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Providing Summative Growth Data with Acadience Reading K–6

Acadience Reading K–6 is a research-validated reading assessment useful for identifying students who need additional instructional support and for monitoring the progress of student reading growth over time.

Scores on the Acadience Reading assessment are used to measure a student’s individual reading progress over the course of the year and to determine how his or her performance compares with that of other students. The Summative Growth Report provides additional information for educators to consider when examining systems-level reading outcomes using Acadience Reading data. This report allows administrators to see how one classroom compares to other classrooms at the same grade level across the nation.

The Summative Growth Report is unique and valuable because a student’s reading progress is measured only in comparison to other students who began the year at a similar level. This procedure ensures that classroom systems comprised primarily of students who have low skills are not unfairly compared to classroom systems comprised primarily of students who have high skills.

The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used first and foremost to examine system-level outcomes with the goal of supporting teachers in their efforts to improve student and classroom outcomes. For schools that must now include formative reading data in their teacher-evaluation program, the Summative Growth Report may also be useful as one piece of information about student growth within a comprehensive educator-evaluation and accountability program. We strongly recommend certain conditions be met for schools using the Summative Growth Report in this manner (see pages 4–7 of this Implementation Guide).
How to Use Acadience Reading K–6 with the Summative Growth Report

The following shows how the Summative Growth Report fits into the cycle of assessment and instruction already in place with Acadience Reading. Schools must establish this cycle early in the year and ensure that teachers are aware of how the Summative Growth Report works in conjunction with Acadience Reading.

**Cycle of Assessment and Instruction**

1. Administer the Acadience Reading **Beginning-of-Year Benchmark Assessment**.
   - Enter beginning-of-year scores into your eligible data-management system.*
   - Teachers set student goals as needed (using the Pathways of Progress™ Goal-Setting Utility*).

2. Conduct Acadience Reading progress monitoring as needed to ensure students are on track to meet goals.

3. Administer the Acadience Reading **Middle-of-Year Benchmark Assessment**.
   - Enter middle-of-year scores into your eligible data-management system.
   - Teachers review middle-of-year Acadience Reading data to ensure students are on track to meet goals.

4. Conduct Acadience Reading progress monitoring as needed to ensure students are on track to meet goals.

5. Administer the **Acadience Reading End-of-Year Benchmark Assessment** following the procedures outlined in this manual.
   - Enter end-of-year scores into your eligible data-management system.
   - Teachers review end-of-year scores and classroom Pathways of Progress reports to identify which students have met goals.

6. Administrators review the **Summative Growth Report** data with teachers to evaluate reading progress for individual students, classrooms, and schools.

---

*For 2018–2019, the eligible data-management system is Acadience Data Management from DMG.

1The Pathways of Progress Goal-Setting Utility is available in Acadience Data Management. For additional information about Pathways of Progress, see https://acadiencelearning.org/pathways_of_progress.html
Key Considerations

How should the assessment data be used?
Acadience Reading assessment results are designed to help teachers monitor students’ skill levels and make instructional decisions that will help improve reading outcomes. Results of the Summative Growth Report may be used to evaluate the progress of groups of students (e.g., classroom systems). These summative growth data may also be used as one part of a comprehensive educator evaluation approach.

How are materials managed?
Acadience Reading materials are publicly available, however, they should not be used for practice or sent home with students in advance of an assessment (i.e., benchmark or progress monitoring). When a student practices a test form prior to assessment, the scores obtained may not be a valid representation of student reading skill, which could prevent the student from receiving the additional support he or she needs.

Who should administer the assessments to students?
Acadience Reading must be administered by someone who is properly trained. If schools are planning to use the Summative Growth Report for teacher evaluation or accountability purposes, then schools should choose alternatives to teachers testing their own students for the end-of-year benchmark when practical to do so. See pages 5–6 for information on choosing and training assessors.

How are the assessments scored?
Acadience Reading assessments should be scored according to the procedures outlined in the Acadience Reading Assessment Manual (Good et al., 2011, revised 2018). Each assessor should have a copy of this manual when administering the Acadience Reading assessment. Additional copies are available from Dynamic Measurement Group or for purchase from Voyager Sopris Learning.

Who should enter student data into the data-management system?
Teachers may enter a student’s beginning-of-year and middle-of-year benchmark data and any progress-monitoring scores into the data-management system. If the the Summative Growth Report is going to be used for educator evaluation, then someone other than the student’s classroom teacher should enter scores for the end-of-year Acadience Reading benchmark.
Overview
The primary purpose of assessment in an educational context is to inform instruction and improve learning. Acadience Reading K–6 is a research-based assessment for identifying students who need instructional support, targeting skills for instruction, and monitoring growth toward important reading outcomes. Acadience Reading was designed to support instructional decision making for the purpose of improving reading outcomes and to help teachers meet their learning goals for their students. Acadience Reading was not developed or intended to be used for high-stakes decisions such as evaluating individual teachers for accountability.

Using Acadience Reading for teacher evaluation is of concern because of the potential for unfairness:

1. Acadience Reading is generally available to anyone, and school personnel have access to benchmark materials at any time. It is conceivable, though strongly discouraged, that test forms could be practiced or sent home for practice prior to the assessment. When a student practices a test form prior to the benchmark assessment, the scores obtained may not be a valid representation of student reading skill.
2. Some educators could be at an advantage due to having mostly high-performing students or at a disadvantage due to having mostly low-performing students.

Recent developments in the area of teacher and principal evaluation have led educators to ask the authors of the Acadience family of assessments at Dynamic Measurement Group (DMG) about the use of Acadience Reading for teacher accountability. We believe that every teacher wants his or her students to learn. Schools that rely on Acadience Reading and that are now required to provide teacher-evaluation information based on their formative reading assessment data may wish to have a measure with the reliability, validity, and utility of Acadience Reading. DMG has developed procedures that allow for the examination of student growth over time in a summative fashion in a manner that addresses the issue of fairness in two important ways:

1. Administrators at the district level agree to ensure that (a) the Acadience Reading measures are administered by a well-trained assessor, (b) assessment fidelity is periodically checked, (c) end-of-year benchmark testing is conducted by someone other than the student’s teacher whenever possible, and (d) they strongly discourage using assessment materials for practice and monitor instances of such. These procedures increase confidence that the use of Acadience Reading is fair and consistently implemented. (See Procedures, page 4, for more information.)
2. The Summative Growth Report provides an evaluation of reading growth over time, compared to other students with the same level of initial skills. As such, teachers are not penalized for having students with very low initial skills because their growth will be compared to others with the same initial skill level. Similarly, students who start the year above the benchmark will not give teachers an unfair advantage because their growth will be compared to other students who started the year with the same high scores.
We envision the primary use of the Summative Growth Report to be for examining reading outcomes for classroom systems as part of an Outcomes-Driven service delivery model. However, following the guidelines and procedures outlined in this Implementation Guide, the Summative Growth Report may be used as one indicator of student growth within a comprehensive teacher-evaluation and accountability program.

**Acadience Reading and the Outcomes-Driven Model**

The Acadience Reading measures were developed to provide teachers with information they need to make decisions about instruction. The authors of Acadience Reading advocate a data-based decision-making model, referred to as the Outcomes-Driven Model, because the data are used to make decisions to improve student outcomes by matching the amount and type of instructional support with the needs of the individual students. The steps of the model are described below. More detailed information on the Acadience Reading measures and the Outcomes-Driven Model is available in the Acadience Reading Assessment Manual (Good et al., 2011, revised 2018). Additionally, technical information on Acadience Reading is available in the Acadience Reading K–6 Technical Manual (Good et al., 2013, revised 2019).

**Step 1:** Benchmark data are used to identify need for instructional support, as defined by scoring below or well below the benchmark or in a way that raises concern for teachers.

**Step 2:** Scores are validated. This step begins by determining the fidelity and accuracy of the data collected. At this step, educators determine if they are reasonably confident in the accuracy of the scores. If there are concerns about the accuracy of the data, then scores are validated by retesting or gathering additional information until we are reasonably confident that additional instructional support is needed.

**Step 3:** Instructional support is planned and implemented based on Acadience Reading and other assessment data.

**Step 4:** The effectiveness of instructional support is evaluated with ongoing progress-monitoring data.

**Step 5:** Outcomes are reviewed for all students, individually and in the aggregate, at the next benchmark assessment time.
At Step 5 of the Outcomes-Driven Model, educators review the outcomes for all of their students using the middle- and end-of-year benchmark assessments. This process is a self-evaluation conducted by a reflective professional. “How am I doing? How can I improve outcomes?” The consequences of action or inaction at this step are generally between the educator and the student. In contrast, use of the Summative Growth Report may involve consideration of outcomes by a supervisor (or someone in a supervisory role) when used as a part of a comprehensive teacher evaluation approach. Questions might include: “How effective is this classroom system in supporting students who began the year At, Below, and Well Below Benchmark to make progress?” “How is a particular teacher doing?” “What are the strengths and targets of opportunity within each grade level?” or “What classroom systems or teachers may need additional support?” The consequences of student growth or lack of growth over the course of the school year may contribute to decisions about access to professional development, promotion, the direction of resources, etc.

**Important Features of the Summative Growth Report**

There are a number of features that make Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report a useful tool for evaluating the effectiveness of classroom systems’ instructional support. Acadience Reading is:

1. **Sensitive to Instruction:** Acadience Reading provides an opportunity to empower teachers and principals in the process of evaluating instructional effectiveness. The Acadience Reading measures directly assess the basic literacy skills needed every day in the classroom. Thus, student growth is not based on high-inference
assessments, where student performance on a test is inferred to be related to classroom tasks. In addition, Acadience Reading measures are very sensitive to instruction, thus empowering educators to quickly and efficiently know what skills students need to learn and focus their teaching on these skills. While other assessment results may not be known for weeks or months, Acadience Reading data allow teachers to immediately know where students are at the beginning of the school year. Acadience Reading data also allow teachers to track student progress frequently across the year rather than make decisions based on a test given once a year.

2. Efficient: Using Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report is efficient because an additional assessment is not needed.

3. Fair: Student growth is measured against other students who started the year with the same initial skill level. Educators are not penalized for having students with very low initial skills because their growth will be compared to others with the same initial skill level. Similarly, students who start the year above the benchmark will not give educators an unfair advantage because their growth will be compared to other students who started the year with the same high scores. Data are used within an open, public, and transparent decision-making framework.

4. Research Supported: The technical properties of Acadience Reading can be found in the Acadience Reading K–6 Technical Manual (Good et al., 2013, revised 2019). The oral reading (Oral Reading Fluency; ORF) and silent reading (Maze) passages were studied for readability and assignment to grade levels.

5. Empowering: When using Acadience Reading and the Summative Growth Report, educators are able to know the level of skill and the timeline that define adequate student progress. Frequent progress information is readily available for students of concern. Finally, using the Pathways of Progress Goal-Setting Utility, educators are able to establish goals that are meaningful, ambitious, and attainable.

Procedures for Using Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report

There are several key procedures for using Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report. These procedures are particularly important to follow when using this report for teacher evaluation or accountability purposes. Most often, a school-level administrator (e.g., school principal) will be in charge of implementation. However, other key personnel identified by the school administrator, such as an Acadience Reading Mentor or assessment coordinator, may also manage some of the implementation responsibilities.

Implementation Responsibilities

The administrator in charge of overseeing the use of Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report has the following responsibilities:

1. Discuss the use of Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report and how it fits into the overall plan for evaluating instruction. Most typically, this step will be carried out by a school-level administrator (i.e., principal).

2. Coordinate the implementation and the assessment process, including ensuring that assessors are trained to administer Acadience Reading with fidelity (see the Preparing and Training Assessors section on pages 5–6).

3. Conduct Acadience Reading testing within a two- to three-week window.

4. If the data will be used as one piece of information in a comprehensive teacher evaluation process, develop a plan to ensure that students are not tested by their own teacher for the end-of-year benchmark.

5. Monitor the fidelity and accuracy of the assessment.
6. Keep the data-entry process secure. Ensure data are entered into a system that supports the Summative Growth Report. For 2018–2019, the system that supports the Summative Growth Report is Acadience Data Management from DMG. Enter your Acadience Reading data as you typically would. Please note that we recommend that teachers not enter their own students’ Acadience Reading end-of-year benchmark data when using the Summative Growth Report for teacher evaluation and accountability purposes.

7. Make reports and interpretation guidance available to appropriate staff and support them in using the data appropriately.

Schedule
DMG recommends use of a two- to three-week assessment window and that each grade level be assessed in the same order that was used at the beginning of the year.

Assessors
One of the key decisions that must be made is determining who will collect the data. When using the Summative Growth Report for educator evaluation or accountability, we recommend that teachers not test their own students for the end-of-year benchmark assessment. Teachers may participate in end-of-year benchmark data collection with Acadience Reading by testing any students other than their own. Assignment of teaching staff to assessment classes might best be done at the school or district level, close to the end-of-year benchmark assessment time. Several practical options are described below and are discussed further in the *Acadience Reading Assessment Manual* (Good et al., 2011, revised 2018):

1. Swap classrooms. Teachers can pair up, swap classrooms, and assess the students in the other teacher’s class. Swapping classrooms could be conducted within or across grades.

2. Use assessment teams. Assessment teams can include classroom teachers and other school personnel who have been trained in Acadience Reading. In some schools, assessment teams do not include classroom teachers.

3. Train other personnel as assessors. Retired teachers, substitutes, student teachers, or interns who have been properly trained can collect the end-of-year benchmark data.

Preparing and Training Assessors
Once assessors are identified, the administration and scoring procedures for Acadience Reading should be reviewed to ensure accuracy and fidelity of assessment. The *Acadience Reading Assessment Manual* (Good et al., 2011, revised 2018) includes the standardized procedures for accurately administering and scoring each measure. The *Acadience Reading Assessment Manual* is available from Dynamic Measurement Group. Each assessor should have a copy of the *Acadience Reading Assessment Manual* and review it before testing. Video scoring practice is available on the DMG website at https://acadiencelearning.org/scoring_practice.html.

We recommend checking the administration and scoring accuracy of each assessor prior to administering the Acadience Reading assessment. Refresher training should be conducted with personnel who will be collecting the data. The following methods may be used to check assessment accuracy:

1. Observe each assessor testing one student and fill out the Acadience Reading Assessment Accuracy Checklist found in the *Acadience Reading Assessment Manual* (Good et al., 2011, revised 2018). This checklist is used to observe and give feedback to the assessor.
2. Conduct shadow scoring with each assessor by having two assessors work with a student at the same time. One assessor administers the measures while the other is simultaneously timing and scoring. After the assessment is completed, the two assessors compare timing and scores. Scores on each measure should be within 1 or 2 points and within 5 points on ORF Retell. Differences in scoring marks or total score, or questions about correct scoring procedures, can be resolved by consulting the Acadience Reading Assessment Manual.

Training (or refresher training) on administration and scoring is available from Dynamic Measurement Group.

Data Collection and Assessment Considerations

Which Students to Assess

All students who have the response capabilities to complete Acadience Reading assessments should participate in testing, including students who are diverse learners (e.g., students receiving special education services, English Language Learners). A student should not be excluded unless Acadience Reading testing is inappropriate for that student. Acadience Reading testing is appropriate for most students for whom learning to read in English is an instructional goal.

However, Acadience Reading testing is not appropriate for the following:
- Students who are learning to read primarily in a language other than English
- Students who are deaf
- Students who have fluency-based speech disabilities such as stuttering (if it occurs during the Acadience Reading testing) or oral apraxia
- Students with severe disabilities for whom learning to read connected text is not an IEP goal

In addition, if Acadience Reading is administered in braille or with an unapproved accommodation (such as a student whose IEP requires that assessments be given untimed), those scores can only be used to measure individual growth over time and should not be interpreted as Acadience Reading scores, entered into an Acadience Reading data-reporting service, or included in the Summative Growth Report. For more information on approved and unapproved accommodations, see Chapter 2 of the Acadience Reading Assessment Manual (Good et al., 2011, revised 2018).

If a student has the response capabilities to be included in Acadience Reading assessments using standardized procedures (i.e., no unapproved accommodations were used), and it is a goal for the student to learn to read in English, then that student should be included in the Summative Growth Report.

For further guidance, see the Diverse Learners Case Scenarios in Appendix A.

Invalidating a Score

Occasionally a score will need to be invalidated. There are a number of circumstances when it might be necessary to invalidate a score and retest a student. For example, if you are partway through the assessment and the fire alarm or another interruption causes you not to complete the test, you may start over the assessment with a new form. Another example would be learning after the assessment that the student wears glasses for reading but did not have them during testing. If an end-of-year benchmark testing score is found to be invalid, retest the student with a form from the set of 20 alternate forms from the Acadience Reading progress-monitoring materials.

If one form is invalidated (e.g., FSF, PSF, LNF, NWF, Maze, or one ORF passage), retest with the next form in the progress-monitoring materials that the student has not seen. If two ORF forms are invalidated, retest with the next two forms in the progress-monitoring materials that the student has not seen. If all three ORF forms are invalidated,
retest with the last three passages in the Acadience Reading progress-monitoring materials appropriate for the student’s grade level. Enter the new score as the student’s end-of-year benchmark score(s) in the data system.

Validating an Unexpected Score
Following the end-of-year benchmark assessment, reports should be generated for use by teachers and other educators. Teachers and others working with students should scan their students’ scores and identify any unexpected scores that may require validation. Unexpected scores can be validated according to the procedures described in Step 2 of the Outcomes-Driven Model (see Chapter 1 of the Acadience Reading Assessment Manual). With respect to using Acadience Reading data with the Summative Growth Report for educator evaluation or accountability purposes, retesting to validate a score must be done by someone other than the student’s classroom teacher. Test forms from the set of 20 alternate forms available for progress monitoring may be used for validating a score. Personnel at each school should oversee the process of deciding to retest, selecting the form(s) for retesting, certifying that the form wasn’t practiced, and deciding whether or not to replace the score in the database.

Pathways of Progress and Its Role in the Summative Growth Report
To understand how the Summative Growth Report works, it is important to understand Pathways of Progress. Pathways of Progress classifies five types of student reading progress, from Well Below Typical to Well Above Typical. These five pathways are calculated by comparing the end-of-year scores from all students who have the same beginning-of-year Reading Composite Score. These comparisons are made for every possible beginning-of-year composite score value. For each beginning-of-year composite score, the end-of-year scores at the 20th, 40th, 60th, and 80th percentiles serve as boundaries for establishing the five Pathways of Progress (see Figure 2).

Pathway Descriptor | Pathway Number | Progress Descriptor | Progress Percentile Range
--- | --- | --- | ---
WELL ABOVE TYPICAL | 5 | 80th percentile and above
ABOVE TYPICAL | 4 | 60th to 79th percentile
TYPICAL | 3 | 40th to 59th percentile
BELOW TYPICAL | 2 | 20th to 39th percentile
WELL BELOW TYPICAL | 1 | Below 20th percentile

Note. Pathways of Progress are calculated based on 2014–2015 Acadience Reading data for 2,395,969 students across grades K–6 from DMG’s data-reporting service, Acadience Data Management.

Pathways of Progress provides educators with a research-based tool for (a) establishing individual student progress-monitoring goals; (b) evaluating individual student progress and rate of growth; and (c) reflecting on the effectiveness of support at the classroom, school, or district level.
Summative Growth Reports are based upon the Pathways of Progress analysis. Individual student-level pathways are identified for each student in a classroom. These individual student data are then summarized by classroom. The overall reading progress for a classroom can then be compared to the overall reading progress of other classrooms at the same grade level. Importantly, when using Pathways of Progress, students are only compared to other students who had the same initial composite score. As such, Summative Growth results are appropriate for diverse learners and should not unfairly disadvantage a teacher of students with low skills.

While Pathways of Progress may be used independently of the Summative Growth Report, the Summative Growth Report cannot be accomplished without the use of Pathways of Progress.¹

**Improved Goal Setting with Pathways of Progress**

When used in conjunction with the Acadience Reading benchmark goals, Pathways of Progress further empowers educators to set goals that are meaningful, ambitious, and attainable. The Acadience Reading benchmark goals are the same for all students in a grade, regardless of their starting skill level, and represent the **lowest score** for which a student is likely to still be on track to reach future reading outcomes (e.g., to be on track for fourth grade, every third-grade students should reach a Reading Composite Score of 330 by the end of the year).

While benchmark goals are meaningful, there may be some students for whom they are not ambitious enough, and others for whom they are unattainable. Pathways of Progress helps increase decision-making precision with respect to goal setting and evaluating progress. Pathways of Progress allows teachers to use a normative context, in addition to the benchmark goals, when setting goals and evaluating progress. Pathways of Progress clarifies what rate of progress is Typical, Above Typical, or Well Above Typical. Pathways of Progress also informs educators when the rate of progress is Below Typical or Well Below Typical. Figure 3 shows how the Pathways of Progress might correspond to the Acadience Reading benchmark goals for a sample second-grade student, Josh. As illustrated in Figure 3, Pathways of Progress is particularly helpful for determining if reaching the grade-level end-of-year benchmark goal might be unrealistically ambitious.

---

¹Additional information about Pathways of Progress is available at https://acadiencelearning.org/pathways_of_progress.html.
Teachers can use the Pathways of Progress goal-setting utility available in Acadience Data Management to see the target scores for each pathway and set end-of-year goals for students. These features will assist teachers when tracking students’ progress toward their goals throughout the year. Setting goals is particularly important for students who are performing Below or Well Below Benchmark and in need of additional instructional support. It is highly recommended that all teachers in schools using the Summative Growth Report have access to the goal-setting utility at the beginning of the year or as soon as possible thereafter.

Goal setting is a professional decision that should be made with several considerations in mind. Student goals should represent a professional judgment about a goal that is simultaneously meaningful, ambitious, and attainable. When setting goals, consider the following:

1. What is a meaningful goal?
   - The big idea is to increase a student’s odds of achieving important literacy outcomes in the future. Therefore, goals should be set with the intention of students exceeding, achieving, or coming as close as possible to their Acadience Reading grade-level benchmark goals.
   - Moving a student from Below Benchmark to At or Above Benchmark or moving a student from Well Below Benchmark to either Below Benchmark or to At or Above Benchmark represents a meaningful goal.

2. What is an ambitious goal?
   - Above Typical Progress (Pathway 4) and Well Above Typical Progress (Pathway 5) represent ambitious goals. Below Typical Progress (Pathway 2) and Well Below Typical Progress (Pathway 1) are not considered ambitious goals.
   - Typical Progress (Pathway 3) may be sufficient for students who are already At or Above Benchmark.
   - Typical Progress may not be adequate for students who are likely to need additional support to achieve benchmark goals.
3. What is an attainable goal?
   • Goals in the Well Above Typical range may not always be attainable.
   • Typical and Above Typical Progress are likely attainable. Well Below Typical and Below Typical Progress may be attainable, but are not ambitious or meaningful. Appropriate goals are both attainable and ambitious.
   • It is important to consider what might be possible with a very effective, research-based intervention.

Goal-Setting Example: Tabitha

This section illustrates how the Acadience Data Management goal-setting utility could be used to set goals for a third-grade student, Tabitha. This utility allows educators to set goals by considering Pathways of Progress information in conjunction with the benchmark goals.

At the beginning of third grade, Tabitha earned the following scores, most of which are below her grade-level benchmark:
   • Reading Composite Score = 205 (Below Benchmark)
   • ORF Words Correct = 65 (Below Benchmark)
   • ORF Accuracy = 96% (At or Above Benchmark)
   • ORF Retell = 14 (Below Benchmark)
   • Retell Quality of Response Rating = 1 (Below Benchmark)
   • Maze Adjusted Score = 6 (Below Benchmark)

To establish a goal for Tabitha, her teacher would need to consider what end-of-year goals would be meaningful, attainable, and ambitious.
   • A meaningful goal will result in proficient reading At or Above Benchmark (i.e., reading for meaning, at an adequate rate, and with a high degree of accuracy).
   • An attainable goal would be Typical or Above Typical Progress (Pathways 3 or 4) relative to students who began the year at a similar skill level.
   • Because Tabitha is Below Benchmark, an ambitious goal of Above Typical Progress (Pathway 4) would be appropriate to bring her skills up to, or as close as possible to, benchmark.

Figure 4 shows Tabitha's beginning-of-year Acadience Reading data as it would appear in the Acadience Data Management goal-setting utility. Tabitha's beginning-of-year Acadience Reading scores are listed on the left-hand side, including her Reading Composite Score (RCS) and the scores for each individual measure. The square next to each score represents the benchmark status of that score (i.e., open square indicates Well Below Benchmark, half-filled square indicates Below Benchmark, solid square indicates At or Above Benchmark).
To activate the goal-setting utility, the educator clicks on Tabitha’s name, and boxes appear where the end-of-year goals can be entered for each measure (as shown in Figure 5).

**Figure 5. Activated Goal-Setting Utility for Tabitha**

To set a goal for a measure, the teacher selects (i.e., clicks on) that measure. The teacher will then see a screen that shows the five possible Pathways of Progress choices, a default score from the middle of each pathway, and the range of scores for each pathway. In Figure 6, the teacher believes Above Typical Progress is appropriate for Tabitha, so the teacher enters 106 as the end-of-year goal for the ORF Words Correct score (in the Above Typical Progress range).
**Figure 6. ORF Goal Setting for Tabitha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabitha</th>
<th>Beg of Year Score</th>
<th>Pathways of Progress</th>
<th>End of Year Student Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORF Words Correct</td>
<td>65</td>
<td><strong>WELL ABOVE TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ABOVE TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BELOW TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WELL BELOW TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 7–9 show the teacher setting Tabitha’s goals on the other measures: ORF Accuracy, Retell, and Maze. Because the teacher believes that Above Typical Progress is both ambitious and attainable, all the end-of-year goals fall in the Above Typical Progress score range.

**Figure 7. ORF Accuracy Goal Setting for Tabitha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabitha</th>
<th>Beg of Year Score</th>
<th>Pathways of Progress</th>
<th>End of Year Student Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORF Accuracy</td>
<td>96</td>
<td><strong>WELL ABOVE TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ABOVE TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BELOW TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WELL BELOW TYPICAL</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once goals for each component measure have been entered, the screen will appear as shown in Figure 10. All end-of-year goals are shown along with their associated pathway. In this example, all end-of-year goals for component measures and the Reading Composite Score represent Above Typical Progress.
Figure 10. Completed Goal Setting for Tabitha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabitha</th>
<th>Beg of Year Score</th>
<th>Pathways of Progress</th>
<th>End of Year Student Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORF Words Correct</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF Accuracy</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retell</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the end-of-year goal selections made using the goal-setting utility, Tabitha’s end-of-year goal would be written as:

*By the end of the year, Tabitha will read aloud a third-grade ORF passage at a rate of 106 or more words correct per minute with at least 98% accuracy, and be able to talk about what she has read with a Retell score of at least 45 words. She will read a third-grade Maze passage silently for meaning and earn a score of at least 20.*

Tabitha’s goal reflects important characteristics of proficient readers. Proficient readers are reading for meaning, at an adequate rate, and with a high degree of accuracy. All three of these components are essential. In an acquisition phase we may build accuracy first, but the goal is relative balance across these reading components.

Once goals have been established, that information can be transferred to the student’s progress-monitoring graphs, as shown for Tabitha in Figure 11. Her end-of-year goal for ORF, represented by the star, and all five Pathways of Progress borders are noted on the sample graph.
Acadience Reading measures, on which Pathways of Progress is based, are powerful, reliable, and valid indicators of a student’s reading proficiency. They are also brief and efficient. The goal is always to make good decisions. Establishing end-of-year goals is a professional judgment informed by the end-of-year benchmark goals and the Pathways of Progress.

For additional information on using the Acadience Data Management goal-setting utility, please see the Pathways of Progress overview video available at https://acadiencelearning.org/pathways_of_progress.html.

**Using Pathways of Progress for Evaluating Individual Student Progress**

When using Pathways of Progress reports to evaluate individual student progress within classrooms, the pathways are evaluated relative to typical progress for students with the same initial skill. We can describe the progress the student has made across the school year in this context. Evaluation of progress can be done at the student level and the classroom level.

One Pathways of Progress feature is called the Pathways of Progress report, which shows student performance at the beginning and middle or end of the school year, and provides the pathways for each student based on that student’s Reading Composite Scores. This report is available for classrooms or instructional groups. As such, classroom teachers have access to this report. Currently, this report is available at the middle and end of the year in Acadience Data Management. A sample Pathways of Progress report from Acadience Data Management is included in Figure 12.
**Figure 12. Sample Pathways of Progress Report**

**School:** Jefferson Elementary School  
**Grade:** Fourth Grade  
**Year:** 2016–2017  
**Class:** Cento 4

### BEGINNING OF YEAR
All pathways are based on the beginning-of-year composite score.

### END OF YEAR COMPONENT SCORE PATHWAYS
Component score pathways are compared to other students with the same beginning-of-year composite score.

To support overall reading proficiency, more growth is needed in a student's areas of relative weakness.

### END OF YEAR OVERALL PATHWAY
A student's overall pathway is based on the student’s end-of-year composite score compared to other students with the same beginning-of-year composite score.

---

### Key for interpreting the benchmark status
- **At or Above Benchmark / Likely to Need Core Support**
- **Below Benchmark / Likely to Need Strategic Support**
- **Well Below Benchmark / Likely to Need Intensive Support**

### Key for interpreting the pathway number and the star rating
- **WELL ABOVE TYPICAL**
- **ABOVE TYPICAL**
- **TYPICAL**
- **BELOW TYPICAL**
- **WELL BELOW TYPICAL**

---

### End-of-year scores for each component Acadience™ Reading measure with associated benchmark status and pathway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>ORF Words Correct Score</th>
<th>ORF Accuracy Score</th>
<th>ORF Retell Score</th>
<th>Maze Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Stars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bauey, Ernest</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubgu, Patricia</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corare, Shawn</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daimble, Terry</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imblue, Frances</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilhauze, Benjamin</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty, Aaron</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquesi, Diane</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber, Marilyn</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minig, Patricia</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisoni, Earl</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossgate, Carol</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odinte, Ann</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl, Edward</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiofeld, Susan</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resoble, Martin</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roa, Cheryl</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roos, Juan</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutqua, Emie</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieve, Eric</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varischke, Irene</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vian, Patricia</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviol, Terry</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintan, Janet</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpreting Individual Student Pathways of Progress

When interpreting the Pathways of Progress report, follow these steps:

1. **Review the composite score pathway for each student.** The number of stars corresponds to the *Pathway of Progress* (e.g., three stars for Pathway 3). The pathway for the composite score represents the overall progress each student made relative to other students with the same beginning-of-year composite score.

2. **Review the component measure scores for each student.** The end-of-year component scores and pathway (circled number(s)) are reported for each student. The symbols next to each score correspond to the student’s benchmark status on that score. The amount of progress students made on the component measures and whether or not the student reached the end-of-year benchmark goal can contribute to understanding the overall pathways.

Important considerations when reviewing the Pathways of Progress report includes accuracy of scores and the Highly Skills Learners criteria.

**Accuracy of Scores**

Do you have confidence in the accuracy of the student scores on which the pathway is based? If yes, proceed with interpreting the Pathways of Progress report. If no, then retest with alternate materials to validate those scores (see the Data Collection and Assessment Considerations section, pages 6–7). This recommendation is consistent with Step 2 of the Outcomes-Driven Model. The accuracy of scores may be called into question for a variety of reasons including (a) suspected data entry error, (b) an error in the standard administration, or (c) an unusual pattern across students or teachers (i.e., unexpectedly low or high scores based on past scores). The need to check the accuracy of scores should occur rarely. It is important to train assessors to administer and score the assessment with accuracy (see the Preparing and Training Assessors section, pages 5–6).

**Reviewing Results for Highly Skilled Learners**

Highly Skilled Learners are students who are solidly on track in learning basic early literacy and reading skills and are very likely to stay on track in the following year. The Highly Skilled Learners criteria in Table 1 are based upon end-of-year reading expectations for each grade level. Values in bold correspond to Above Benchmark performance (i.e., the 60th percentile or higher using national norms); values in italics correspond to performance at or above the benchmark goal for each grade level.

Highly Skilled Learners are those students in grades K–6 whose Acadience Reading benchmark scores are all equal to or higher than the scores reported in Table 1. A student must meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria for each measure listed in Table 1, for the grade in question, in order to meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria. These Highly Skilled Learners criteria apply to the 2018–2019 school year. In subsequent years, Highly Skilled Learners criteria may change based on updated research.

For grades K–1, students may meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria only at the end of the year, because the measures and the composite score change during the course of the year. For grade 2, students may meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria at the middle or end of the year (but not at the beginning of the year), because the measures and composite score remain consistent between the middle and end of the year. For grade 3–6, students may meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria at the beginning, middle, or end of the year, because the measures and composite score remain consistent over the year.
In our analysis, students who met the Highly Skilled Learners criteria at the end of one school year had the following outcomes at the end of the next school year (averaged across grades; exact percentages varied somewhat by grade):

- 69% earned scores at or above the 80th percentile the following year,
- 70% met the Highly Skilled Learners criteria the following year,
- 91% earned scores in the Above Benchmark range (60th percentile or higher) the following year, and
- 99% earned scores in the At or Above Benchmark range the following year.

These percentages are consistent even if the student met the Highly Skilled Learners criteria at the end of the year and had made Below Typical or Well Below Typical progress (Pathways 1 or 2) over the course of the year. Consequently, students who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria will be assigned to Pathway 3 (Typical Progress) or higher at the end of the year. For example, if a student who is a Highly Skilled Learner is on the Below Typical Progress pathway (Pathway 2) at the end of the year, he or she will be assigned to Pathway 3 for reporting purposes. If a student who is a Highly Skilled Learner achieves Above Typical Progress (Pathway 4) or Well Above Typical Progress (Pathway 5), then no changes will be made to their Pathway for reporting purposes.

For some students who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria, it may be appropriate to shift instructional emphasis to more advanced skills in the scope and sequence of basic early literacy and reading skills—and potentially to skills above their grade placement. For example, kindergarten students who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria and have very high skills in phonemic awareness and basic phonics may benefit more from an instructional emphasis on advanced decoding and overall reading proficiency instead of continued emphasis on phonemic awareness and basic phonics. Likewise, for students in first grade and above who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria and have high levels of text-reading proficiency (i.e., reading for meaning, at an adequate rate, with a high degree of accuracy), it may be more valuable to invest instructional time in applying their reading skills to more advanced or challenging reading materials (e.g., above-grade level texts) rather than focusing on further improvements in reading grade-level text.

For students in grades 3–6 who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria, it may be especially important to shift the instructional emphasis from further building their reading proficiency to investing instructional time in using their high levels of reading proficiency to build their knowledge of other content areas. For example, Daryl is a
Highly Skilled Learner at the beginning of fifth grade. The teacher’s goal for Daryl might be to maintain his high level of reading proficiency and for Daryl to use his reading skills to build further critical thinking and reasoning skills, as well as knowledge in science, social science, literature, and the arts. We recommend that these decisions involve teacher judgment and consideration of the pattern of student scores and performance in other domains.

Students who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria should still participate in Acadience Reading benchmark assessments and are included in the Acadience Reading assessment at the end of the year to ensure they are maintaining their high levels of reading skills and to enable systems-level reporting for the school and classroom. On the Summative Growth and Pathways of Progress reports, students in grades K–6 who meet the Highly Skilled Learners criteria at the end of the year will be assigned to Pathway 3 or higher as appropriate. For example, consider Jenna, a student who met the Highly Skilled Learners criteria. If Jenna continued to be a Highly Skilled Learner at the end of second grade—even though her Acadience Reading scores did not improve (or even declined slightly) from the middle of the year—she would be assigned to Pathway 3 (Typical Reading Progress) for Pathways of Progress and Summative Growth reports. A footnote will appear on the Pathways of Progress report stating, “Student achieved Pathway 3 via Highly Skilled Learners criteria.” As another example, consider Daryl, our fifth-grade student. If Daryl continued to be a Highly Skilled Learner at the end of fifth grade even though his Acadience Reading scores did not improve (or even declined slightly) over the course of the year, he would be assigned to Pathway 3 (Typical Reading Progress) for Pathways of Progress and Summative Growth reports. The same footnote will appear on the Pathways of Progress report stating, “Student achieved Pathway 3 via Highly Skilled Learners criteria.”

Case Examples
Case examples from the sample Pathways of Progress report in Figure 12 illustrate the possibilities for interpretation. Ernie Rutqua and Eric Tieye are both students who started the year At or Above Benchmark on the composite score, made Well Above Typical progress overall and made at least Typical Progress over the year on the component skill measures. These students also ended the year At or Above Benchmark on the composite score and the component measures. The pattern for these students indicates reading instructional support that met their needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>ORF Words Correct Score</th>
<th>ORF Accuracy Score</th>
<th>ORF Retell Score</th>
<th>Maze Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutqua, Ernie</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieye, Eric</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin Resoble also started and ended the year At or Above Benchmark on the composite score, but made Typical Progress overall. His ORF Retell score at the end of the year was Well Below Benchmark and he made Well Below Typical Progress on this component skill as well as Below Typical Progress on ORF Accuracy. This pattern is of concern and should be examined further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>ORF Words Correct Score</th>
<th>ORF Accuracy Score</th>
<th>ORF Retell Score</th>
<th>Maze Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resoble, Martin</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patricia Bubgu started the year Well Below Benchmark on the composite score, made Well Below Typical Progress overall, and ended the year Well Below Benchmark on the composite score. Despite her At or Above
Benchmark score and Above Typical progress on ORF accuracy at the end of the year, her end-of-year ORF Words Correct, Retell, and Maze adjusted scores indicate a need for instructional support. This pattern suggests that the instructional support in reading was either ineffective for Patricia or that other factors prevented her from benefitting from instruction (e.g., high rates of absence).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>ORF Words Correct Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ORF Accuracy Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ORF Retell Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Maze Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bubgu, Patricia</td>
<td>191 □</td>
<td>61 □ □</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98% □</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>15 □ □</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 □ □</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235 □ □</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benjamin Keilhaute started the year Below Benchmark on the composite score and made Well Below Typical Progress overall. His end-of-year composite score and all of the component measure scores indicate a need for instructional support. This pattern suggests that reading instruction was either ineffective for reducing risk for Benjamin or that other factors prevented him from benefitting from instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>ORF Words Correct Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ORF Accuracy Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ORF Retell Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Maze Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keilhaute, Benjamin</td>
<td>266 □</td>
<td>101 □ □</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97% □</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>23 □ □</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 □ □</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>315 □ □</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terry Daimble, Aaron Liberty, and Patricia Viarn all started the year Well Below Benchmark on the composite score. These students made Above or Well Above Typical Progress overall. Aaron made at least Typical Progress on all component measures and ended the year At or Above Benchmark on the composite score, while Terry made at least Typical Progress on all component measures except for ORF Accuracy, but also ended the year At or Above Benchmark on the composite score. Patricia made at least Typical Progress on all but one component measure, ORF Words Correct. The pattern of performance for these students indicates reading instruction was generally effective in reducing overall risk and contributed to them meeting the Reading Composite Score benchmark goal at the end of the year. Despite the overall reduction of risk, Patricia's end-of-year component measure scores suggest she continues to need intensive instructional support in two key skill areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>ORF Words Correct Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ORF Accuracy Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>ORF Retell Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Maze Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Reading Composite Score</th>
<th>Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daimble, Terry</td>
<td>204 □</td>
<td>119 □ □</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97% □</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>42 □ □</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 □ □</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>419 □ □</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty, Aaron</td>
<td>226 □</td>
<td>101 □ □</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99% □</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>42 □ □</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26 □ □</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>401 □ □</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viarn, Patricia</td>
<td>122 □</td>
<td>68 □ □</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99% □</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>75 □ □</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17 □ □</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>398 □ □</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Using the Summative Growth Report**

**Overview and Basic Considerations**

We envision the primary use of the Summative Growth Report to be for examining the reading outcomes for classroom systems as part of an Outcomes-Driven service delivery model. While access to the Summative Growth Report in data systems is limited to administrators, the information and data it provides is intended for use by teachers, coaches, and grade-level teams (along with administrators) to reflect on classroom systems of instruction and support. It is our goal to encourage and model being open and public with teachers and other educators involved with student instruction about these data and the reports, so that the information will be used to improve reading instruction and educational outcomes for students.
The Summative Growth Report provides one piece of information focused on student growth in literacy skills. If schools are using the information provided in this report in the context of examining educator effectiveness, it is important to keep in mind that no system can completely isolate a teacher’s impact on a student’s test scores. While the information provided in this report is valuable and important, there are other important pieces of information to consider in a system of educator effectiveness. Such a system should take into account the full range of what teachers do and the context in which teachers teach (Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, 2010). The evaluation system should be built with the intention of improving not only individual practice but the overall practice of teaching and educational leadership within schools (Reform Support Network, 2011). The information that the Summative Growth Report provides is aligned with important design principles for effective teacher-evaluation systems identified by The New Teacher Project (cited in Reform Support Network, 2011). For example, the Summative Growth Report data are provided annually, standards of instructional excellence are stated clearly, the emphasis is placed on student academic growth, and there are five rating levels (i.e., Classroom Reading Progress Descriptors) used for the Summative Growth Reports.

We recommend that school and district administrators support teachers whose classroom systems have very low student outcomes by providing appropriate resources and tools for improvement. The primary goal of any educational evaluation system should be to improve educational outcomes. The Summative Growth Report and the Pathways of Progress information should serve as a resource for continuous improvement. Pathways of Progress will allow teachers the opportunity to know early, and over time, how their students are doing so that they can make changes. Outcomes are not fixed but malleable.

The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used first and foremost to examine system-level outcomes with the goal of supporting teachers in their efforts to improve student and classroom outcomes rather than solely for accountability purposes. Therefore, we do not endorse releasing the information about individual teachers and classrooms to the public at large. Rather, we believe these data may inform decisions regarding relevant coaching and professional development that might be provided in support of teachers and that ultimately result in improved student outcomes.

The Summative Growth Report should be considered a tool for professional conversations. Student progress is one piece of information that informs a conversation about evaluating instructional effectiveness. In addition to teacher-related factors (e.g., fidelity of core program implementation), student reading progress is impacted by other factors, including those related to (a) the student (e.g., attendance); (b) the school system (e.g., available instructional resources and support); and (c) the home and community (e.g., mobility). As described below, additional data from other sources, as well as data collected over more than one year, will provide a fuller picture for discussion and decision making.

### Logistical and Procedural Considerations

1. For the 2018–19 school year, Summative Growth Reports are available through Acadience Data Management.

2. When viewing Summative Growth Report results for classes or groups of students, be sure to use the results from the teacher who has primary responsibility for those students’ reading instruction. Which classes or groups to look at will depend on how your school has organized the students within the data-reporting service. For example, if students are enrolled in their homeroom classes in your data-reporting service, but reading instruction is taking place in groups other than homeroom classes, you should view your Summative Growth results for those groups rather than the homeroom classes.
3. To be included in Summative Growth Report results, a student must have a Reading Composite Score from the beginning-of-year Acadience Reading benchmark assessment and from the end-of-year Acadience Reading benchmark assessment.

4. The Summative Growth Report for a teacher requires at least five students from a single grade in order to generate results. Summative Growth results are reported for each grade separately, so teachers with split-grade classes will receive multiple results.

How Pathways of Progress Informs Summative Growth Reports

Summative Growth Reports are based upon the Pathways of Progress analysis. Individual student-level pathways are identified for each student in a classroom. The percentage of students within each classroom who are on each pathway is determined. Next, classrooms at each grade level are ranked by the percentage of students who have made typical progress or better (Pathway 3, 4, or 5 with descriptors Typical, Above Typical, and Well Above Typical Progress) by the end of the year. These are called classroom reading progress percentiles. These classroom reading progress percentiles are used to establish guidelines for evaluating the effectiveness of reading instruction and reading progress at the classroom level. For the Summative Growth Report, classrooms are compared to other classrooms at the same grade level across a large, broad-based sample of students nationwide.³

The five categories delineated in Table 2 are used to describe classroom reading progress on Summative Growth Reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>96th to 99th and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>76th to 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>25th to 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>5th to 24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>below 1st to 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Other descriptions and decision points selected by states or districts may be reasonable and appropriate. State departments of education and school districts can work with Dynamic Measurement Group if they would like to establish different criteria and/or descriptors.

Classrooms described as having Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress are those at the 96th percentile or higher with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better (i.e., students on Pathways 3, 4, and 5). Classrooms described as having Above Average Classroom Reading Progress are those that fall between the 76th and 95th percentiles with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better. Classrooms described as having Average Classroom Reading Progress are those that are between the 25th and the 75th percentiles with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better. Classrooms

³For the 2018–2019 school year, the sample includes between 1,733 and 24,222 classrooms per grade level, representing 38,718 to 465,132 students per grade in the systemwide data set (Acadience Data Management, VPORT®, and mCLASS® systems combined).
described as having Below Average Classroom Reading Progress fall between the 5th and the 24th percentiles with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better. Finally, classrooms described as having Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress fall below the 5th percentile with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better.

**Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria**

The classroom reading progress descriptors used with Summative Growth Reports are based on the percent of students making typical progress or better (i.e., percent of students in Pathways 3, 4, and 5) compared to other students who started the school year with the same Reading Composite Score. The minimum percent of students making typical progress or better who align with the percentile criteria for each classroom reading progress descriptor (see Table 2) is determined for each grade. Because the percentile rank of the classroom depends on the performance of the other same-grade classrooms, each grade has its own table showing the minimum percent of students making typical progress or better necessary for each category descriptor. The classroom reading progress criteria tables (see examples in Figures 13 and 14) allow comparison between the reading progress of students in one classroom to the reading progress of all students in all other classrooms at the same grade level. Classroom reading progress descriptors are based on the percent of students who made at least typical progress, relative to the reading progress achieved by other classrooms at the same grade.

Classroom reading progress descriptor criteria tables for two grade levels are shown in Figures 13 and 14. The first column lists the classroom reading progress descriptor. The second column shows the minimum percent of students making typical progress or better that aligns to each descriptor. The third column shows the long form of the classroom reading progress descriptors. These two tables illustrate how the minimum percent of students making typical progress or better that align with each descriptor may differ from one grade to the next. For example, if a first-grade classroom had 52 percent of the students making typical progress or better, that classroom would be described as having Average Classroom Reading Progress when compared to other first-grade classrooms (see Figure 13). However, if a fourth-grade classroom had 52 percent of students making typical progress or better, that classroom would be described as having Below Average Classroom Reading Progress when compared to other fourth-grade classrooms (see Figure 14).

---

4 Classroom Progress Criteria Tables for each grade level that apply for 2018–2019 are found in Appendix B.
The information in Figure 13 indicates that at least 52 percent of students in a first-grade classroom need to be making typical progress or better (i.e., in Pathway 3, 4, and 5) for the Average Classroom Reading Progress descriptor to be used on the Summative Growth Reports. Also using this first-grade example, a first-grade classroom in which 79.17 percent of the students made at least typical progress (i.e., Pathway 3, 4, and 5) would be described as having Above Average Classroom Reading Progress on their Summative Growth Reports. First-grade classrooms in which 94.74 percent or more of students made at least typical progress (i.e., Pathways 3, 4, and 5) would be described as having Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress in this example.

First-grade classrooms would be described as having Below Average Classroom Reading Progress when at least 28.57 percent, but less than 52 percent, of the students made typical progress or better (i.e., Pathway 3, 4, and 5) (See Figure 13). Finally, first-grade classrooms in which fewer than 28.57 percent of the students made at least typical progress (i.e., Pathways 3, 4, and 5) would be described on their Summative Growth Reports as having Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress.

Interpreting Summative Growth Reports
We designed the Summative Growth Reports (see an example in Figure 15) to provide an efficient and user-friendly format. Reports are organized by school. The report is intended for use by building and district administrators, not for sharing directly with teachers (see Sharing Summative Growth Information with Teachers on page 27 for more information). To encourage administrators to reflect on the variety of factors that may impact student performance, the top of each Summative Growth Report has a narrative explaining that classroom reading progress is one piece of data to consider and that it may be impacted by a variety of factors. Several of these factors are then listed for consideration (see Figure 15).

On each school’s report, the grade levels and the teachers in each grade level are listed in the far left-hand column (see Column A in Figure 15). It is important to note that the teacher who will be listed is the teacher...
of record in the data system. Other educators may have contributed to these outcomes, but their names may not appear on the report. In the column immediately to the right of the teachers’ names (Column B) are the total number of students included in each teacher’s classroom who had both beginning- and end-of-year composite scores. Teachers are not included in the Summative Growth Report if they have fewer than five students assigned to them within a grade level.

In the next two columns to the right are the percent (and number) of students in that teacher’s classroom who were in Pathways 3, 4, and 5 (i.e., students making typical progress or better) (Column C), as well as the classroom reading progress percentile that corresponds to that percent (Column D). The final column (E) shows the classroom reading progress descriptor (shown in Table 2).

**Analyzing Summative Growth Reports**

Once administrators have these Summative Growth Reports, they should consider how to analyze the information. In the example shown in Figure 15, the fourth-grade classroom for which Bergert is listed as the teacher had Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress. Bergert’s class had 96 percent of students making typical progress or better and was ranked at the 96th percentile compared to other fourth-grade classrooms (see Columns C and D in Figure 15). The team working with Ms. Bergert should review and document the reading instructional supports used this year so they can be continued for these students as they move to fifth grade. In contrast, the first-grade classroom for which Vanderaa is listed as the teacher has the descriptor of Below Average Classroom Reading Progress. When compared to other first-grade classrooms, most classrooms supported more students to make typical progress or better over the year than Ms. Vanderaa’s classroom. The team working with Ms. Vanderaa’s classroom should analyze the factors that led to less progress and look for targets of opportunity to improve (i.e., instructional time, instructional delivery, sequencing of instruction, student attendance, etc.). The administrator supporting Ms. Vanderaa should discuss with her the instructional supports and professional development that may be needed to improve student reading outcomes next year.

Administrators can use the Summative Growth Reports to identify areas of strength as well as areas that need additional support to improve future outcomes. For example, based on the report shown in Figure 15 for Jefferson Elementary School, third and fourth grades appear to be strengths for the school with respect to reading outcomes. Five of the six classrooms were described as having Above Average or Well Above Average Progress in reading. The building and district administrators can reflect on this information in terms of the way resources are organized and delivered to those grades, the skills of the teachers in those grades, and the individual students in those grades. Perhaps there are factors in those grades that could be expanded to other grades.

In contrast, consider the results for the kindergarten and first-grade classrooms where two classes were described as having Below Average Classroom Reading Progress. The building and district administrators can think about needs and resources at these grade levels over the course of the school year and reflect on what might have been occurring, what could have been done differently, and what might need to change for the next school year.

Finally, the building and district administrators can use the Summative Growth Reports to identify individual classroom systems or teachers who may need additional support. This is particularly relevant when one particular classroom has very different outcomes from the other classrooms at that same grade level.
Figure 15. Sample Summative Growth Report

Classroom reading progress is one piece of data that informs a conversation about the effectiveness of the system of instruction at the classroom level, and it can be affected by many factors. In addition to teacher-related factors, classroom reading progress is impacted by factors related to the students, the school system, the home, and the community.

If individual classrooms display Below or Well Below Average Reading Progress, it is important to consider factors that can be modified via additional resources or professional development to improve classroom reading progress in the future. If multiple classrooms in a grade or school display Below or Well Below Average Reading Progress, then it is also important to consider factors that can be improved at the systems level. Examples of teacher, student, system, home, and community factors that affect classroom reading progress include:

**Teacher-related factors:**
- implementation fidelity of reading instruction
- use of effective supplemental and intervention reading materials
- classroom management
- instructional grouping
- instructional scope and sequence
- instructional time
- early identification and progress monitoring

**Student-related factors:**
- individual attendance
- individual behavioral concerns
- individual learning difficulties
- English Language Learner status

**System-related factors:**
- core reading curriculum
- selection and availability of effective supplemental and intervention reading materials
- availability of professional development aligned with effective reading instruction
- availability of instructional support personnel (e.g., reading coach)
- instructional scope and sequence
- instructional time
- early identification and progress monitoring

**Home and community factors:**
- home support for academic skill development
- student mobility

### Summative Growth Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Total Students Included</th>
<th>Percent of Students in Pathways 3, 4, and 5</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Percentile</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaidos</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.0% (n=13)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurick</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.0% (n=13)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.0% (n=9)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macknight</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76.0% (n=19)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marthaler</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72.0% (n=18)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderaa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.0% (n=12)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrella</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.0% (n=20)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hever</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68.0% (n=17)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weider</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84.0% (n=21)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88.0% (n=22)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maganda</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.0% (n=24)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willand</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>84.0% (n=21)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergert</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96.0% (n=24)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cento</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.0% (n=13)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92.0% (n=23)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrators can explore questions about why these differences may have occurred related to student needs (i.e., more students at risk, more transiency, more absenteeism, etc.) and related to teacher needs (i.e., less experience at the grade level, less effective instructional practices, less knowledge of teaching reading, etc.).

Building administrators can use the Summative Growth Reports from the previous school year to plan for the next school year. One consideration is in regard to grade levels where there are students who did not make sufficient progress. Those students will possibly begin a new school year without prerequisite skills. Using the Summative Growth Report in Figure 15 as an example, the principal will want to be sure to review beginning-of-year benchmark data for the first- and second-grade students who were at Jefferson last year in the Hendon and Vanderaa classes. Reviewing the beginning-of-year benchmark data would be an excellent role for an Acadience Reading Mentor. Many of the students who were in those classrooms did not make adequate progress and may be at risk in the coming year. The organization and delivery of instructional services to first- and second-grade classrooms and the students in those classrooms will be particularly important as these students move into those grade levels. An additional consideration in the Jefferson example is the professional development needs of the kindergarten and first-grade teachers. The lack of progress for students may mean that those teachers need support so that the same outcome is not seen at the end of the next school year.

Sharing Summative Growth Information with Teachers

We believe it is important that teachers be aware and informed of the Summative Growth process at the earliest possible time. To facilitate communication, a one-page handout about the Summative Growth Report is available in Appendix C. A similar handout explaining the Summative Growth Report to school administrators is available in Appendix D. In addition, we encourage administrators to ensure teachers have a copy of this manual available to them. Important considerations when reviewing Summative Growth Reports include the following:

- Resources (professional development, materials, time, etc.) available to the district, school, and teacher
- Home and community resources and support for instruction
- Student performance in subjects other than reading
- The instructional context through school-wide data review (percent of students At or Above Benchmark in each grade)
- Transience of the student population
- Teacher narrative that can be used to frame the discussion
- Multiple years of data

We suggest that the use of Summative Growth Reports and Pathways of Progress for evaluative purposes occurs in the context of other methods of evaluating teacher performance such as observation, record review, and data on growth in other academic skills. We recommend that school and district administrators support teachers with very low student outcomes by providing appropriate resources and tools for improvement.

Data from the Summative Growth Reports should be shared with teachers and accompanied with or closely followed by a meeting with the principal. Teachers should have access to the data and Summative Growth results for their own classroom, but they should not see the outcomes for other teachers’ classrooms. Information about individual classrooms needs to be lifted from the Summative Growth Report to be shared individually with teachers. We do not think it would be wise to distribute these data in a group setting. Principals will want to put the Pathways of Progress data in the context of how the whole school, and perhaps
the district, performed over the course of the school year. We recommend looking for targets of opportunity in the data from the previous year and considering what could have been done differently, or what might be done the next year, to improve outcomes.

Key talking points for principals to use in their discussions of the data from Summative Growth Reports with teachers are:

- This information is a tool for discussion regarding the progress of students with respect to their overall reading proficiency and what may have contributed to their progress (or lack thereof).
- These data will be used to guide and inform the support provided to teachers and students.
- If the Summative Growth Report will be used with respect to accountability, then note that teacher effectiveness is now being judged in part by student progress. This process may be quite different from how effectiveness has been determined previously.
- This is one piece of information with respect to decisions around teacher effectiveness. Other information will be considered. See the list of important considerations above, as well as the factors noted at the top of the Summative Growth Report (i.e., teacher-related, student-related, system-related factors, as well as home and community factors).
- Although students’ progress is considered for their teacher of record in the context of the Summative Growth Reports, many personnel are involved in each student’s education and are responsible for the student’s progress. Importantly, no system of evaluation can completely isolate a teacher’s impact on a student’s test scores.

In addition, it is important to keep in mind the directions for interpreting Pathways of Progress data (see Interpreting Individual Student Pathways of Progress, pages 17–21). There will likely be a range of reactions to the information. It will be important to convey the message that the principal and other district administrators will work to provide resources and supports for teachers to improve outcomes.

Remind teachers of the advantages of using Acadience Reading and Pathways of Progress, including:

- The ability to use data to inform goal setting
- The value of using data on student performance over time, not on a single test at one point in time
- The opportunity to change instruction as a result of seeing insufficient progress on an Acadience Reading progress-monitoring graph
- The research-based nature and transparency of the Acadience Reading benchmark goals and Pathways of Progress

Next, move the conversation with teachers to the targets of opportunity for the coming year.

- Review the Pathways of Progress reports each fall. Think about students who will need additional instructional support.
- Review the Initial Grouping Suggestions Report (available in Acadience Data Management) for ideas about how to group students for reading instruction. Discuss the kind of instruction that will benefit students in each group.
- Conduct Acadience Reading Survey¹ and Acadience Reading Diagnostic when needed.

¹Published as DIBELS Next® Survey. Acadience™ Reading is the new name for the DIBELS Next assessment. Acadience is a trademark of Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. (DMG). The DIBELS Next copyrighted content is owned by DMG. The DIBELS Next registered trademark was sold by DMG to the University of Oregon (UO) and is now owned by the UO.
Acadience Reading Survey is a set of testing materials useful for determining a student's appropriate progress-monitoring and instructional level, as well as for setting goals for students who missed the prior benchmark goals and continue to struggle in acquiring basic early literacy skills.

Acadience Reading Diagnostic is an advanced diagnostic assessment tool designed to provide in-depth information to help identify instructional targets for students who have not yet reached their grade-level benchmark goals or for students who may have met some benchmark goals but are inaccurate in their skills.

- Select the most appropriate Acadience Reading measure to use for progress monitoring those students who are receiving additional instructional support.
- Use the Pathways of Progress goal-setting utility to set meaningful, ambitious, and attainable goals for those students. The Pathways of Progress goal-setting utility is currently available in Acadience Data Management.
- Schedule a time to review the progress-monitoring data so instruction can be changed when progress is consistently falling below the aimline.

**Contact Information**

For additional information about Acadience Reading and the Summative Growth Report, please contact:

Dynamic Measurement Group  
859 Willamette Street, Suite 320  
Eugene, OR 97401  
(541) 431-6931  
info@acadiencelearning.org
## Appendix A

### Diverse Learners Case Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario description</th>
<th>Is Pathways of Progress appropriate?</th>
<th>Is the Summative Growth Report appropriate?</th>
<th>Who should be listed as the teacher of record on Summative Growth Reports?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A student who...</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General education classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • is in special education,  
• has an IEP goal in reading or has reading as an instructional target, and  
• receives reading instruction from the general education classroom teacher. |                           |                                                                      |
| A student who...     | Yes                                  | Yes                                        | The person providing reading instruction (e.g., special education teacher or reading-intervention group teacher) |
| • is in special education,  
• has an IEP goal in reading or has reading as an instructional target, and  
• receives reading instruction from someone other than the general education classroom teacher (e.g., special education teacher or interventionist). |                           |                                                                      |
| A student who...     | Yes                                  | Yes                                        | General education classroom teacher                               |
| • has low initial reading skills but is not in special education,  
• has reading as an instructional target, and  
• receives reading instruction from the general education classroom teacher. |                           |                                                                      |
| A student who...     | Yes                                  | Yes                                        | The person providing reading instruction (e.g., special education teacher or reading-intervention group teacher) |
| • has low initial reading skills but is not in special education,  
• has reading as an instructional target, and  
• receives reading instruction from someone other than the general education classroom teacher (e.g., special education teacher or interventionist). |                           |                                                                      |
| A student who...     | No                                   | No                                         | n/a                                                             |
| • is in special education and  
• has an IEP goal for functional reading skills (e.g., high-frequency words, signs, etc.) but not for reading in connected text. |                           |                                                                      |
| A student who...     | No                                   | No                                         | n/a                                                             |
| • is in special education and  
• has an IEP, but reading is not a goal or instructional target. |                           |                                                                      |

*Note. All students who have the response capabilities to complete Acadience Reading assessments should participate in the benchmark testing conducted with Acadience Reading materials. In general, the last two rows of this table refer to students who do not have the response capabilities to participate (e.g., students with more severe cognitive disabilities).*
The purpose of this document is to provide an overview and context for the Summative Growth classroom reading progress percentile and descriptor tables that will be used for the 2018–2019 school year. First, we review Pathways of Progress™, and how it informs Summative Growth Reports. Next, classroom reading progress percentile and descriptor tables are presented and discussed.

**Pathways of Progress**

Pathways of Progress is a research-based tool for: (1) establishing individual student progress monitoring goals; (2) evaluating individual student progress and growth over time; and (3) reflecting on the effectiveness of support at the classroom, school, or district level.

Pathways of Progress provides an evaluation of growth over time, compared to other students with the same level of initial skills. Thus, it provides a normative reference for professionals to consider. It increases the precision with which progress is evaluated at the student and classroom levels. The Pathways clarify what rate of progress is Typical, Above Typical, or Well Above Typical. Pathways of Progress also informs educators when progress is Below Typical or Well Below Typical. The Acadience Reading benchmark goals are used in conjunction with Pathways of Progress to provide a frame of reference that represents the lowest score above which a student is likely to be on track to reach future reading outcomes. The use of Pathways of Progress enhances the use of the benchmark goals and the Reading Composite Score. Pathways of Progress increases the precision with which decisions can be made about goal setting and evaluating progress. Pathways of Progress and the Acadience Reading benchmark goals empower educators to set goals that are meaningful, ambitious, and attainable.

**How Pathways of Progress Informs Summative Growth Reports**

Summative Growth Reports are based upon the Pathways of Progress analysis. Individual student-level Pathways are identified for each student in a classroom, and the percentage of students within each classroom who are on Pathways 3, 4, and 5 is determined. Next, classrooms at each grade level are ranked by the percentage of students who have made typical progress or better (Pathway 3, 4, or 5 with descriptors Typical, Above Typical, and Well Above Typical Progress) by the end of the year. For Summative Growth Reporting, classrooms are compared to other classrooms at the same grade level across a large, broad-based sample of students nationwide. These are called classroom reading progress percentiles. These classroom reading progress percentiles are used to establish guidelines for evaluating the effectiveness of reading instruction and reading progress at the classroom level.

---

1 For the 2018–2019 school year, the sample includes between 1,733 and 24,222 classrooms per grade level, representing 38,718 to 465,132 students per grade in the systemwide data set (Acadience Data Management, VPORT™, and mCLASS® systems combined).
Classroom Reading Progress Percentiles and Summative Growth Descriptors

The five categories delineated in Table B1 are used to describe classroom reading progress on Summative Growth Reports. Other descriptors and decision points selected by states or districts may be reasonable and appropriate. State departments of education and school districts can work with DMG if they would like to establish different criteria. However, for the 2018–2019 school year, these are the default criteria and descriptors used for Summative Growth Reports available from Acadience Data Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>96th and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>76th to 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>25th to 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>5th to 24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>below 1st to 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classrooms described as having Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress are those at the 96th percentile or higher with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better (i.e., students on Pathways 3, 4, and 5). Classrooms described as having Above Average Classroom Reading Progress are those that fall between the 76th and 95th percentiles with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better. Classrooms described as having Average Classroom Reading Progress are those that are between the 25th and the 75th percentiles with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better. Classrooms described as having Below Average Classroom Reading Progress fall between the 5th and the 24th percentiles with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better. Finally, classrooms described as having Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress fall below the 5th percentile with respect to the percent of students making typical progress or better.

Classroom reading progress descriptor criteria for each grade level are included in this document (Tables B2–B8). Because the percentile rank of the classroom depends on the performance of the other same-grade classrooms in the sample, each grade level has a different table showing the minimum percent of students making typical progress or better (on Pathway 3, 4, or 5) necessary to fit into each descriptor category. As such, a classroom in which 48 percent of the students make typical progress or better might be described as having Average Classroom Reading Progress in one grade (e.g., see Table B2 for kindergarten), but at another grade level that classroom might be described as having Below Average Classroom Reading Progress (e.g., see Table B3 for first grade.)

Each table shows the classroom reading progress descriptor criteria for the respective grade level that will be used for the 2018–2019 school year Summative Growth Reports. The first column lists the classroom reading progress descriptor. The second column shows the minimum percentage of students who made Typical, Above Typical, or Well Above Typical progress (Pathways 3, 4, and 5) compared to other students who started the school year with the same Reading Composite Score that corresponds to each descriptor.
### Table B2. Kindergarten Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 21,665 classrooms.

### Table B3. First Grade Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 24,222 classrooms.

### Table B4. Second Grade Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 22,146 classrooms.
Table B5. Third Grade Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>80.95%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 17,262 classrooms.

Table B6. Fourth Grade Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 5,908 classrooms.

Table B7. Fifth Grade Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>80.95%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 5,351 classrooms.
Table B8. Sixth Grade Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor Criteria for the 2018–2019 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Minimum Percent of Students Making Typical Progress or Better</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor (Long Form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>79.89%</td>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>54.01%</td>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on 1,733 classrooms.
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Summative Growth Report Teacher Handout

What Is the Summative Growth Report?

The Summative Growth Report provides additional information for examining systems-level reading outcomes using your Acadience Reading data. Data and information from the Summative Growth Report is intended for use by teachers, coaches, and grade-level teams to reflect on the classroom system of instruction and support. The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used first and foremost to examine system-level outcomes with the goal of supporting teachers in their efforts to improve student and classroom outcomes. However, schools that incorporate Acadience Reading in educator-evaluation systems may find the Summative Growth Report useful as one indicator of student growth within a comprehensive teacher-evaluation and accountability program. When schools elect to use the Summative Growth Report for accountability purposes, we strongly recommend that the Acadience Reading end-of-year benchmark testing be administered by trained personnel other than the student’s teacher. These assessment data are used to measure each student’s individual reading progress over the course of the year and to determine how their performance compares with that of other students who began the year with the same level of initial skills.

How Is Student Reading Progress Examined with the Summative Growth Report?

Student reading progress is examined using a tool called Pathways of Progress™. Pathways of Progress provides an evaluation of a student’s reading progress over time, compared to other students with the same level of initial skills. It examines all students with the same beginning-of-year Reading Composite Score and compares their progress over the course of the year to determine if their progress is Well Above Typical, Above Typical, Typical, Below Typical, or Well Below Typical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway Descriptor</th>
<th>Pathway Number</th>
<th>Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Progress Percentile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★★★★★★</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WELL ABOVE TYPICAL</td>
<td>80th percentile and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★★</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ABOVE TYPICAL</td>
<td>60th to 79th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★★</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TYPICAL</td>
<td>40th to 59th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★★</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BELOW TYPICAL</td>
<td>20th to 39th percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELL BELOW TYPICAL</td>
<td>Below 20th percentile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because each student’s progress is determined by comparing that student only to others with the same initial skill level, teachers are not penalized for having students with very low initial skills. Similarly, students who start the year above the benchmark will not give teachers an unfair advantage because their progress is compared to other students who started the year with the same high scores.

Pathways of Progress allows teachers to use a normative context, in addition to the benchmark goals, when setting goals and evaluating progress. A goal-setting utility is available in Acadience Data Management to help teachers understand the amount of progress that each student must make to achieve each of the pathway descriptors. Setting goals is an important first step in monitoring a student’s progress throughout the year and making adjustments to instruction as needed (e.g., when a student is not on track to reach the goal). Monitoring progress is particularly essential for students who are in need of additional instructional support to achieve benchmark goals.
How Does the Summative Growth Report Inform Decision Making?

Summative Growth Reports, which are available to administrators at the end of the year, are based on the Pathways of Progress analysis described above. The Summative Growth Report shows the percent of students in each classroom who are making typical progress or better (i.e., the number of students on Pathway 3, 4, and 5). These data are then compared to data from other classrooms across the country at the same grade level to determine each classroom’s overall classroom reading progress. On the Summative Growth Report, classrooms are given one of five classroom reading progress descriptors based on their percentile rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>96th and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>76th to 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>25th to 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>5th to 24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>below 1st to 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Should Summative Growth Data Be Used?

The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used first and foremost to examine system-level outcomes with the goal of supporting teachers in their efforts to improve student and classroom outcomes. In addition, the Summative Growth Report provides a useful tool that can be used as one component of a comprehensive teacher-evaluation process. The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used in conjunction with other methods of evaluating teacher performance such as observation, records review, and data on growth in other academic skills areas.

The Summative Growth Report is intended for use by teachers, coaches, and grade-level teams to reflect on the classroom system of instruction and support. Administrators are encouraged to use Summative Growth Reports to help identify areas of strength, as well as areas that need additional support to improve future outcomes. The Summative Growth Report is a tool for discussion regarding the progress of students with respect to their overall reading proficiency and what may have contributed to their progress (or lack thereof). To encourage educators to consider the variety of factors that may impact student performance, the top of each Summative Growth Report contains a brief narrative discussing how a variety of factors impact these data. Several of these factors are then listed for consideration.

When using the Summative Growth Report for evaluation and accountability purposes, data from the reports should be shared with teachers individually and accompanied with or closely followed by a meeting with the principal.

Additional information about the Summative Growth Report can be found in the Acadience Reading K–6 Summative Growth Report Implementation Guide.

---

1These are the default criteria. Modified criteria can be requested by state departments of education if their expectations and criteria are different.
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Summative Growth Report School Administrator Handout

What Is the Summative Growth Report?
The Summative Growth Report provides additional information for examining systems-level reading outcomes using your Acadience Reading data. The Summative Growth Report is intended for use by teachers, coaches, and grade-level teams to reflect on the classroom system of instruction and support. The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used first and foremost to examine system-level outcomes with the goal of supporting teachers in their efforts to improve student and classroom outcomes. However, schools that incorporate Acadience Reading in educator-evaluation systems may find the Summative Growth Report useful as one indicator of student growth within a comprehensive teacher-evaluation and accountability program. When schools elect to use the Summative Growth Report for accountability purposes, we strongly recommend that the Acadience Reading end-of-year benchmark testing be administered by trained personnel other than the student’s teacher. These assessment data are used to measure each student’s individual reading progress over the course of the year and to determine how their performance compares with that of other students who began the year with the same level of initial skills.

Key Implementation Procedures for Administrators
A school-level administrator typically will be in charge of Summative Growth Report implementation. However, administrators may designate other key personnel (e.g., Acadience Reading Mentor, assessment coordinator) to manage some of the following implementation responsibilities:

1. Discuss the use of Acadience Reading with the Summative Growth Report and how it fits into the overall plan for evaluating instruction. Most typically, this step will be carried out by a school-level administrator (i.e., principal).
2. Coordinate the implementation and the assessment process, including ensuring that assessors are trained to administer Acadience Reading with fidelity (see the Preparing and Training Assessors section on pages 5–6 of the Acadience Reading K–6 Summative Growth Report Implementation Guide).
3. Conduct Acadience Reading testing within a two- to three-week window.
4. If the data will be used as one piece of information in a comprehensive teacher evaluation process, develop a plan to ensure that students are not tested by their own teacher for the end-of-year benchmark.
5. Monitor the fidelity and accuracy of the assessment.
6. Keep the data-entry process secure. Ensure data are entered into a system that supports the Summative Growth Report. For 2018–2019, the system that supports the Summative Growth Report is Acadience Data Management from DMG. Acadience Reading data should be entered as benchmark data typically would be entered. Please note that we recommend that teachers not enter their own students’ Acadience Reading end-of-year benchmark data when using the Summative Growth Report for teacher evaluation and accountability purposes.
7. Make reports and interpretation guidance available to appropriate staff and support them in using the data appropriately.

How Is Student Reading Progress Measured with the Summative Growth Report?
Student reading progress is examined using a tool called Pathways of Progress™. Pathways of Progress provides an evaluation of progress over time, compared to other students with the same level of initial skills. It examines all students with the same beginning-of-year Reading Composite Score and compares their progress over the course of the year to determine if their progress is Well Above Typical, Above Typical, Typical, Below Typical, or Well Below Typical.
Because each student’s progress is determined by comparing that student only to others with the same initial skill level, teachers are not penalized for having students with very low initial skills. Similarly, students who start the year above the benchmark will not give teachers an unfair advantage because their progress is compared to other students who started the year with the same high scores.

Pathways of Progress allows teachers to use a normative context, in addition to the benchmark goals, when setting goals and evaluating progress. A goal-setting utility is available in both Acadience Data Management to help teachers understand the amount of progress that each student must make to achieve each of the pathway descriptors. Setting goals is an important first step in monitoring a student’s progress throughout the year and making adjustments to instruction as needed (e.g., when a student is not on track to reach the goal). Monitoring progress is particularly important for students who need additional instructional support to achieve benchmark goals.

How Does the Summative Growth Report Inform Decision Making?

Summative Growth Reports, which are available to administrators at the end of the year, are based on the Pathways of Progress analysis described above. The Summative Growth Report shows the percent of students in each classroom who are making typical progress or better (i.e., the number of students on Pathways 3, 4, and 5). These data are then compared to data from other classrooms across the country at the same grade level to determine each classroom’s overall classroom reading progress. On the Summative Growth Report, classrooms are given one of five classroom reading progress descriptors based on their percentile rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Descriptor</th>
<th>Classroom Reading Progress Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>96th and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>76th to 95th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>25th to 75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>5th to 24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below Average Classroom Reading Progress</td>
<td>below 1st to 4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1These are the default criteria. Modified criteria can be requested by state departments of education if their expectations and criteria are different.
**How Should Summative Growth Data Be Used?**

The information from the Summative Growth Report should be used first and foremost to examine system-level outcomes with the goal of supporting teachers in their efforts to improve student and classroom outcomes. In addition, the Summative Growth Report provides a useful tool that can be used as one component of a comprehensive teacher-evaluation process. The information from Summative Growth Reports should be used in conjunction with other methods of evaluating teacher performance such as observation, records review, and data on growth in other academic skill areas. The Summative Growth Report is intended for use by teachers, coaches, and grade-level teams to reflect on the classroom system of instruction and support. Administrators are encouraged to use Summative Growth Reports to help identify areas of strength, as well as areas that need additional support to improve future outcomes.

When using the Summative Growth Report for evaluation and accountability purposes, data from the reports should be shared with teachers individually and accompanied with or closely followed by a meeting with the principal. Key talking points for principals to use in their discussions of the data from Summative Growth Reports with teachers are:

- This information is a tool for discussion regarding the progress of students with respect to their overall reading proficiency and what may have contributed to their progress (or lack thereof).
- These data will be used to guide and inform the support provided to teachers and students.
- If the Summative Growth Report will be used with respect to accountability, then note that teacher effectiveness is now being judged in part by student progress. This process may be quite different from how effectiveness has been determined previously.
- This is one piece of information with respect to decisions around teacher effectiveness. Other information will be considered. See the list of important considerations above, as well as the factors noted at the top of the Summative Growth Report (i.e., teacher-related, student-related, system-related factors, as well as home and community factors).
- Although students’ progress is considered for their teacher of record in the context of the Summative Growth Reports, many personnel are involved in each student’s education and are responsible for the student’s progress. Importantly, no system of evaluation can completely isolate a teacher’s impact on a student’s test scores.

Additional information about the Summative Growth Report can be found in the *Acadience Reading K–6 Summative Growth Report Implementation Guide.*
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