

DYSLEXIA REFERRAL CHECKLIST MANUAL KINDERGARTEN

WHAT IS DYSLEXIA?

- a. There are numerous definitions of dyslexia. However, most of the definitions include references to difficulty learning to read and spell. The Texas Education Code (TEC) §38.003 defines dyslexia as...
 - “Dyslexia” means a disorder of constitutional origin manifested by a difficulty in learning to read, write, or spell, despite conventional instruction, adequate intelligence, and sociocultural opportunity. “Related disorders” include disorders similar to or related to dyslexia, such as developmental auditory imperceptions, dysphasia, specific developmental dyslexia, developmental dysgraphia, and developmental spelling disability.

- b. The International Dyslexia Association (2002) describes dyslexia in the following way...
 - Dyslexia is a specific learning disability that is neurobiological in origin. It is characterized by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities. These difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities and the provision of effective classroom instruction. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.

While broad definitions like those included above can be used to help parents understand dyslexia, educators in Texas are required to follow laws and guidelines around dyslexia screening and intervention.

WHAT ARE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFYING STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA IN TEXAS?

Federal Law	State Law	State Implementation
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 as amended in 2008 (Section 504), the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).	HB 1886 Texas Administrative Code §74.28 Texas Education Code §38.003(a) - screened for dyslexia at the end of the school year of each student in kindergarten and each student in the first grade.	Dyslexia Handbook Adopted 2018. This update implements statutory requirements added by 85 th Texas Legislature

The above referenced Dyslexia Handbook does an excellent job of summarizing the characteristics of dyslexia.

- a. Students identified as having dyslexia typically experience primary difficulties in phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness and manipulation, single-word reading, reading fluency, and spelling. Consequences may include difficulties in reading comprehension and/or written expression. These difficulties in phonological awareness are unexpected for the student's age and educational level and are not primarily the result of language difference factors. Additionally, there is often a family history of similar difficulties.
- b. Reading/Spelling characteristics of dyslexia:
 - Difficulty reading words in isolation
 - Difficulty accurately decoding unfamiliar words
 - Difficulty with oral reading (slow, inaccurate, or labored without prosody)
 - Difficulty spelling
- c. Reading/Spelling characteristics are most often associated with the following:
 - Segmenting, blending, and manipulating sounds in words (phonemic awareness)
 - Learning the names of letters and their associated sounds
 - Holding information about sounds and words in memory (phonological memory)

- Rapidly recalling the names of familiar objects, colors, or letters of the alphabet (rapid naming)
- d. Consequences of dyslexia might include
- Variable difficulty with aspects of reading comprehension
 - Variable difficulty with aspects of written language
 - Limited vocabulary growth due to reduced reading experiences
- e. In early elementary school (i.e., kindergarten through second grade), characteristics of dyslexia might include the following:
- Difficulty breaking words into smaller parts, or syllables (e.g., “baseball” can be pulled apart into “base” “ball” or “napkin” can be pulled apart into “nap” “kin”)
 - Difficulty identifying and manipulating sounds in syllables (e.g., “man” sounded out as /m/ /ă/ /n/)
 - Difficulty remembering the names of letters and recalling their corresponding sounds
 - Difficulty decoding single words (reading single words in isolation)
 - Difficulty spelling words the way they sound (phonetically) or remembering letter sequences in very common words seen often in print (e.g., “sed” for “said”)

(Note: Please remember that students with dyslexia display differences in the degree of impairment across these characteristics and may not exhibit all of the characteristics included)

- a. Changes to the state laws/education code.
- In the last legislative session, the State Board of Education (SBOE) introduced amended rules in the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §74.28, Students with Dyslexia and Related Disorders.
- b. The change in rules speaks primarily to the evaluation and identification of a student with dyslexia or related disorders. In addition, the new rule includes guidelines for screening for Kindergarten and First Grade students.
- c. Essentially, the new rules specify that children need to be screened for dyslexia.

- d. Screening is defined as a universal measure administered to **all** students by qualified personnel to determine which students are at risk for dyslexia or reading difficulties and/or a related disorder. Screening is **not** a formal evaluation.
- *TEC §38.003(a) requires students to be screened or tested, as appropriate, for dyslexia and related disorders at appropriate times in accordance with a program approved by the SBOE. Screening must occur at the end of the school year of each student in kindergarten and each student in the first grade.*
- e. Regardless of the primary language of the student, instruments used to screen for dyslexia and other reading difficulties must address the skills in Figure 2.2 of the Dyslexia Handbook, which include:
- Phonological Awareness
 - Phonemic Awareness
 - Sound-Symbol Recognition
 - Letter Knowledge
 - Decoding Skills
 - Spelling
 - Listening Comprehension
- f. While the selected screening instrument will be expected to measure each of the skills identified above, it is important that individuals who administer the screening instrument document student behaviors observed during the administration of the instrument. A list of behaviors that may be observed during the administration of the screening and which should be documented are included in Figure 2.3 of the Dyslexia Handbook:
- Lack of automaticity
 - Difficulty sounding out words left to right
 - Guessing
 - Self-Correcting
 - Inability to focus on reading
 - Avoidance behavior

(Note: These student behaviors might look quite different in children who are in kindergarten versus first or second grade. For instance, first and second grade students might lack automaticity in terms of reading a list of words, while a kindergarten student might struggle with automaticity in relation to naming letters and/or letter sounds.)

RESOURCES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE:

The Children's Learning Institute (CLI) and Texas Education Agency's (TEA) Response.

- a. Through a collaborative research effort funded through the Department of Education, CLI and TEA partnered to develop the Texas Kindergarten Entry Assessment (TX-KEA). TX-KEA was originally designed to be a one-time comprehensive screener to be used at the BOY. However, with funding from The Brown Foundation, TX-KEA now includes ongoing Kindergarten progress monitoring for three time points (BOY, MOY, EOY).
- b. While not specifically designed to be a dyslexia screener, TX-KEA subtests evaluate many of skills considered to be important for early reading (e.g., listening comprehension, letter names, letter sounds, blending, and spelling). In addition, short assessments evaluating early decoding skills were developed for MOY and EOY. Therefore, TX KEA subtests can certainly provide educators with information surrounding whether or not children are likely to be struggling readers.
- c. Given that TEC stipulates that all Kindergarten students must be screened for dyslexia at EOY, stakeholders began to work to find ways to leverage existing resources to meet the needs of school districts.
- d. One of the benefits of the collaboration between the CLI and TEA was the launch of a comprehensive professional development, assessment, and quality improvement platform: CLI Engage. (www.cliengage.org). This digital delivery system allows for cost-effective administration of universal screening/progress monitoring measures in public and charter schools across Texas. Additionally, through data sharing agreements with TEA, assessments developed by the Children's Learning Institute can be compared to state data that delineates which children were served in 504 plans or classified as a Special Education student. Finally, scores from CLI designed assessments can be compared to already existing datasets (e.g., CIRCLE Progress Monitoring measures in pre-K, K, and 1st grade, as well as STAAR assessment results in 3rd grade). Comparing results from the assessments developed by the CLI to state datasets across multiple years can provide both CLI and TEA with ongoing information about the validity and usefulness of measures designed to determine which children are at most risk for dyslexia.
- e. Given the mandate of recent legislation, the CLI and TEA are currently introducing the Dyslexia Referral Checklist.

DYSLEXIA REFERRAL CHECKLIST DESCRIPTION

The Dyslexia Referral Checklist (DRC) is a questionnaire that builds a link between direct assessment of early reading skills (e.g., universal screening and progress monitoring measures) and classroom observations. The DRC has versions designed for use in Kindergarten, First Grade, and Second Grade. The DRC was designed following an evaluation of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) domains and the Texas Education Agency’s Dyslexia Handbook (2018).

Item content within the DRC evaluates areas considered to be important for early reading (e.g., language-based skills, letter and letter sound knowledge, phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding, and spelling). In addition, one multi-part item asks teachers to document whether universal screening/progress monitoring assessment data has indicated that a child might be at risk.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION TO CONSIDER

As is suggested in the Dyslexia Handbook, teachers are advised to utilize both quantitative and qualitative information when attempting to determine if a child would benefit from a more comprehensive assessment of reading skills. In fact, the Dyslexia Handbook (2018) suggests teachers utilize multiple sources of data to evaluate reading skills (Figure 2.4, see below).

Figure 2.4. Sources and Examples of Screening Data	
Quantitative Information	Qualitative Information
<p>Results of-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current screening instruments • Previous Screening instruments • Formal and informal classroom reading assessments • Additional brief and targeted skill assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations of student during screening • Other observations of student progress • Teacher observations • Parent/guardian input (e.g., family history, early language skills) • Current student work samples • Work samples from earlier grade(s) • Intervention history

While teachers are encouraged to consider multiple sources of data prior to rating individual students using the DRC, the measure was not designed to be tied to a specific universal screening/progress monitoring measure. That is, districts could use alternative screeners

already in adopted use. In short, the DRC items have been constructed to cut across measures and look at component skills necessary for students to make adequate reading progress.

DEALING WITH SUBJECTIVITY OF RATING SCALES

As the DRC was being constructed, the CLI had the opportunity to conduct a focus group with Dyslexia Specialists. Many dyslexia specialists recognized that districts would require assistance in terms of meeting new legislative mandates for dyslexia screening. In addition, dyslexia specialists recognized that teachers play a critical role in the referral process. However, professionals who reviewed the DRC recognized that one of the limitations of the measure surrounded the fact that the questionnaire data is subjective. In other words, what some teachers, school districts, or even dyslexia specialists see as being concerning, might not be worrisome to others. Using rating scales to evaluate reading skills without carefully considering other data would be irresponsible. However, there is value in a systematic method of collecting data about teacher perceptions of the reading skills of children. It is also important to remember that the DRC was NOT designed to be the only piece of information that is used to determine if children should participate in a more comprehensive evaluation of their reading skills. Teachers and districts would be encouraged/mandated to evaluate results from formal and informal screening assessments, classroom observations, parent reports, and work samples. In order to deal with subjectivity inherent in rating scales in general, an example of some of the types of common rating biases are described below.

- Leniency-- evaluating the skills of most children positively without strong evidence.
- Tendency toward the middle-- a tendency to choose the midpoint of a rating scale
- Severity-- a child might struggle in one area of literacy (e.g., phonemic awareness) and is rated negatively across most/all aspects of literacy skill development.
- Halo-- a tendency to rate skills as being high based upon one positive attribute.

While no rating scale, or test for that matter is perfect, teachers are encouraged to remember learning to read is a multidimensional process. That is, children can be strong in some reading skill areas while displaying a relative weakness in another area (e.g., weak phonological processing skills but excellent letter recognition skills). This is especially true in young children who have not participated in high quality preschool programs. Early reading behaviors should be rated in relation to state and district standards surrounding what is expected during kindergarten.

GUIDE TO RATING ANCHORS

After considering the pros and cons of different rating scale options (e.g., far below grade level to far above grade level), a decision was made to use anchors similar to what TEA uses to describe STAAR performance. The following anchors will be used to describe children's early literacy/reading skills:

- *Masters Grade Level*- performance in this category indicates that the student is expected to succeed in the next grade with little or no academic intervention.
- *Meets Grade Level*- performance in this category indicates that students have a high likelihood of success in the next grade but might need some short-term, targeted academic intervention.
- *Approaches Grade Level*- performance in this category indicates that students are likely to succeed in the next grade with targeted academic intervention.
- *Did Not Meet Grade Level*- performance in this category indicates that students are unlikely to succeed in the next grade without significant, ongoing academic intervention.

EXPLANATION OF SCORING

In most of the Dyslexia Referral Checklist items, there are four possible ratings (i.e., Did not meet grade level expectations, Approaches grade level expectations, Meets grade level expectations, Masters grade level expectations).

- Ratings of "Did not meet grade level expectations" receive a risk level score of 2.
- Ratings of "Approaches grade level expectations" receive a risk level score of 1.
- Ratings of "Meets or Masters grade level expectations" each receive a risk level score of 0.

A similar strategy is used in the 2 questions in the Observable section. These 2 questions utilize different anchors (i.e., Never, Rarely, Often, Almost Always).

- Ratings of "Almost Always" receive a risk level score of 2.
- Ratings of "Often" receive a risk level score of 1.
- Ratings of "Rarely" or "Never" receive a risk level score of 0.

Items that document the results of screening assessment are scored differently than the previous items.

- "High Risk Observed" scores receive a risk level score of 2. High Risk is defined as when a student has not responded to Tier 1 or Tier 2 intervention support. At this

point, the classroom teacher/referral committee might be considering pursuing an evaluation under IDEA or Section 504

- “Some Risk Observed” scores receive a risk level score of 1. In this case, students have not responded as well as classmates to Tier 1 instruction and would likely benefit from Tier 2 intervention and ongoing monitoring.
- Ratings of “No Risk” or “Monitoring (Tier 1)” and “Not Assessed” will receive a risk level score of 0.

(Note: The “Not Assessed” rating was included because it is recognized that not all universal screening/progress monitoring measures evaluate all domains. Not Assessed ratings might also represent that a classroom teacher did not complete universal progress monitoring measures for some reason (e.g., sensory impairment, behavioral difficulties, etc.). In short, the Dyslexia Referral Committee, teacher, and school administrators (e.g., Special Ed Coordinator) on each campus will be responsible for evaluating all data to determine if a more comprehensive evaluation is required. The Dyslexia Referral Checklist should be seen as one piece of information to help determine if a more comprehensive evaluation is necessary.)

CUT OFF SUGGESTIONS

The CLI and TEA recognize that with any new instrument there will be a learning curve in relation to cut off criteria. In reality, the Dyslexia Referral Checklist will become a stronger instrument over time as data is collected and analyzed by TEA, the CLI, and local school districts. As TEA and the CLI are committed to continuing this work, it is hoped that districts will use the suggested cutoff scores described below to have meaningful conversations about whether or not students who receive high risk scores would benefit from more comprehensive assessment of their reading skills. In March of 2020, the Dyslexia Referral Checklist was distributed to approximately 40 stakeholders (e.g., Dyslexia Specialists, TEA officials, and content experts). Twenty individuals answered a question about cut score determination. When averaged together, most raters recommended that students who receive a score of 24 or greater should be considered for further evaluation to rule out reading differences. Children who would be considered to be at the greatest risk (i.e., most severe rating on each category) would receive a Risk Score of 38 points.

NOTES ON ELL CHILDREN

It is recognized that many of the skills important for reading in Spanish or English are quite similar. For instance, research recognizes that children learning to read in either language benefit when they have well-developed language, phonological awareness, and letter knowledge/letter sound skills. Therefore, many of the items contained in the DRC work equally well for children learning to read Spanish or English. However, there are some subtle

differences in which vowel-consonant combinations children learn first when being taught to read and spell. Items seven through 10 of the DRC-K include different Spanish examples for items evaluating phonological awareness, decoding and spelling skills. The rest of the content is identical for Spanish and English versions of the DRC-K. Given that the 20-21 academic year is essentially a pilot project, the cut off score for Spanish and English versions is identical (i.e., score of 24 or more should be considered to be at-risk).

NEXT STEPS


Fortunately, the TEA Dyslexia Handbook provides teachers and school districts with a wealth of information surrounding how to best respond to students where a suspicion of dyslexia exists. Figure 2.5 of the 2018 Texas Dyslexia Handbook provides a graphic representation of how the screening and referral process should occur. The Dyslexia Referral Checklist, along with universal screening for reading and dyslexia should be used to help guide school committees to determine how to intervene to help students. As previously mentioned, data that should be considered might include results of current and previous screening measures, formal and informal classroom reading assessments, additional brief and targeted skill assessments, observable behaviors during screening, other observations of student progress, parent/guardian input, work samples, and intervention history.

Results of the DRC should be used to supplement information gathered to determine if a more comprehensive evaluation for dyslexia or Special Education services would be warranted. Results from the DRC should be considered to fit in the "Collect and review quantitative and qualitative data on the student" (i.e., highlighted by a red rectangular box below). Essentially, school districts have the option of utilizing subtests on the Engage platform (e.g., Letter Naming KEA BOY, Syllabication CPM PK EOY, Blending KEA EOY, Spelling KEA EOY, Decoding KEA EOY, Listening Comprehension KEA EOY) or subtests from other assessment systems in use. The DRC is an important piece of data that allows teachers to document their concerns in a systematic way.

The Dyslexia Referral Team within a school/district then brings all of the information together. Professionals move through the decision tree (bottom of the right-hand side of figure). If a referral committee thinks that the data indicates a child DOES exhibit characteristics of dyslexia, then initiation of the IDEA/Section 504 evaluation should begin. If analysis of all of the information considered in figure 2.4 shows that the student exhibits reading difficulties that are NOT consistent with characteristics of Dyslexia or a related disorder, then districts should begin or continue academic intervention (e.g., Tier 2) and continue to monitor student progress to determine if an evaluation might be needed in the future.

A. FIGURE 2.5: UNIVERSAL SCREENING AND DATA REVIEW FOR READING RISK

Figure 2.5
Universal Screening and Data Review for Reading Risk



*Testing and screening in accordance with TEC §28.006 and §38.003(a)

(Note: This image was retrieved from page 17 of ["The Dyslexia Handbook"](#) (2018 update), by the Texas Education Agency.)

B. KINDERGARTEN DYSLEXIA REFERRAL CHECKLIST

Instructions: Please consider your observations of children's behaviors within the classroom and school to complete this checklist. Read each item and evaluate whether a behavior is:

KEY

- **Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations - 2 Points**
- **Approaches Grade Level - 1 Point**
- **Meets Grade Level Expectations - 0 Points**
- **Masters Grade Level Expectations - 0 Points (purple)**

STUDENT NAME:						
TEACHER NAME:			DATE:			
LANGUAGE/COMPREHENSION:			2 points	1 point	0 points	0 points
1. Student is able to use and understand a range of vocabulary words in conversation with adults (e.g., answering open ended questions during read alouds).						
2. Student is able to use language to have her/his needs met in the classroom (e.g., asking for help to complete a challenging task, asking to use the restroom).						
3. Student is able to understand and respond to peers who attempt to initiate conversation.						
LETTER KNOWLEDGE & SOUND-SYMBOL RECOGNITION:						
4. Student is able to identify all letter names.						
5. Student is able to identify all letter sounds.						
Phonological & Phonemic Awareness:						
6. Student is able to separate sentences into words.						
7. Student is able to identify initial sounds (e.g., what is the first sound you hear in the word 'sun?'). For Spanish Speaking students the item example would be changed to (e.g., ¿Cuál es el primer sonido que escuchas en la palabra gato?).						
8. Student is able to blend individual sounds/phonemes when provided an oral example (e.g., what words do these sounds make /s/ /u/ /n/?). For Spanish Speaking students the item example would be changed to (e.g., ¿Qué palabra hacen estos sonidos /p/ /a/ /n/?).						

KEY

- **Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations - 2 Points**
- **Approaches Grade Level - 1 Point**
- **Meets Grade Level Expectations - 0 Points**
- **Masters Grade Level Expectations - 0 Points (purple)**

DECODING SKILLS:	2 points	1 point	0 points	0 points
9. Student is able to use letter sound relationships to decode words that follow common spelling patterns: (e.g., VC, CVC, CCVC, and CVCC. For Spanish speaking students decoding words in Spanish follow these patterns (e.g., CV, VC, CCV, CVC, VCV, CVCV, CCVCV, and CVCCV).				
SPELLING:				
10. Student is able to correctly spell common words with VC, CVC, and CCVC patterns. For Spanish speaking students spelling common words in Spanish follow these patterns (e.g. CV, VC, CCV, CVC, VCV, CVCV, CCVCV, and CVCCV patterns).				

Instructions: Please consider your observations of children’s behaviors within the classroom and school to complete this checklist. Read each item and evaluate whether a behavior is:

KEY

- **Almost Always-2 Points**
- **Often-1 Point**
- **Rarely-0 Points**
- **Never-0 Points (purple)**

STUDENT NAME:				
TEACHER NAME:			DATE:	
OBSERVABLES:	2 points	1 point	0 points	0 points
11. When reading or attempting to read words in isolation or grade level texts, the student displays a lack of fluency (e.g., hesitant, often guesses, or frequently self-corrects).				
12. When engaged in reading activities alone or in a small-group setting, the student appears to display an inability to focus and/or engages in avoidance behaviors.				

Instructions: Please consider your observations of children’s behaviors within the classroom and school to complete this checklist. Read each item and evaluate whether a behavior is:

KEY

- **“High Risk Observed” scores receive a risk level score of 2.** High Risk is defined as when a student has not responded to Tier 1 or Tier 2 intervention support. At this point, the classroom teacher/referral committee might be considering pursuing an evaluation under IDEA or Section 504
- **“Some Risk Observed” scores receive a risk level score of 1.** In this case, students have not responded as well as classmates to Tier 1 instruction and would likely benefit from Tier 2 intervention and ongoing monitoring.
- **Ratings of “No Risk” or “Monitoring (Tier 1) will receive a risk level score of 0.**
- **“Not Assessed” (in purple) will receive a risk level score of 0.**

STUDENT NAME:				
TEACHER NAME:			DATE:	
INCORPORATING RESULTS OF SCREENING ASSESSMENTS Universal screening (i.e., direct assessment) has indicated that the student is at risk for reading difficulties across the following domains.	2 points	1 point	0 points	0 points
13. Phonological Awareness				
14. Phonemic Awareness				
15. Sound-Symbol Recognition				
16. Letter Knowledge				
17. Decoding Skills				
18. Listening Comprehension				
19. Spelling				

***(Note: After completing the assessment, tally up the points from each column and add them together. If the student receives a score of 24 or greater, they should be considered for further evaluation to rule out reading difficulties. If you enter the scores online through CLI Engage, the score will automatically update and provide total results.)

C. KINDERGARTEN DYSLEXIA REFERRAL CHECKLIST

ANCHOR EXPLANATION

LANGUAGE/COMPREHENSION		
1. Student is able to use and understand a range of vocabulary words in conversation with adults (e.g., answering questions during read alouds).	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student appears to use and understand words that seem more advanced than peers when engaged in conversation with adults.
	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student has the ability to use and understand grade level vocabulary when engaged in conversation with adults.
	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student appears to be able to use and understand a range of grade appropriate vocabulary but occasionally struggles using and understanding common vocabulary words when engaged in conversation with adults. Student might struggle knowing the names of objects, actions, and/or concepts.
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student routinely struggles using and understanding grade appropriate vocabulary when engaged in conversation with adults.
2. Student is able to use language to have her/his needs met in the classroom (e.g., asking for help to complete a challenging task, asking to use the restroom).	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is readily able to use language to have needs met within the classroom at advanced levels (e.g., May I use the restroom please? Could you help me open up my pack of markers?).
	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is competent using language to have needs met in the classroom. Utterances are fully formed but might lack some of the specificity of children who master grade level expectations (e.g., Can you open this?).

	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student attempts to have needs met in the classroom using language but it might be difficult to completely understand the student without relying on a combination of verbal and visual cues (e.g., child might vaguely say help while holding up an object).
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	Child frequently struggles using language to have needs met in the classroom. Child might point or use gestures to aid others in understanding.
3. Student is able to understand and respond to peers who attempt to initiate conversation.	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is easily able to understand and respond verbally to peers about a variety of topics and is able to use higher level language strategies (e.g., negotiation) language to navigate common classroom challenges.
	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is able to understand and respond verbally to peers surrounding a variety of topics. However, the student might occasionally need adult support to navigate challenging classroom situations (e.g., teacher required to help resolve differences over access to materials).
	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is sometimes able to understand and respond appropriately to peers. However, the child occasionally needs support from adults to navigate challenging situations.
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student often needs scaffolding support of adults to understand and respond appropriately to peers within the class.
LETTER KNOWLEDGE & SOUND-SYMBOL RECOGNITION		
4. Student is able to identify all letter names. (Note: We recognize that the KEA Letter Naming subtest only measures a	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is able to fluently recall all upper and lower case letter names (i.e., able to identify letter names accurately without hesitation).

subset of letters. Therefore, other data should be considered when completing the rating for this item).	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student knows all letter names. However, the recall of letter names is not always fluent (i.e., takes time or hesitates when naming some letters).
	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	The student might occasionally incorrectly label commonly mistaken letter pairs (e.g., b, d, p, q).
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	In addition to incorrectly naming commonly mistaken letter pairs, the student struggles naming a number of the letters of the alphabet (e.g., approximately half of the letters are named incorrectly).
5. Student is able to identify all letter sounds. (Note: We recognize that the KEA Letter Sounds subtest only measures a subset of letters. Therefore, other data should be considered when completing the rating for this item).	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student easily recalls all letter sounds fluency (i.e., able to identify letter sounds without hesitation).
	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student knows all letter sounds. However, the recall of letter names is not automatic (i.e., takes time or hesitates when naming letters).
	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	The student might occasionally incorrectly name letter sounds, especially more difficult letter sounds (e.g., q and x).
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	In addition to not being able to identify more difficult letter sounds, the child struggles providing sounds for a number of the letters of the alphabet (e.g., approximately half of the letters sounds labeled incorrectly).
PHONOLOGICAL & PHONEMIC AWARENESS:		
6. Student is able to separate sentences into words.	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is easily able to separate sentences into words without error.

	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student does a reasonably good job of separating sentences. However, the student might occasionally make mistakes when compound words are included in the sentence (e.g., footprint, without).
	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is able to separate simple sentences of 3-4 words into single words (e.g., I want lunch). However, the student might struggle separating sentences that contain more words and/or include unfamiliar compound words.
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	Even though provided with ongoing instruction, student struggles separating simple sentences into individual words.
7. Student is able to identify initial sounds (e.g., what is the first sound you hear in the word 'sun').	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is easily able to identify initial sounds in words without hesitation and high accuracy.
For Spanish Speaking students the item example would be changed to	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is easily able to identify initial sounds in words. However, student might occasionally incorrectly label the initial sound in harder words (e.g., words starting with g or j).
(e.g., ¿Cuál es el primer sonido que escuchas en la palabra gato?).	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is able to identify initial sounds in some words but routinely makes mistakes.
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	Even though provided with ongoing instruction, student struggles identifying initial sounds in simple words.
8. Student is able to blend individual sounds/phonemes when provided an oral example	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is easily able to blend up to 5 or 6 individual sounds/phonemes.
	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is often able to blend up to 4-5 individual sounds/phonemes.

<p>(e.g., what word do these sounds make /s/ /u/ /n/?).</p> <p>For Spanish Speaking students the item example would be changed to</p> <p>(e.g., ¿Qué palabra hacen estos sonidos /p/ /a/ /n/?).</p>	<p><i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i></p>	<p>Student is occasionally able to blend up to 3 phonemes. However, the student makes often makes mistakes when attempting more complicated blends.</p>
	<p><i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i></p>	<p>Even though provided with ongoing instruction, student struggles blending 3 sounds or compound words.</p>

DECODING SKILLS

<p>9. Student is able to use letter sound relationships to decode words that follow common spelling patterns: (e.g., VC, CVC, CCVC, and CVCC).</p> <p>For Spanish speaking students the item example would be changed to</p> <p>(e.g., CV, VC, CCV, CVC, VCV, CVCV, CCVCV, and CVCCV).</p>	<p><i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i></p>	<p>Student is quite competent and almost always able to decode words that follow common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, CCVC, and CVCC). Decoding occurs fluently and without hesitation.</p>
	<p><i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i></p>	<p>Student is usually able to decode words that follow common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, CCVC, and CVCC). However, the student might struggle decoding words with less familiar spelling patterns.</p>
	<p><i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i></p>	<p>Student is sometimes able to decode words with common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, CCVC, and CVCC). However, decoding is certainly not fluent and appears to take a great deal of effort.</p>
	<p><i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i></p>	<p>Student is rarely, if ever, able to decode words with common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, CCVC, and CVCC).</p>

SPELLING		
<p>10. Student is able to correctly spell common words with VC, CVC, and CCVC patterns. Note: Emphasis of this item is on spelling words correctly not handwriting).</p> <p>For Spanish speaking students the item example would be changed to (e.g., CV, VC, CCV, CVC, VCV, CVCV, CCVCV, and CVCCV patterns).</p>	<i>Masters Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is competent and almost always able to correctly spell words with common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, and CCVC).
	<i>Meets Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is usually able to correctly spell words with common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, and CCVC).
	<i>Approaches Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student is occasionally able to spell words with common spelling patterns correctly (e.g., VC, CVC, and CCVC). However, student is just as likely to incorrectly spell words with common spelling patterns.
	<i>Did Not Meet Grade Level Expectations</i>	Student almost always incorrectly spells words with common spelling patterns (e.g., VC, CVC, and CVCC).
OBSERVABLES		
<p>11. When reading or attempting to read words in isolation or grade level texts, the student displays a lack of fluency (e.g., hesitant, often guesses, or frequently self-corrects).</p>	<i>Almost Always</i>	Student is never able to read words or text fluently. When reading, the student is always hesitant, halting, and struggles reading even simple words accurately.
	<i>Often</i>	Student is rarely able to read words, or text, fluently. When reading, the student will often misread or guess at words. Student often becomes tentative or hesitant when asked to read words and/or text.
	<i>Rarely</i>	Student is typically able to read with reasonable fluency but sometimes struggles or becomes flustered when reading less than familiar words/text. Student might occasionally become tentative or hesitant when asked to read challenging words/text.
	<i>Never</i>	Student never displays a lack of fluency and reading skills seem advanced for grade level.

12. When engaged in reading activities alone or in a small-group setting, the student appears to display an inability to focus and/or engages in avoidance behaviors.	<i>Almost Always</i>	Student almost always struggles focusing and remaining engaged when attempting to read words or grade level text. In addition, avoidant behaviors are observed when reading (e.g., looking away, giving up, or complaining).
	<i>Often</i>	Student often struggles focusing and remaining engaged when reading words or grade level text. In addition, avoidant behaviors are sometimes observed when reading (e.g., looking away, giving up, or complaining).
	<i>Rarely</i>	Student rarely has difficulty focusing and remaining actively engaged when reading. However, focus and engagement might wane slightly when attempting to read challenging text.
	<i>Never</i>	Student never struggles focusing and remaining actively engaged when reading. Focus and engagement is maintained even when attempting to read challenging text.

INCORPORATING RESULTS OF SCREENING ASSESSMENTS

Universal screening (i.e., direct assessment) has indicated that the student is at risk for reading difficulties across the following domains.	Domain	Risk Level			
	13. Phonological Awareness	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed
	14. Phonemic Awareness	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed
	15. Sound-Symbol Recognition	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed
	16. Letter Knowledge	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed
	17. Decoding Skills	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed

	18. Listening Comprehension	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed
	19. Spelling	High Risk Observed	Some Risk Observed	No Risk or Monitoring	Not Assessed

NOTES:

- High Risk Observed: Student has not responded to Tier 1 instruction or Tier 2 intervention support. Recommend evaluation under IDEA or Section 504.
- Some Risk Observed: Student has not responded as well as classmates to Tier 1 instruction and would likely benefit from Tier 2 Intervention and ongoing monitoring.
- No Risk Observed: Student appears to be making adequate progress with current Tier 1 instruction and progress will continue to be monitored.
- Not Assessed: Student was not screened for Dyslexia.

REFERENCES:

Texas Education Agency. "19 TAC Chapter 110. Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for English Language Arts and Reading." Texas Education Agency - 19 TAC Chapter 110. 2017. <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter110/index.html>.

Texas Education Agency. THE DYSLEXIA HANDBOOK. 2018. https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/2018-Dyslexia-Handbook_Approved_Accomodated_12_11_2018.pdf.