

How *Jamestown Reading Navigator*TM
Supports Research-Based Instruction
for Struggling Adolescent Readers

Formative and Summative Assessment

Prepared for

Glencoe/McGraw-Hill

by

Interactive Educational Systems Design, Inc.

New York, NY



Glencoe

About This Paper

This paper presents research-supported best practices related to instruction of struggling adolescent readers—that is, students in grades 6–12 who are reading at least two levels below grade level—and describes how *Jamestown Reading Navigator*[™] supports those practices.

What Is *Jamestown Reading Navigator*?

Jamestown Reading Navigator is a reading intervention program designed specifically for students in grades 6–12 who are reading two or more reading levels below their grade in school. The program provides direct, explicit instruction and modeling of good reading practices, together with opportunities for students to practice and apply these reading strategies.

Jamestown Reading Navigator combines online activities featuring interactive multimedia for students to complete; engaging and appropriate online and print texts for students to read; an audio component for further guided or independent study; student writing in response to reading; student recording of fluency passages; an assessment program to monitor students' progress; an independent measure of progress monitoring; and teacher support materials, including professional development, lesson plans, instructional recommendations, and reteaching skills support. Major areas of focus for *Jamestown Reading Navigator* include

- Comprehension skills and strategies, designed for application to content-area reading
- Vocabulary
- Writing
- Fluency
- Decoding/phonics (for students with a particular need in this area)

The *Jamestown Reading Navigator* Learner Management System helps teachers manage individual student learning and provides ongoing, up-to-the-minute information on how students are performing. Online professional development modules and on-site professional development sessions offered by Jamestown Education help educators—teachers, administrators, literacy specialists, and others—learn how to implement *Jamestown Reading Navigator* more effectively. These sessions also provide information and suggestions to help educators develop effective strategies for working with struggling adolescent readers.

Jamestown Reading Navigator has been developed based on the most up-to-date research and expert thinking in adolescent literacy, drawing on more than 30 years of experience in reaching adolescent readers with the popular Jamestown Education print series. This paper describes the match between *Jamestown Reading Navigator* and the best available instructional thinking in a variety of specific areas that are important to the success of struggling adolescent readers, as described below.

Introduction

A Critical Need to Support Struggling Adolescent Readers

Problems with literacy have serious and long-lasting consequences. A lack of literacy skills is “one of the most commonly cited reasons” for students to drop out of school (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 7). A resource guide on adolescent literacy prepared for the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory described the problem as follows:

For secondary-level students . . . the social and economic consequences of not reading well can be cumulative and profound: the failure to attain a high school diploma, a barrier to higher education, underemployment or unemployment, and difficulty in managing personal and family life. Years of failing at what is deemed a hallmark of intelligence and worth can also leave struggling readers with emotional consequences, such as anxiety and low self-esteem, that affect personality and interpersonal relationships. These effects within and beyond the classroom walls show that by the secondary grades educators can no longer defer solutions to future development or instruction. (Peterson et al., 2000, p. 6)¹

¹ Peterson et al. (2000) is laid out in a paginated PDF format, but the format does not include page numbers. Page references for quotes from Peterson et al. (2000) that are given in this paper have therefore been calculated on the basis of page numbers shown in the document table of contents.

Numerous sources attest to the scope of the challenge. *Reading Next* cited both results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the opinions of experts in adolescent literacy that “as many as 70 percent of students struggle with reading in some manner” that requires instruction differentiated for their specific needs (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 8, citing Loomis & Bourque, 2001; NCES, 1999, 2006; Olson, 2006).

Adolescents struggle with literacy for a variety of reasons. For some, English may not be their first language. Others may have mild learning disabilities. In many cases, students may simply lack experience and skill with reading. Unfortunately, difficulties in reading don’t cure themselves, but instead tend to get worse as students get older—a phenomenon reading experts refer to as the “Matthew Effect” (Stanovich, 1986). These students need literacy instruction that addresses the specific challenges they face, using the best available research-based methods and principles, in order to improve their chances of succeeding both during school and afterward.

The State of Research on Struggling Adolescent Readers

Over the last two decades, attempts to improve student literacy on the national level have focused largely on elementary instruction, and particularly on early literacy—that is, literacy at the primary grades. For example, the focus of the Reading First initiative was on improving literacy at the primary levels. Recently, however, a number of efforts—including research summaries for a variety of sources, publication of the *Reading Next* report and other documents from the Alliance for Excellent Education, and position statements from organizations such as the National Reading Conference and the International Reading Association—have helped create a higher profile for instructional issues related to adolescent readers, and particularly the large proportion of adolescents who struggle with reading.

Initiatives such as the No Child Left Behind Act have raised expectations for instruction. Instruction is expected to be backed with solid research that concludes it is likely to result in the desired impact on student learning. Unfortunately, research on what constitutes effective literacy instruction for adolescents is still limited. According to the editors of a volume intended to “compile from the best researchers in the field a summary and synthesis of adolescent literacy research and practice,”

As of 2003, there is not a body of research to tell us appropriate interventions that will help struggling middle and secondary school readers who can barely read. As of 2003, we still do not have a body of research to provide us with appropriate interventions to help high school readers who can read fluently but remain 3 or 4 years below grade level in reading. (Jetton & Dole, 2004, p. 6)

Although research on what constitutes effective literacy instruction for adolescents is limited in significant ways, there is substantial support in research and expert opinion for a variety of specific instructional recommendations. The state of knowledge with regard to effective instruction for struggling adolescent readers fits the description of *best available evidence* as characterized by U.S. Department of Education Assistant Secretary Grover J. Whitehurst: that is, “the integration of professional wisdom with the best available empirical evidence in making decisions about how to deliver instruction” (Whitehurst, 2002).

The Reading Next Report

A critical milestone in recent efforts to highlight the challenges related to adolescent literacy was the publication of *Reading Next*, a report to Carnegie Corporation of New York focusing on the needs of adolescent readers (defined in the report as those in grades 4–12), with a special emphasis on the needs of struggling readers. Preparation of this report included the following steps.

- A panel of five nationally known and respected educational researchers was convened in spring 2004, together with representatives of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Alliance for Excellent Education.
- These panelists drew up a set of recommendations for how to meet the needs of struggling readers, including 15 specific elements of effective adolescent literacy programs that had “a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12). These included both elements with an instructional focus and recommended infrastructure elements to improve adolescent literacy.

- The resulting paper was reviewed and augmented at the 2004 meeting of the Adolescent Literacy Funders Forum (ALFF).
- An Appendix was compiled of literature supporting each of the report’s main recommendations.
- In 2006, a second edition of the report was published.

The *Reading Next* recommendations thus represented a synthesis of research-informed expert opinion that serves as an important touchstone for much of what is known about effective adolescent literacy instruction. Several caveats, however, are in order with regard to using the recommendations as a yardstick for measuring instructional programs in general, and *Jamestown Reading Navigator* in particular.

- While all 15 elements identified by *Reading Next* are characterized as having “a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12), the report nonetheless cautions that “the optimal mix of these factors has yet to be determined. . . . Nor does the remediation of adolescent literacy difficulties involve indiscriminately layering on all fifteen key elements. Choices should be matched to school and student needs” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 29). The expectation is not that each literacy program should necessarily include all 15 elements, but that developers and adopters of such programs should select those elements that seem best matched to their specific circumstances.
- The focus of *Reading Next* is explicitly on “the large population of struggling students who already decode accurately but still struggle with reading and writing after third grade” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 11). The report thus does not include recommendations related to areas such as decoding and fluency that may be important for readers who are struggling at a more basic level.
- Several of the elements of *Reading Next* relate to how infrastructure impacts adolescent literacy learning. The most that any purchased instructional program can do in these areas is to provide support to schools and districts as they implement these elements.

Development of This Paper

Development of this research-based white paper included the following steps.

- A top-level review of *Reading Next* was conducted to identify claims and recommended practices, including both those that are associated with the 15 key elements of adolescent literacy identified in the report and those that appear elsewhere in the report. As part of this review, information was collected about the sources in the Appendix to *Reading Next*, which listed literature supporting each of the 15 key elements.
- Well-known experts in the field of adolescent literacy were consulted to identify key, current, and reputable sources related to instruction for struggling adolescent readers. These included both experts who had been consulted during the development of *Jamestown Reading Navigator* and an independent expert not previously associated with the program.²
- Key documents were identified for review, with priority given to two types of documents:
 - *Broad policy-oriented research reviews and surveys of expert opinion, developed by reputable institutions and authors, with a goal of identifying key elements in effective adolescent literacy programs*
 - *More focused research syntheses and meta-analyses from reputable sources, describing the state of research and/or theory related to a specific relevant topic in adolescent literacy (e.g., comprehension, writing, formative assessment)*

² Key contributors included Dr. Thomas W. Bean, professor in literacy/reading and coordinator of doctoral studies in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Nevada at Las Vegas; Dr. William G. Brozo, professor of literacy, Graduate School of Education, George Mason University; and Dr. Douglas Fisher, professor of language and literacy education, San Diego State University. Drs. Brozo and Fisher had previously consulted with the development team for *Jamestown Reading Navigator*. These experts provided input into interpretation of the research literature, as well as recommendations of sources to review, but are not responsible for writing the summaries of the literature or for developing the correlations of the instructional recommendations to *Jamestown Reading Navigator*.

In addition to these two types of documents, some specific research reports were also identified for review, in the case of studies that were particularly germane to topics under investigation.

- Sources were reviewed and summarized, with special reference to
 - *Specific instructional recommendations*
 - *The nature of the evidence supporting each recommendation*
- Instructional recommendations were consolidated from multiple sources.
- Cross-comparison of the research-based recommendations and *Jamestown Reading Navigator* verified that *Jamestown Reading Navigator* supports each research-based recommendation listed in this paper.

In the final paper as presented here, each section spells out specific instructional recommendations that are supported by a mix of research and expert opinion. A table then provides information on how *Jamestown Reading Navigator* aligns with each recommendation.

Key policy-oriented documents and research syntheses that were reviewed for this paper are listed in the References section of the complete White Paper.

FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

“[T]he best instructional improvements are informed by ongoing assessment of student strengths and needs.”—*Reading Next* (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 19)

“Adolescents deserve assessment that shows them their strengths as well as their needs and that guides their teachers to design instruction that will best help them grow as readers.”—Position statement from the International Reading Association’s Commission on Adolescent Literacy (Moore et al., 1999, p. 6)

What Are Formative and Summative Assessment?

Formative assessment and summative assessment share a common goal of evaluating student knowledge. The key distinction between the two is the purpose for which the evaluation is carried out.

- Formative assessment is intended to inform and guide adjustments to instruction on an ongoing basis.
- Summative assessment is intended to monitor progress and evaluate the overall success of both students and instructional programs on a long-term basis.

Other distinctions stem from this difference in purpose:

- Formative assessments are often (though not always) informal and either embedded in classroom work or closely aligned to specific instructional activities, while summative assessments are more formal and separate from classroom instructional activities.
- Formative assessments are primarily intended to inform teachers and students, whereas summative assessments are intended to inform a broader range of stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, administrators, the community, and various levels of institutional accountability.
- Formative assessments can take many different forms, all of which contribute to an understanding of a student’s learning, while summative assessments typically consist of a few standardized measures. Common examples of formative assessments include informal reading inventories, running records, miscue analyses, fluency checks for repeated readings, oral questioning in a group setting, and oral or written retellings of what students have read.

Why Are Formative and Summative Assessment Important?

Based on a review of 250 research studies across multiple ages and subject areas, Black and Wiliam (1998b) found that “All these studies show that innovations that include strengthening the practice of formative assessment produce significant and often substantial learning gains” (p. 140), with typical effect sizes ranging from 0.4 to 0.7 (p. 141). Black and Wiliam generalized that “The gains in achievement [across the research they reviewed] appear to be quite considerable, and . . . amongst the largest ever reported for educational interventions” (Black & Wiliam, 1998a, p. 61).

This finding aligns with the description of formative assessment in *How People Learn*, a synthesis of research on learning across the subject areas, which incorporated findings from psychology, child development, the study of learning transfer, anthropology, and neuroscience. Discussing the assessment-centered classroom, the authors of *How People Learn* stated,

Formative assessments—ongoing assessments designed to make students’ thinking visible to both teachers and students—are essential. They permit the teacher to grasp the students’ preconceptions, understand where the students are in the “developmental corridor” from informal to formal thinking, and design instruction accordingly. In the assessment-centered classroom environment, formative assessments help both teachers and students monitor progress. (National Research Council, 2000, p. 24)

In particular, Black and Wiliam (1998b) found that many of the studies they reviewed concluded that “improved formative assessment helps low achievers more than other students and so reduces the range of achievement while raising achievement overall” (p. 141). Their analysis found that “While formative assessment can help all pupils, it yields particularly good results with low achievers by concentrating on specific problems with their work and giving them a clear understanding of what is wrong and how to put it right” (pp. 142–143). Formative assessment also helps teachers adjust their instruction as needed in response to the specific challenges students are facing. These factors make formative assessment particularly important as a tool to help struggling readers.

Summative assessment plays a different, but also vital, role. Ongoing summative assessment represents an important tool for monitoring student progress across time—both a single year and multiple years—and across subject areas. As such, it is an indispensable component of the type of comprehensive and coordinated literacy programs recommended by *Reading Next*. Summative assessments also allow evaluation of the intervention program itself and analysis of changes that can be made to improve its success for all students.

In light of these factors, it is hardly surprising that formative assessment and summative assessment are two of three critical elements (together with professional development) that *Reading Next* identified for improving adolescent literacy. As the report stated:

No literacy program targeted at older readers is likely to cause significant improvements without these elements, because of their importance to ensuring instructional effectiveness and measuring effects. (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 5)

Instructional Recommendations

Formative Assessment

Based on the description in *Reading Next* and other selected credible sources, effective formative assessment includes the following characteristics.

- **Is ongoing and frequent.** According to *Reading Next*, “[T]he best instructional improvements are informed by ongoing assessment of student strengths and needs. Such assessments . . . frequently occur on a daily basis” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 19). A report on adolescent literacy for the National Association of State Boards of Education similarly stated that ongoing formative assessments are “taken frequently, even daily, to identify students’ individual needs and to design instruction so that students can reach learning goals” (NASBE, 2006, p. 33).

- **Is used for guiding instruction.** *Reading Next* described formative assessments as being “specifically designed to inform instruction on a very frequent basis so that adjustments in instruction can be made to ensure that students are on pace to reach mastery targets” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 20). The NASBE (2006) report similarly described “[u]se of formative assessments as a frequent part of teaching and learning to help guide instruction” as being among “the fundamentals of those essential components that have been consistently linked with high student achievement” (NASBE, 2006, p. 18).
- **Provides useful feedback to students.** A key element of formative assessment is the essential role played by feedback to students. According to Black and Wiliam (1998b), “Feedback has been shown to improve learning when it gives each pupil specific guidance on strengths and weaknesses” (p. 144). Specifically, Black and Wiliam (1998a) cited a meta-analysis of 58 experiments that found that of the variables tracked, the quality of feedback had the largest impact on students’ performance (p. 36, citing Bangert-Drowns, Kulik, Kulik, & Morgan, 1991). Similarly, Marzano (2003) reported “impressive results” from a review of five synthesis studies³ on the importance of feedback to students (p. 37). Average effect sizes in this research ranged from 0.54 to 1.35, with corresponding percentile gains ranging from 21 to 41 points. Describing these results in more depth, Marzano identified two research-based characteristics that feedback must have in order to be effective:
 - “First, it must be timely. Students must receive feedback throughout the learning process—ideally multiple times throughout the school year” (p. 37, citing Bangert-Drowns et al., 1991).
 - “Second, effective feedback must be specific to the content being learned” (p. 38, citing Bangert-Drowns et al., 1991; Madaus, Kellaghan, Rakow, & King, 1979; Madaus, Airasian, & Kellaghan, 1980).
- **Incorporates formal and informal measures.** In describing ongoing and frequent formative assessments, the authors of *Reading Next* stated, “Such assessments are often, but not exclusively, informal” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 19).
 - More broadly, the NASBE (2006) report argued, “In order to tailor instruction effectively, multiple indicators including curriculum-based assessments and diagnostic measures (e.g., fluency checks, individual reading inventories) should be used to undertake a more thorough analysis of reading difficulties” (p. 27).
- **Incorporates self-assessment.** According to Black and Wiliam’s (1998a, 1998b) analysis, self-assessment is an essential component of formative assessment whose value is verified by research.
 - Black and Wiliam claim that “[S]elf-assessment by pupils, far from being a luxury, is in fact an essential component of formative assessment. . . . Thus we conclude: if formative assessment is to be productive, pupils should be trained in self-assessment so that they can understand the main purposes of their learning and thereby grasp what they need to do to achieve” (1998b, p. 143; emphasis in original).
 - Similarly, How People Learn singles out self-assessment as a critical component of effective instruction, particularly in the context of metacognition: “Effective teachers . . . help students build skills of self-assessment. Students learn to assess their own work, as well as the work of their peers, in order to help everyone learn more effectively. . . . Such self-assessment is an important part of the metacognitive approach to instruction” (National Research Council, 2000, p. 140, citing Vye et al., 1998a, 1998b).
- **Makes information available to educators.** In describing the need for formative assessments, the authors of *Reading Next* stated, “Data should be cataloged [sic] on a computer system that would allow teachers, administrators, and evaluators to inspect students’ progress individually and by class” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, pp. 19–20). Such availability of information facilitates the use of assessment information to guide ongoing adjustments to instruction, suggesting that information from formative assessments may be used in ways that relate to summative evaluation of students and programs.

3 Bloom, 1976; Haller, Child, & Walberg, 1988; Kumar, 1991; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Walberg, 1999.

Summative Assessment

Based on the description in *Reading Next*, effective summative assessment includes the following characteristics that are supported by *Jamestown Reading Navigator*.

- **Facilitates progress monitoring.** *Reading Next* identified “ongoing summative assessment of students and programs” as one of 15 “promising elements of effective adolescent literacy programs . . . that had a substantial base in research and/or professional opinion” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 12). According to *Reading Next*, “[T]hese assessments are designed specifically for implementation with continuous progress-monitoring systems. These systems would allow teachers to track students throughout a school year and, ideally, over an entire academic career, from kindergarten through high school” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 21). Similarly, the NASBE report on adolescent literacy identified “[c]omprehensive systems to monitor performance of individual students and to intervene to help struggling students” as being among “the fundamentals of those essential components that have been consistently linked with high student achievement” (NASBE, 2006, p. 18).
 - *The potential importance of such information was described by Peterson et al. (2000) in a review of research on secondary reading: “To provide appropriate support, teachers should know the history of a student’s reading difficulties, the interventions made, and the instruction missed. For example, the teacher can look for evidence of the development of reading proficiency such as phonemic knowledge at the primary grades, background knowledge at grades three and four, and strategy knowledge at the upper grades” (p. 17, citing Willson & Rupley, 1997).*
 - *Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) represents one reliable, valid approach to ongoing assessment that is sensitive to student improvement (Deno, Fuchs, Marston, & Shin, 2001; Fuchs, 1986; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1999, 2004). In CBM reading, students read graded text passages of equal difficulty at set time intervals, completing either a multiple-choice cloze test or an oral reading measure to evaluate their reading. Research has shown that CBM can be an effective tool for goal setting and progress monitoring, and for improving achievement in students with reading needs (Fuchs, 1998; Fuchs, Deno, & Mirkin, 1984; Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, & Ferguson, 1992; Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, & Stecker, 1991; Fuchs, Hamlett, Stecker, & Ferguson, 1988).*
- **Provides information for multiple audiences.** The *Reading Next* report described the “intended audience” of summative assessments as including “the local school district administration, the state and federal departments of education, and others who fund and/or support the school, such as private foundations, the local community, parents, and students” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006, p. 20).

How *Jamestown Reading Navigator* Aligns with the Characteristics of Effective Formative and Summative Assessment

Direct responsibility for summative assessment typically rests with the local school and district, sometimes guided by state requirements or involving a state-sponsored test. *Jamestown Reading Navigator* includes features that support summative assessment, as well as a rich set of formative assessment features. The following table describes *Jamestown Reading Navigator’s* assessment features and explains how they align with the characteristics of effective formative and summative assessment described above.

Summary of Assessment Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
Assessments should be ongoing and frequent.	<p><i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a variety of assessment features that ensure ongoing and frequent assessment of student progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A placement test, consisting of text passages followed by reading skill and vocabulary comprehension questions, is used to place students into their appropriate trek (level) in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. • Within the treks, students complete activities that function as ongoing formative assessments of student learning. Examples include prereading skill activities, vocabulary matching, and comprehension monitoring questions. A student who works daily in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> will likely encounter multiple assessments each day.

Continued ➡

Summary of Assessment Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Assessments should be ongoing and frequent. <i>(continued)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A variety of more formal assessments also appears frequently in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>. For example, in Trek 1, students review sight words and word family words in a series of three graded activities. In Treks 2–4, students complete the Journey Test, Check Your Skill, Check Your Vocabulary, and <i>inClass Reader</i> quizzes. • Each quest (unit) in Treks 2–4 includes a summative test that checks for transfer of skills. Students read four separate passages to determine whether the reading skills and vocabulary they learned in the quest’s journeys are self-extending and can be applied to new material. • Separate from their other work in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>, students complete an AIMSWEB Progress Monitoring Maze multiple-choice cloze task every other week throughout Treks 1–4. This curriculum-based measurement (CBM) provides an independent measure of student progress in reading and helps identify whether students are progressing satisfactorily.
<p>Assessments should guide adjustments to instruction.</p>	<p>Assessments in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> guide instruction in a variety of ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance on the placement test determines where students begin their work. • An optional pretest at the beginning of each journey (lesson) in Treks 2–4 lets students skip the journey if they already know the skills and the vocabulary it teaches. • Also in Treks 2–4, students who score 50 percent or less on the skill or vocabulary section of the Journey Test (administered in the After Reading section of the journey) complete a review lesson and follow-up assessment on the skill or vocabulary component. Students who do not pass these assessments are listed on the Reading Skills Intervention Report and/or the Vocabulary Intervention Report. Teachers are encouraged to provide these students with additional instruction and practice as needed, using resources in the <i>Reteaching Skills Support</i> materials. • Based on student performance on the Journey Tests and the Quest Tests, teachers can choose to have students repeat a specific journey to review the skills and the content covered in that journey. • Teachers are encouraged to monitor student performance using the <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> reports and adjust instruction accordingly. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Class Summary Reports show whether a student <i>requires</i> intervention, may need intervention, or has successfully completed a quest. – The Sight Words Intervention Report, the Word Families Intervention Report, the Reading Skills Intervention Report, and the Vocabulary Intervention Report list students who need additional help with a specific skill or learning area. Teachers are encouraged to use <i>Reteaching Skill Support</i> resources to provide additional instruction and practice in these areas. Teachers can also choose to have a student repeat a journey. – Interpreting Learner Management System reports and using the information from them to evaluate student progress, plan lessons, and conduct targeted intervention is an area of focus for both the initial on-site <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> implementation training and the follow-up training.

Continued ➡

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Summary of Assessment Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
Assessments should provide timely and specific feedback to students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students completing a Journey Test or a Quest Test receive immediate and substantive feedback that shows whether their choice is correct or incorrect, what the correct choice is, and why an answer is correct or incorrect. • Students completing scored online activities in <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> receive immediate feedback that shows whether their choice was correct or incorrect and what the correct choice is. • Students completing the AIMSWEB Progress Monitoring assessments see immediate feedback showing a score that consists of the number of correct words. • The <i>Teacher Resource Guide</i> provides guidance to teachers on how to score students' writing assignments and fluency recordings. Teachers are guided to assess students' writing and fluency assignments in ways that are clear and provide accurate feedback to students.
Assessments should incorporate a variety of measures, including both formal and informal assessments.	<i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> includes a wide range of assessments as described above, including both informal measures as students are carrying out learning activities and more formal assessments.
Students should have opportunities to assess their own progress.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on assessments provides students with opportunities to assess their own learning in specific areas. • Students assess their own work in literature circle activities (described in the <i>inClass Reader Teacher Guide</i>). Students write their responses to the following questions: How did your group do today? How did you add something positive to your group today? How could your group have done better? What will you do better in the next group? Teachers are provided with space on the form to respond to students' self-assessments. • Each student has access to a My Scores Report that shows scores from the student's current quest. Scores from previous treks and quests can be accessed using drop-down menus. • Teachers are encouraged to have students keep a Goals and Progress Chart to help them keep track of their progress on a daily basis, using a format that is provided as a blackline master. Students in Treks 2–4 are asked to reflect on their progress by answering the questions What progress did I make? What would I do differently next time? • Within Trek 1, students complete a metacognition activity at the end of each journey in which they assess their own progress.
Assessment data should be maintained on a computer system and accessible to educators.	<i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> maintains all data on student online performance within the program in the Learner Management System, where it can be accessed through a variety of reports. (See the next page for more detail.) Teachers also input students' scores on writing assignments and fluency recordings into the Learner Management System.

Continued ➔

Summary of Assessment Recommendations	Application Through <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i>
<p>Assessments should allow educators to monitor individual student progress throughout the school year.</p>	<p>Reports in the <i>Learner Management System</i> show</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where each student began the program; how far each student has progressed; and whether a student <i>requires</i> intervention, <i>may</i> need intervention, or has successfully completed a quest (Class Summary Report) • Scores from all completed journeys in each student’s current quest (Class Scores Report) • All of an individual student’s scores from all completed journeys in the current trek, together with indications of whether the student requires intervention; starting date and total time spent in a journey; reading level progress; and access to the Progress Monitoring Report, which shows the student’s raw scores over time on the AIMSWEB assessment (Student Scores Report) • A comprehensive list of work a student has completed, with access to the student’s online work and detailed information about student performance, including time spent on each activity and scores for each graded activity (View Student Work) • Growth in the reading level of all students in the class, as measured by scores on the Sight Words Reviews and Word Family Reviews in selected Indicator Journeys (Trek 1) or on the Journey Pretest or the Journey Test in selected Indicator Journeys (Treks 2–4) (Reading Level Progress Report) • Summary for administrators of students’ progress in reading levels for a specific site, grade level, teacher, or class (Summary of Reading Level Progress Report). A version of this report lets administrators view scores in specified NCLB categories: grade level, gender, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, migrant status, English proficiency, and disabilities status. • Summary for administrators of students’ reading-level growth over time on the AIMSWEB Progress Monitoring assessments for a specific site, grade level, teacher, or class (Progress Monitoring Report) • A list of students who need intervention on a specific skill or learning area (Sight Words Intervention Report, Word Families Intervention Report, Reading Skills Intervention Report, Vocabulary Intervention Report) • A list of students who have completed journeys related to specific reading skills and indicators of students’ performance in those skills (Reading Skills Overview)
<p>Assessments should provide information for administration.</p>	<p>The two administrator reports described above—Summary of Reading Level Progress Report and the administrator version of the Progress Monitoring Report—provide information on student progress for a specific site, grade level, teacher, or class. The Summary of Reading Level Progress Report lets administrators view scores in specified NCLB categories, as described above.</p>
<p>Assessments should provide information for parents.</p>	<p>A printable version of the Student Scores Report can be shared with parents to provide information on their child’s performance.</p>
<p>Assessments should provide information for students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on student performance in the <i>Jamestown Reading Navigator</i> activities and assessments is provided directly to students. • Each student has access to a My Scores Report that shows scores from the student’s current quest and that can be used to show scores from previous treks and quests.

INTRODUCTION References

- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 8, 2007, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf>.
- Jetton, T. L., & Dole, J. A. (2004). Introduction. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 1–11). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Loomis, S. C., & Bourque, M. L. (Eds.). (2001). *National assessment of educational progress achievement levels 1992–1998 for reading*. Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board. Retrieved from <http://www.nagb.org/pubs/readingbook.pdf>.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (1999). *Nation's report card: Reading 1998*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=1999500>.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2006). *Nation's report card: Reading 2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006451>.
- Olson, L. (2006). A decade of effort. *Quality Counts*, 25, 8–10, 12, 14, 16, 18–21.
- Peterson, C. L., Caverly, D. C., Nicholson, S. A., O'Neal, S., & Cusenbary, S. (2000). *Building reading proficiency at the secondary level: A guide to resources*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/reading16/buildingreading.pdf>.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360–407.
- Whitehurst, G. J. (2002, October). *Evidence-based education (EBE)* [electronic presentation]. Retrieved May 31, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/methods/whatworks/eb/edlite-slide001.html>.

FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

References

- Bangert-Drowns, R.L., Kulik, C-L.C., Kulik, J.A., & Morgan, M.T. (1991a). The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 213–238.
- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 8, 2007, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf>.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998a). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 7–71.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998b). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–148.
- Bloom, B. S. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Deno, S. L., Fuchs, L. S., Marston, D., & Shin, J. (2001). Using Curriculum-Based Measurement to establish growth standards for students with learning disabilities. *School Psychology Review*, 30, 507–524.
- Fuchs, L. S. (1986). Monitoring progress among mildly handicapped pupils: Review of current practice and research. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7, 5–12.
- Fuchs, L. S. (1998). Computer applications to address implementation difficulties associated with Curriculum-Based Measurement. In M. R. Shinn (Ed.), *Advanced applications of Curriculum-Based Measurement* (pp. 89–112). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fuchs, L. S., Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. (1984). The effects of frequent Curriculum-Based Measurement and evaluation on pedagogy, student achievement, and student awareness of learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 449–460.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1999). Monitoring student progress toward the development of reading competence: A review of three forms of classroom-based assessment. *School Psychology Review*, 28(4), 659–671.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2004). *What is scientifically based research on progress monitoring?* Washington, DC: National Center on Progress Monitoring, American Institute for Research, Office of Special Education Programs. Retrieved April 9, 2007, from http://www.studentprogress.org/library/What_is_Scientificall_%20Based_Research.pdf.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., & Ferguson, C. (1992). Effects of expert system consultation within Curriculum-Based Measurement using a reading maze task. *Exceptional Children*, 58(5), 436–450.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., & Stecker, P. M. (1991). Effects of Curriculum-Based Measurement and consultation on teaching planning and student achievement in mathematics operations. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 617–641.
- Fuchs, L. S., Hamlett, C. L., Stecker, P. M., & Ferguson, C. (1988). Conducting Curriculum-Based Measurement with computerized data collection: Effects on efficiency and teacher satisfaction. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 9(2), 73–86.
- Haller, E. P., Child, D. A., & Walberg, H. J. (1988). Can comprehension be taught? A quantitative synthesis of “metacognitive studies.” *Educational Researcher*, 17(9), 5–8.
- Kumar, D. D. (1991). A meta-analysis of the relationship between science instruction and student engagement. *Education Review*, 43(1), 49–66.
- Madaus, G. F., Airasian, P. W., & Kellaghan, T. (1980). *School effectiveness: A reassessment of the evidence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Madaus, G. F., Kellaghan, T., Rakow, E. A., & King, D. (1979). The sensitivity of measures of school effectiveness. *Harvard Educational Review*, 49(2), 207–230.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., and Rycik, J. A. (1999). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement*. Retrieved January 29, 2007, from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1036_adolescent.pdf. Also published in the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43, 97–112.
- National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school* (expanded ed.). Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning and Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice. J. D. Bransford, A. Brown, & R. R. Cocking (Eds.). Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- NASBE Study Group on Middle and High School Literacy. (2006). *Reading at risk: The state response to the crisis in adolescent literacy* (Rev. ed.). Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education. Retrieved February 17, 2007, from http://www.carnegie.org/literacy/pdf/Reading_at_Risk_report.pdf.
- Peterson, C. L., Caverly, D. C., Nicholson, S. A., O’Neal, S., & Cusenbary, S. (2000). *Building reading proficiency at the secondary level: A guide to resources*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved April 3, 2007, from <http://www.seidl.org/pubs/reading16/buildingreading.pdf>.
- Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. (1997). *The foundations of educational effectiveness*. New York: Elsevier.
- Vye, N. J., Goldman, S. R., Voss, J. F., Hmelo, C., Williams, S., and Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1998a). Complex mathematical problem solving by individuals and dyads. *Cognition and Instruction*, 15(4).
- Vye, N. J., Schwartz, D. L., Bransford, J. D., Barron, B. J., Zech, L., and Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1998b). SMART environments that support monitoring, reflection, and revision. In D. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, and A. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in educational theory and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Walberg, H. J. (1999). Productive teaching. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *New directions for teaching practice and research* (pp. 75–104). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing.
- Willson, V. L., & Rupley, W. H. (1997). A structural equation model for reading comprehension based on background, phonemic, and strategy knowledge. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 1(1), 45–63.



The McGraw-Hill Companies

ONE PRUDENTIAL PLAZA
130 E. RANDOLPH STREET, #900
CHICAGO, IL 60601

1-800-334-7344
glencoe.com
glencoe.com/catalog