

\*Based on: Sugai, G., Horner, R., & Todd, A. (2000). *Effective behavior support: Self-assessment survey*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

#### Directions for completing this form electronically:

This form is a fillable PDF document. You must have Adobe Reader (available for free from Adobe's website: http://www.adobe.com/) in order to complete this form electronically (the form can also be printed and completed by hand).

To complete the form:

- 1) Select the Hand tool.
- 2) Position the pointer inside a form field, and click. The I-beam pointer (or cursor symbol) allows you to type text and the Pointing Finger icon lets you select a button, check box, radio button, or an item from a list.
- 3) After entering text or making a selection, do any of the following:
  - Press Tab to accept the form field change and go to the next field.
  - Press Enter (Windows) or Return (Mac OS) to accept the form field change and deselect the current fields. In a multi-line text form field, pressing Enter or Return creates a paragraph return in the same field. You can use Enter on the keypad to accept the change.
    - Press Esc to reject the form field change and deselect the current form field.
- 4) Once you have filled in the appropriate form fields, do one of the following:
  - Choose File > Save As, and rename the file to save the form with the data you entered.
  - Print the Form.

#### **IMPORTANT DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING:**

Each item has a value of 0, 1, or 2 to indicate the level of implementation (see below). Please note that some items are designated with a factor, (e.g., <u>x 2</u>). Items with this designation are considered more important in the overall reading program. Fill in the blank with your item rating score using the 0 to 2 scale.

If you are completing this form electronically, the correct overall item score (i.e., the level of implementation rating multiplied by the appropriate factor) will be automatically calculated within the form. In addition, the total point value and percent of implementation will be automatically calculated for each section, and for the totals on page 12.

If you are completing this form by hand, you will need to calculate the item scores, totals, and percent of implementation for each section yourself, using the directions on the next page.

In the right-hand column of the table, document evidence available to support your rating for each item.

#### Levels of Implementation Description

- 0 = Not in place
- 1 = Partially in place
- 2 = Fully in place

School:	Date:
Position (check one):	Current Grade(s) Taught (if applicable):
Administrator	Kindergarten
Teacher	First
Paraprofessional/Educational Assistant	Second
Grade Level Team	Third
Years of Teaching Experience:	Years at Present School:

### Directions

Based on your knowledge of your school's reading program (e.g., goals, materials, allocated time), please use the following evaluation criteria to rate your reading program's implementation.

Each item has a value of 0, 1, or 2 to indicate the level of implementation (see below). Please note that some items are designated with a factor, (e.g., <u>x</u> 2). Items with this designation are considered more important in the overall reading program. Fill in the blank with your item rating score using the 0 to 2 scale, then multiply your item rating by the indicated factor. Put the total score in the "Total Item Score" blank below the item.

In the right-hand column of the table, document evidence available to support your rating for each item.

#### Levels of Implementation Description

- 0 = Not in place
- 1 = Partially in place
- 2 = Fully in place

This document is available to download from: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/resources/ © University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning (IDEA). All rights reserved.

## Internal/External Auditing Form 0 1 2 Not in place Partially in place Fully in place **EVALUATION CRITERIA** DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE I. <u>Goals, Objectives, Priorities</u> – Goals for reading achievement are clearly defined, anchored to research, prioritized in terms of importance to student learning, commonly understood by users, and consistently employed as instructional guides by all teachers of reading. Goals and Objectives: 1. are clearly defined and quantifiable at each grade level. 2. are articulated across grade levels. 3. are prioritized and dedicated to the essential elements (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) in reading. The score for this item should be multiplied by: Total Item Score: \_\_\_\_\_ 4. guide instructional and curricular decisions (e.g., time allocations, curriculum program adoptions). The score for this item should be multiplied by: Total Item Score: \_\_\_\_\_ 5. are commonly understood and consistently used by teachers and administrators within and between grades to evaluate and communicate student learning and improve practice.

\_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ Total Points = \_\_\_% Implementation

This document is available to download from: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/resources/

© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning (IDEA). All rights reserved.

0	1 2
Not in place Partial	y in place Fully in place
EVALUATION CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
II. <u>Assessment</u> – Instruments and procedures specified, measure essential skills, provide r performance, and inform instruction in impor	eliable and valid information about student
1. A schoolwide assessment system and database are established and maintained for documenting student performance and monitoring progress.	
The score for this item should be multiplied by: Total Item Score:	
2. Measures assess student performance on prioritized goals and objectives.	
3. Measures are technically adequate (i.e., have high reliability and validity) as documented by research.	
4. All users receive training and follow-up on measurement administration, scoring, and data interpretation.	
5. At the beginning of the year, screening measures identify students' level of performance and are used to determine instructional needs.	
6. Progress monitoring measures are administered formatively throughout the year to document and monitor student reading performance (i.e., quarterly for all students; every 4 weeks for students at risk).	

#### II. Assessment continued

EVALUATION CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
7. Student performance data are analyzed and summarized in meaningful formats and routinely used by grade-level teams to evaluate and adjust instruction. <i>The score for this item should be multiplied by:</i> <i>Total Item Score:</i>	
8. The building has a "resident" expert or experts to maintain the assessment system and ensure measures are collected reliably, data are scored and entered accurately, and feedback is provided in a timely fashion.	

Not in plac	ce Partial	ly in place	Fully in place
EVALUATION CRITE	ERIA	DO	CUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
	arch-based findings	s and practice	grams and materials have documented s, align with state standards and
1. A comprehensive or program with documented rese efficacy is adopted for use scho The score for this item should be r Total Item Score:	earch-based old wide.		
2. The instructional pro materials provide explicit and s instruction on critical reading pr phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension The score for this item should be r Total Item Score:	ystematic riorities (i.e., fluency, n).		
3. The instructional matrix program align with and support standards/scientifically based provide sufficient instruction in elements to allow the majority or reach learning goals.	state practices and essential		
4. Supplemental and in programs of documented effica to support students who do not adequately from the core progr	cy are in place benefit		
The score for this item should be r Total Item Score:	multiplied by:		
5. Programs and mater implemented with a high level of			
The score for this item should be r Total Item Score:	-		

This document is available to download from: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/resources/ © University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning (IDEA). All rights reserved. View the *Permission to Use* statement that applies to this document at: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/news.php#ed\_use

0	1 2
Not in place Partial	ly in place Fully in place
EVALUATION CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
IV. Instructional Time - A sufficient amount of timused effectively.	e is allocated for instruction and the time allocated is
1. A schoolwide plan is established to allocate sufficient reading time and coordinate resources to ensure optimal use of time.	
2. Reading time is prioritized and protected from interruption.	
The score for this item should be multiplied by: Total Item Score:	
3. Instructional time is allocated to skills and practices most highly correlated with reading success (i.e., essential elements of reading including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension).	
4. Students in grades K-3 receive a minimum of 30 minutes of small-group teacher-directed reading instruction daily.	
The score for this item should be multiplied by: Total Item Score:	
5. Additional instructional time is allocated to students who fail to make adequate reading progress.	

0	1 2
Not in place Partiall	y in place Fully in place
EVALUATION CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
V. <u>Differentiated Instruction/Grouping/Schee</u> by tailoring instruction to meet current levels of kr instruction to enhance student learning.	
1. Student performance is used to determine the level of instructional materials and to select research-based instructional programs.	
2. Instruction is provided in flexible homogeneous groups to maximize student performance and opportunities to respond.	
3. For children who require additional and substantial instructional support, tutoring (1-1) or small group instruction (< 6) is used to support teacher-directed large group or whole class instruction.	
4. Group size, instructional time, and instructional programs are determined by and adjusted according to learner performance (i.e., students with greatest needs are in groups that allow more frequent monitoring and opportunities to respond and receive feedback).	
5. Cross-class and cross-grade grouping is used when appropriate to maximize learning opportunities.	

0	1 2
Not in place Partial	ly in place Fully in place
EVALUATION CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
-	tion - Strong instructional leadership maintains a focus es resources to support reading, and establishes and practices.
1. Administrators or the leadership team are knowledgeable of state standards, priority reading skills and strategies, assessment measures and practices, and instructional programs and materials.	
2. Administrators or the leadership team work with staff to create a coherent plan for reading instruction and implement practices to attain school reading goals.	
3. Administrators or the leadership team maximize and protect instructional time and organize resources and personnel to support reading instruction, practice, and assessment.	
4. Grade-level teams are established and supported to analyze reading performance and plan instruction.	
5. Concurrent instruction (e.g., Title, special education) is coordinated with and complementary to general education reading instruction.	
6. A communication plan for reporting and sharing student performance with teachers, parents, and school, district, and state administrators is in place.	

0	1 2
Not in place Partial	ly in place Fully in place
EVALUATION CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION OF EVIDENCE
VII. <u>Professional Development</u> - Adequate an available to support reading instruction.	d ongoing professional development is determined and
1. Teachers and instructional staff have thorough understanding and working knowledge of grade-level instructional/reading priorities and effective practices.	
2. Ongoing professional development is established to support teachers and instructional staff in the assessment and instruction of reading priorities.	
3. Time is systematically allocated for educators to analyze, plan, and refine instruction.	
4. Professional development efforts are explicitly linked to practices and programs that have been shown to be effective through documented research.	

# **Individual Summary Score**

**Directions:** Return to each element (e.g., goals; assessment) and total the scores at the bottom of the respective page. Transfer each element's number to the designated space below. Sum the total scores to compute your overall evaluation of the schoolwide reading program. The total possible value is 100 points. The total score can be used to evaluate the overall quality of the school's reading program.

Evaluate each element to determine the respective quality of implementation. For example, a score of 11 in Goals/Objectives/Priorities means that in your estimation the school is implementing approximately 80% of the items in that element.

Element	Score	Percent
I. Goals/Objectives/Priorities	/	
II. Assessment	/	
III. Instructional Practices and Materials	/	
IV. Instructional Time	/	
V. Differentiated Instruction/Grouping	/	
VI. Administration/Organization/Communication	/	
VII. Professional Development	/	
Total Score	/	

# **School Summary Score**

<u>Calculating Average Schoolwide Element Scores</u>: Enter each individual's score by element on the following table. Sum down each column and divide by the number of participants to achieve an average school score for each element.

Calculate the proportion of total points for each element by dividing the average element score by the total possible points. This will provide the percentage of total points earned for each element.

<u>Calculating Average Schoolwide Overall Scores</u>. Enter the total scores of each individual in the designated space. Sum down the Total column and divide by the number of participants to achieve an average overall score for the school.

# Average Schoolwide Overall Scores

			Assess-	Instr.	Instr.				
		Goals	ment	Prac.	Time	Grouping	Admin.	Prof. Dev.	
	Name		II		IV	V	VI	VII	TOTAL
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									ļ
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
Total	1								<u> </u>
Mean									<u> </u>
-	Possible	14	20	22	14	10	12	8	100
	tage of Total Points								<u> </u>

This document is available to download from: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/resources/

© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning (IDEA). All rights reserved.

# **Narrative Summary**

1. Based on the schoolwide summary scores for each element and the average total schoolwide score, identify the areas of strength. Strengths may be based on elements or on specific items within elements.

2. List each element and specific items within each element that are in need of further development.

# **Reading Action Plan**

#### Name of School, District

City, State

	Reading Goals and Priorities
Goal/P	riority #1
What:	
Who:	
When:	
Goal/P	riority #2
What:	
Who:	
When:	
Goal/P	riority #3
What:	
Who:	
When:	
Commit	tee Members:
A de et -	
Ααοριεί	d by School Staff on: Date

This document is available to download from: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/resources/ © University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning (IDEA). All rights reserved. View the *Permission to Use* statement that applies to this document at: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/news.php#ed\_use