skills: Teacher as Facilitator and Reflective Thinker

1. Learn how to administer, score, and interpret a variety of early reading assessments, including universal screeners and diagnostic instruments (HTM 1.3, 2.3, 3.3) (CAEP 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 6) (TIAI 5, 8) (CAEP K-6 3.a, 3.b) (TGR 3)
2. Identify specific competencies, strengths, and deficits in early reading through formal and informal assessments (HTM 1.3, 2.3, 3.3) (CAEP 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 6) (TIAI 5, 8) (CAEP K-6 3.a, 3.b) (TGR 3)
3. Understand and apply national norms for grade level skills in early reading (HTM 1.2, 2.2, 3.2) (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 4, 7, 10) (TIAI 1, 3, 14, 25) (CAEP K-6 1.a, 3.c, 4.c, 5.a) (ISTE 2.b, 4.c, 4.c, 5.c, 6.a, 6.d) (TGR 1, 4, 9)
4. Explain results of assessments to a variety of audiences including parents (HTM 1.3, 2.3, 3.3) (CAEP 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 6) (TIAI 5, 8) (CAEP K-6 3.a, 3.b) (TGR 3)
5. Plan and execute appropriate interventions to remediate specific early literacy deficits (HTM 1.2, 2.2, 3.2) (CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) (INTASC 4, 7, 10) (TIAI 1, 3, 14, 25) (CAEP K-6 1.a, 3.c, 4.c, 5.a) (ISTE 2.b, 4.c, 4.c, 5.c, 6.a, 6.d) (TGR 1, 4, 9)

C: Objective – Disposition: Teacher as Responsible Professional

1. Hold responsibility for the student’s learning (HTM 1.4, 2.4, 3.4) (CAEP 1.1, 1.4) (INTASC 1, 2, 3, 8, 10) (TIAI 2, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23) (CAEP K-6 1.b, 1.c, 3.d, 3.e, 3.f, 4.c, 5.a) (ISTE 1.a, 2.c, 3.a, 3.b, 4.d, 5.a, 6.b) (TGR 2, 5, 7, 9)
2. Demonstrate confidence, courage, and passion for teaching (HTM 1.4, 2.4, 3.4) (CAEP 1.1, 1.4) (INTASC 1, 2, 3, 8, 10) (TIAI 2, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23) (CAEP K-6 1.b, 1.c, 3.d, 3.e, 3.f, 4.c, 5.a) (ISTE 1.a, 2.c, 3.a, 3.b, 4.d, 5.a, 6.b) (TGR 2, 5, 7, 9)

Note: HTM stands for the Holistic Transfer Model; CAEP standards for the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation; INTASC stands for the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium; TIAI stands for the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument; CAEP K-6 standards for the CAEP 2018 K-6 Elementary Teacher Preparation Standards; ISTE stands for the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards; and TGR stands for the Teacher Growth Rubric.

TECHNOLOGY INFUSION: Technology to be incorporated in this class: pen; paper, computer; internet; PowerPoint; overhead, projection; CD-ROM; VCR

FIELD EXPERIENCE AND CLINICAL PRACTICE: Field experience is not a component of this class. However, teacher candidates will be required to demonstrate administration of assessments, execution of interventions, and critique video samples of assessments and instruction during class time.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES: The in-class teaching methods used to accomplish the goals and objectives of the course include lecture, paired learning, demonstration, presentation, handouts, scaffolding, modeling of strategies with technology, simulations, whole group discussion and small heterogeneous cooperative group activities, and group and individual research. Presentation Methods: Demonstration, Discussion, Group Work, Lecture, Modeling, Role Play

STUDENT EVALUATION: The candidates will be evaluated based on class and group participation, quality of assignments, and attendance of class (Course Objective A-C).

A: Grading Criteria/Grading Procedures-performance based:

Students are graded on the university grading system that ranges from 0 to 100. There is no curve or predetermined distribution of grades in this course. A student’s grade is based on the quality of work in completing course requirements. The classroom practitioner will be evaluated based on class and group participation, quality of assignments, and attendance of class (Course Objectives A, B, and C).

B: Grading Scale: Grades are awarded for performances in accordance with Mississippi Valley

State University’s grading policy.

1. Outstanding effort and performance 90-100=A
2. Satisfactory effort and performance 80-89=B
3. Mediocre effort and performance 70-79=C
4. Minimal effort and performance 60-69=D
5. Failure to meet the intent of the assignment 0-59=F

C: Grading procedures are performance based (Rubrics will be provided to you during the course of study):

1. Practice on running records and interpret the results (Objectives A, B)
2. Practice on observation checklist and interpret the results (Objectives A, B)
3. Practice on assessment on the concepts about print (Objectives A, B) (the 10 point rubric)
4. Practice on interest and attitude inventory (Objectives A, B) (the 10 point rubric)
5. Practice on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation surveys (Objectives A, B)
6. Critique on peer-reviewed research studies in reading assessment published in recent 5 years (Objectives A, B) (the 10 point rubric)
7. Develop a lesson plan based on the test results (Objectives A, B) (the 10 point rubric)
8. Design an activity that explicitly teaches one of five components of reading and present in class (presentation the 5 point rubric, essay on what, how, and why you use the strategy and activities the 5 point rubric) .(Objectives B) (the 10 point rubric)
9. Mid-term exam—Analytical Reading Inventory (Objectives A, B) (the 20 point rubric)
10. Final project—Case Study (Objectives A, B, C) (the 20 point rubric)
11. Electronic Portfolio (Objectives A, B, C) (the 5 point rubric)
12. Positive attitude, participation in class discussion/activities, and emailing to the instructor about his/her contact information (Objectives C) (the 5 point rubric)

We reserve the right to curve letter grades, but will only curve them to your advantage.

D: Attendance Policy: The student is expected to attend every class, arriving on time and leaving only after the class has dismissed.Unless appropriate documentation is provided, any student missing three (3) classes will automatically find that their final course grade will be lowered a letter. Excessive absences (beyond three) will necessitate a reduction in the student’s class participation points. Three (3) tardiness or three (3) leave early will result in one (1) absence. Please see MVSU undergraduate catalog on pp. 46-47 for university class attendance policy.

E: Make-up Policy: When possible, student with an excused absence be allowed to make-up work. Perspective candidates are responsible for all content, discussion, and materials covered during his/her absence. Make provisions with a classmate to obtain notes, copies and other assignment information prior to returning to class so as to be prepared for full class participation. Late work will result in a loss of points.

F: Cell phone Policy: No cell phone should be used except you are expecting an emergency call.

ADA SYLLABUS STATEMENT:Mississippi Valley State University is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for students with a documented disability. If you feel you are eligible to receive accommodations for a covered disability (medical, physical, psychiatric, learning, vision, hearing, etc.) and would like to request it for this course, you must be registered with the Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) program administered by University College. It is recommended that you visit the Disabilities Office located in the Social Science Building Office 105 to register for the program at the beginning of each semester. For more information or to schedule an appointment, please contact Mrs. Kathy Brownlow, via phone or email at 662-254-3443 or kbrownlow@mvsu.edu.

PLAGIARISM/ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:Plagiarism is the intentional or careless use of someone else’s language, ideas, information or original work without acknowledging the source and presenting it as one’s own. Please see the sanctions for the academic integrity violations, MVSU undergraduate catalog pp. 112-114.

To address the situation of plagiarism, the University has implemented Turnitin to fight plagiarism and improve reading, writing, and research skills. Turnitin is a comprehensive plagiarism prevention system that lets faculty quickly and effectively check all students’ work. Results are based on exhaustive searches of billions of pages from both current and archived instances on the Internet. Plagiarism will result in at least a failing grade for the assignment(s) and/or course.

CALENDAR OF ACTIVITIES/COURSE TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Wk Dates Topics

1 8/26 Review syllabus and Overview of Reading and Reading Problems

2 9/2 Factors Associated with Reading Problems

3 9/9 Gathering Data to Develop Students’ Literacy Profiles

4 9/16 Norm-Referenced and Criterion-Referenced Assessments

 5 9/23 Administering an Informal Reading Inventory

 6 9/30 Providing Instruction and Intervention

7 10/7 **Mid-term exam**

810/14 Early Literacy

 9 10/21 Improving Word Knowledge: Word Recognition

 10 10/28 Improving Word Knowledge: Fluency

11 11/4 Vocabulary Development and Listening Comprehension

12 11/11 Comprehension of Narrative and Informational Text

13 11/18Integrating Reading and Writing

14 11/25 **Fall Break and Thanksgiving Holiday**

15 12/2 Literacy Instruction for Diverse Learners and Students with Special Needs

 Senior Final

16 12/9 **Final Exam**

REFERENCES:

**Educational Journals:**

*The* *Literacy Teacher* (International Literacy Association)

*Literacy Research Quarterly* (International Literacy Association)

*English Journal* (National Council of Teachers of English)

 *Journals of Literacy Research* (National Reading Conference)

 *Reading Research and Instruction* (College Reading Association)

**Educational Websites:**

https://www.mdek12.org Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards for

English Language Arts

http://www.ccsso.org Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)

https://dyslexiaida.org International Dyslexia Association (IDA) Standards

http://www.literacyworldwide.org International Literacy Association

http://www.caepnet.org Council for the Accreditation of Educator

Preparation

https://www.iste.org/standards/computational-thinking the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards

http://www.ed.gov Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

United States Department of Education

 http://www.mde.k12.ms.us Mississippi Department of Education

 http://www.mvsu.edu/library/online\_resources.php

 EBSCO host, ID/pwd: magn1309

 [**www.mvsu.edu**](http://www.mvsu.edu) Mississippi Valley State University website

**Other References Include:**

Amendum, S. J. (2014). Embedded Professional Development and Classroom-Based Early Reading Intervention: Early DiagnosticReading Intervention Through Coaching. *Reading & Writing Quarterly**, 30*(14). 348-377.

Chall, J. (1996). *Stages of reading development (2nd ed.).* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.

Chen, S. F. (2017). Modeling the influences of upper-elementary school students’ digital reading literacy, socioeconomic factors, and self-regulated learning strategies. *Research in Science & Technological Education. 35*(3), 330-348. DOI: 10.1080/02635143.2017.1314958.

Cunningham, A. E., & Stanovich, K. E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. American Educator, 22(1 & 2), 8-15.

Davis, D. S., & Willson, A. (2015).  Practices and Commitments of Test-centric Literacy Instruction: Lessons from a Testing Transition. *Reading Research Quarterly, 50*(3), 357-379. DOI: 10.1002/rrq.103.

Dodson, J. (2008). 50 nifty activities for 5 components and 3 tiers of reading instruction. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services.

Goral, D. P., & Bailey, A. L. (2019). Student self-assessment of oral explanations: Use of language learning progressions. Language Testing, 36(3), 391-417. 27.

Hart, B. & Risley, T. (2003). The Early Catastrophe: The 30 Million Word Gap. American Educator, 27, 4-9.

Kamil, M. L., Pearson, P. D., Moje, E. B., & Afflerbach, P. P. (2011). *Handbook of reading research*

 *(Vol. IV).* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Kamil, M.L. Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson, P.D., & Barr, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of reading research (Vol. 3).* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kilpatrick, D. A. (2015). Essentials of Assessing, Preventing, and Overcoming Reading Difficulties. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley

Kontovourki, S. (2012). [Reading Leveled Books in −Assessment-Saturated Classrooms: A Close Examination of Unmarked Processes of Assessment.](http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5Ie4499%2f7KexSLek63nn5Kx58du%2bSa2nrkewpq9Lnqq4SbOwr0yexss%2b8ujfhvHX4Yzn5eyB4rO0T7Oorki0qq4%2b6tfsf7vb7D7i2Lt57t6kjN%2fdu1nMnN%2bGu62ySLCor0uznOSH8OPfjLvc84Tq6uOQ8gAA&hid=25) *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(2), p153-171. DOI: 10.1002/RRQ.014.

Moats, L. C., & Tolman, C. (2009). The Challenge of Learning to Read. Boston, MA: Sopris West.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the*

 *National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based*

 *assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for*

 *reading instruction. (*NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S.

 Government Printing Office.

Navarro, J. J., & Mourgues-Codern, C. (2018). Dynamic Assessment and Computerized Adaptive Tests in Reading Processes. Journal of Cognitive Education & Psychology. 17(1), 70-96.

Petersen, D. B., Allen, M. M., & Spencer, T. D. (2016). [Predicting Reading Difficulty in First Grade Using Dynamic Assessment of Decoding in Early Kindergarten.](http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5Ie4499%2f7KexSLek63nn5Kx58du%2bTK2ntkewpq9Onqm4TbSwsFCexss%2b8ujfhvHX4Yzn5eyB4rOrT7Sur0u2p69MpOLfhuWz44ak2uBV3%2bbmPvLX5VW%2fxKR57LOvSbCvr06xpq4%2b5OXwhd%2fqu37z4uqM4%2b7y&hid=4101)  *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 49*(2),200-215. DOI: 10.1177/0022219414538518.

Piasta, S. B., Connor, C. M., Fishman, B. J., & Morrison, F. J. (2009). Teachers’ knowledge

 of literacy concepts, classroom practices, and student reading growth. *Scientific Studies*

 *of Reading, 13*(3), 224–248.

Scarborough, H. S., & Brady, S. A. (2002). Toward a common terminology for talking about speech and reading: A glossary of the “phon” words and some related terms. *Journal of Literacy Research, 34*(3), 299-336.

Seidenberg, M. S., & M, & McClelland, J. L. (1989). A distributed, developmental model of word recognition and naming. *Psychological Review, 96*, 523-568.

Stone, C. A., Silliman, E. R., Ehren, B. J., & Wallach, G. P. (2014). *Handbook of Language & Literacy: Development and Disorders.* New York: The Guilford.

Tolman, C. (2009). *Teaching phonics, word study, and the alphabetic principle: Presenter’s kit*. Boston, MA: Sopris West.

Toste, J. R., Capin, P., Williams, K. J., Cho, E., & Vaughn, S. (2019). Replication of an experimental study investigating the efficacy of a multisyllabic word reading intervention with and without motivational beliefs training for struggling readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 52*(1),45-58.
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Disclaimer: The information and schedule of events contained in this syllabus are subject to change.