

Mrs. Brown's Class Group Score Summary

Examinee Name	Examinee ID	Age	Test Date	Form	Raw Score	Standard Score	90% Confidence Interval	Percentile	NCE	Stanine	Age Equivalent	GSV
Arturo Student	78958552	9:2	10/01/2019	B	162	160	151 - 162	>99.9	>99	9	>24:11	519
Bob Student	2479455	7:2	10/10/2019	A	16	51	48 - 57	0.1	<1	1	<2:6	436
Debra Student	2434234	8:1	09/14/2019	B	107	101	97 - 105	53	51	5	8:4	495
Ezra Student	667774744	8:7	11/01/2019	A	120	109	105 - 113	73	63	6	9:9	500
James Student	5243759	6:7	09/18/2019	A	83	92	87 - 98	30	39	4	5:8	481
Jody Student	128546	7:7	07/07/2019	B	108	108	104 - 112	70	61	6	8:5	496
Josh Student	87622363	8:5	10/20/2019	A	168	160	154 - 162	>99.9	>99	9	>24:11	523
Olga Student	627260	8:8	10/01/2019	A	112	99	95 - 103	47	49	5	8:8	497
Ricky Student		8:1	10/15/2019	A	153	160	154 - 162	>99.9	>99	9	17:11	515
Yolanda Student	2945749	8:11	09/22/2019	A	126	113	108 - 117	81	68	7	10:8	503

Group Averages

8:2

115

84

71

7

Copyright © 2019 NCS Pearson, Inc. All rights reserved.

Warning: This report contains copyrighted material and trade secrets. The qualified licensee may excerpt portions of this output report, limited to the minimum text necessary to accurately describe their significant core conclusions, for incorporation into a written evaluation of the examinee, in accordance with their profession's citation standards, if any. No adaptations, translations, modifications, or special versions may be made of this report without prior written permission from Pearson.

Pearson and **EVT** are trademarks, in the U.S. and/or other countries, of Pearson Education, Inc., or its affiliates. **PPVT** is a trademark of the Wascana Limited Partnership.

[1.6 / RE1 / QG1]

Group Qualitative Analyses

The tables below provide qualitative analysis information. Reporting qualitative data is based on entry of item response/score data. If item response/score data is not available, a hyphen is printed in the table and that administration will not be included in the group average percent correct calculation.

Home vs. School Vocabulary Qualitative Analysis

Examinee Name	Examinee ID	Form	Test Date	Home			School		
				Attempted	Correct	% Correct	Attempted	Correct	% Correct
Arturo Student	78958552	B	10/01/2019	4	4	100	109	90	83
Bob Student	2479455	A	10/10/2019	11	4	36	4	2	50
Debra Student	2434234	B	09/14/2019	9	6	67	69	48	70
Ezra Student	667774744	A	11/01/2019	5	4	80	83	63	76
James Student	5243759	A	09/18/2019	10	7	70	48	36	75
Jody Student	128546	B	07/07/2019	12	10	83	71	58	82
Josh Student	87622363	A	10/20/2019	5	4	80	131	111	85
Olga Student	627260	A	10/01/2019	4	3	75	72	56	78
Ricky Student		A	10/15/2019	5	4	80	111	96	86
Yolanda Student	2945749	A	09/22/2019	5	4	80	85	69	81

Home vs. School Vocabulary Averages

Home vs. School	Average % Correct	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Home	75									
School	77									

Vocabulary by Part of Speech Qualitative Analysis

Examinee Name	Examinee ID	Form	Test Date	Noun			Verb			Attribute		
				Attempted	Correct	% Correct	Attempted	Correct	% Correct	Attempted	Correct	% Correct
Arturo Student	78958552	B	10/01/2019	76	65	86	18	15	83	19	14	74
Bob Student	2479455	A	10/10/2019	11	5	45	2	1	50	2	0	0
Debra Student	2434234	B	09/14/2019	62	44	71	7	5	71	9	5	56
Ezra Student	667774744	A	11/01/2019	70	54	77	6	5	83	12	8	67
James Student	5243759	A	09/18/2019	48	33	69	3	3	100	7	7	100
Jody Student	128546	B	07/07/2019	66	53	80	8	8	100	9	7	78
Josh Student	87622363	A	10/20/2019	91	78	86	18	15	83	27	22	81
Olga Student	627260	A	10/01/2019	61	47	77	5	3	60	10	9	90
Ricky Student		A	10/15/2019	82	74	90	12	10	83	22	16	73
Yolanda Student	2945749	A	09/22/2019	72	60	83	6	5	83	12	8	67

Vocabulary by Part of Speech Averages

Part of Speech	Average % Correct	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Noun	76									
Verb	80									
Attribute	69									

Three Tier Model of Vocabulary Qualitative Analysis

Examinee Name	Examinee ID	Form	Test Date	Tier 1			Tier 2			Tier 3		
				Attempted	Correct	% Correct	Attempted	Correct	% Correct	Attempted	Correct	% Correct
Arturo Student	78958552	B	10/01/2019	2	2	100	83	70	84	28	22	79
Bob Student	2479455	A	10/10/2019	11	4	36	3	1	33	1	1	100
Debra Student	2434234	B	09/14/2019	6	4	67	49	35	71	23	15	65
Ezra Student	667774744	A	11/01/2019	5	4	80	59	45	76	24	18	75
James Student	5243759	A	09/18/2019	10	7	70	32	24	75	16	12	75
Jody Student	128546	B	07/07/2019	8	7	88	52	41	79	23	20	87
Josh Student	87622363	A	10/20/2019	5	4	80	96	81	84	35	30	86
Olga Student	627260	A	10/01/2019	4	3	75	51	39	76	21	17	81
Ricky Student		A	10/15/2019	5	4	80	79	67	85	32	29	91
Yolanda Student	2945749	A	09/22/2019	5	4	80	59	51	86	26	18	69


Three Tier Model of Vocabulary Averages

Three Tier Model	Average % Correct	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
Tier 1	76									
Tier 2	75									
Tier 3	81									

STEM Vocabulary Qualitative Analysis

Examinee Name	Examinee ID	Form	Test Date	STEM		
				Attempted	Correct	% Correct
Arturo Student	78958552	B	10/01/2019	32	24	75
Bob Student	2479455	A	10/10/2019	1	1	100
Debra Student	2434234	B	09/14/2019	25	15	60
Ezra Student	667774744	A	11/01/2019	29	24	83
James Student	5243759	A	09/18/2019	21	15	71
Jody Student	128546	B	07/07/2019	27	23	85
Josh Student	87622363	A	10/20/2019	43	35	81
Olga Student	627260	A	10/01/2019	27	23	85
Ricky Student		A	10/15/2019	37	34	92
Yolanda Student	2945749	A	09/22/2019	31	24	77

STEM Vocabulary Averages

	Average % Correct	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
STEM	81									

Group Averages by Demographics

The tables below provide group averages broken down by gender, grade, and race/ethnicity. Reporting information for a student's gender, grade, and race/ethnicity is optional; demographic categories are omitted from the tables below if no data were collected. Calculation of each Group Average by Demographics is based on the information that is reported. Therefore, the group total reported for each demographic table may not match the total reported in the Group Score Summary.

Group Average by Gender

Gender	Total in Group	Average Standard Score	Percentile	NCE	Stanine
Female	4	105	63	57	6
Male	6	122	93	81	8

Group Average by Grade

Grade	Total in Group	Average Standard Score	Percentile	NCE	Stanine
1 st Grade	2	72	3	11	1
2 nd Grade	5	128	97	89	9
3 rd Grade	3	124	95	84	8

Group Average by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Total in Group	Average Standard Score	Percentile	NCE	Stanine
Asian	2	111	77	65	6
Black/African-American	3	101	53	51	5
Hispanic/Latino	1	101	53	51	5

Race/Ethnicity	Total in Group	Average Standard Score	Percentile	NCE	Stanine
White	4	132	98	95	9

Suggested Interventions

Effective vocabulary interventions are informed by the accumulated scientific evidence concerning how individuals learn new words, why some individuals lag in their vocabulary development, and what kinds of interventions are most effective for bringing about change in vocabulary development. The accumulated evidence suggests that effective vocabulary interventions will reflect five principles. When collectively applied to the design of vocabulary interventions, the five principles will provide a robust means for accelerating the vocabulary growth of infants through adults. Use these principles when discussing intervention/instruction adjustments with classroom teachers, parents/guardians, and other members of the educational team.

- *Principle of Interest:* This principle emphasizes the importance of promoting an individual's interest in words as objects of attention and scrutiny.
- *Principle of Use:* This principle emphasizes the importance of an individual's active engagement with words as an effective route to learning new words.
- *Principle of Explicitness:* This principle emphasizes the need to provide clear connections between words and their meanings to facilitate learning.
- *Principle of Repetition:* This principle emphasizes that one learns the meaning of a word only gradually over time and with repeated exposures to that word in a variety of different contexts.
- *Principle of Intensity:* This principle emphasizes the importance of addressing as many words as possible within vocabulary interventions to promote breadth of knowledge.

Two sets of suggested interventions for the EVT-3 are provided in this report. The first set includes general, evidence-based strategies and activities embedded directly within the report. The second set provides information from an additional resource, *The Bridge of Vocabulary 2*, also available on Q-global (sold separately).

Evidence-Based Vocabulary Interventions

Based on the group's average age of 8:2, the activities listed below are suggested to further develop the vocabulary skills of this group.

Expressive, Group 3 (E3):

E3-A. Cooperative Learning/Peer Tutoring

E3-B. Robust Vocabulary Instruction

E3-C. Morphemic Analysis

Expressive, Group 3 (E3)

E3-A. Cooperative Learning/Peer Tutoring

Cooperative learning is a common instructional technique in which students work in pairs or small groups to teach one another. Some of the benefits of cooperative learning are that students can work independently while engaging in intellectual discussions, which together can result in improved student motivation and increased time on task (National Reading Panel, 2000). Importantly, cooperative learning can also be used as a tool for building children's expressive vocabulary skills.

An activity described by Miller, Barbetta, and Heron (1994) involved students working in pairs to teach each other target vocabulary words. In this activity, student pairs received a stack of cards on which a target word was printed on one side (e.g., *miasmic*) and the definition was printed on the other. The cards were divided between the two students, who would take turns playing tutor and tutee. The tutor presented a word to the tutee, who then provided a response that was praised or corrected by the tutor. Words were put into two piles by the tutor to differentiate those mastered from those not mastered by the tutee. After a period of time, the two students switched roles. To promote learning and retention of words over time, student pairs can graph each other's performance and monitor growth in words known for a period of time (e.g., over five consecutive days).

References:

Miller, A. D., Barbetta, P. M., & Heron, T. F. (1994). START tutoring: Designing, training, implementing, adapting, and evaluating tutoring programs for school and home settings. In R. Gardner, III, D. M. Sainato, J. O. Cooper, T. E. Heron, W. L. Heward, J. W. Eshleman, & T. A. Grossi (Eds.), *Behavior analysis in education: Focus on measurably superior instruction* (pp. 265-282). Pacifica Grove, CA: Brookes/Cole.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read*. Washington, DC: Author.

E3-B. Robust Vocabulary Instruction

Robust vocabulary instruction is a term coined by Isabel Beck and her colleagues (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2013) to describe an approach to vocabulary instruction in which words are brought to life for students. Beck and colleagues argue that typical vocabulary instruction lacks many things and does little to provoke children's independent interest in and motivation toward words. With robust vocabulary instruction, students learn to be intrigued by and curious about words and word meanings that they do not know. Given that there are far too many words to teach to children through direct instruction, Beck and colleagues suggest that robust vocabulary instruction provides a critical avenue for making children seek out the learning of new words on their own and becoming independent learners of vocabulary.

To provide robust vocabulary instruction, teachers and other professionals must ensure that students have ample opportunities to both hear and explore previously unknown words. In a classroom using robust vocabulary procedures, several new words are introduced each day in various contexts and activities. An important feature of robust vocabulary instruction is allowing children to hear "student-friendly definitions" that make sense to them and then generate their own definitions of words. Some activities that might be used in robust vocabulary instruction to provide student-friendly definitions and to help students engage meaningfully and enjoyably with new words are these:

1. Linking words to children's lives: Play a "have you ever" game with children that poses a question about a new word, as in, "Have you ever felt exhausted? Tell me about it..."
2. Finding out which words children like: Play an "applause, applause" game with children in which they clap softly versus loudly for words they like or don't like or words they would like used to describe them versus those they would not.
3. Elaborating words during storybook reading interactions: Select several unknown words from storybooks read to the class, and pause during reading to discuss the meanings of these words. Allow children to give definitions using their own words and examples.

Reference:

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

E3-C. Morphemic Analysis

When children come upon new words and must decipher their meaning, they can utilize their knowledge of morphology to help them. Experts contend that students can self-teach themselves new words, thus increasing the breadth and depth of their vocabulary substantially by conducting morphemic analysis (Baumann, Edwards, Boland, & Font, 2012; Carlisle, 2010; Mann & Singson, 2003). Morphemic analysis involves examining the root and affix structures of words and is an appropriate focus of vocabulary instruction beginning in the fourth grade (Baumann et al., 2012). Typically, instruction in morphemic analysis focuses on teaching the most common prefixes (e.g., *un-*, *re-*, *in-*, *dis-*) and derivational suffixes (e.g., *-less*, *-ness*, *-ment*, *-er*).

One approach used in teaching morphemic analysis involves teaching children about word families (Nagy & Anderson, 1984). A word family is a root word and all of its derived forms that are created through additions of suffixes and prefixes. For instance, family members of the root word *work* include *schoolwork*, *worker*, *workman*, *overworked*, and so forth. A useful activity for teaching children about word families is to provide a target word and develop a family map around that word that contains all of the possible derivations. When creating the map, direct students to think about word formation (e.g., How did we change *work* to *schoolwork*?) and also think about the differences and similarities in meaning among words in a given family. By modeling both, guide students toward conducting such analyses independently when they encounter unknown words. A sequence of instruction for affixes is provided in Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, and Johnston (2004).

References:

- Baumann, J. F., Edwards, E. C., Boland, E., & Font, G. (2012). Teaching word-learning strategies. In E. J. Kame'enui & J. F. Baumann (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice* (2nd ed., pp. 139-168). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bear, D. R., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (2004). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Carlisle, J. F. (2010). Effects of instruction in morphological awareness on literacy achievement: An integrative review. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(4), 464-487. doi:10.1598/RRQ.45.4.5
- Mann, V., & Singson, M. (2003). Linking morphological knowledge to English decoding ability: Large effects of little suffixes. In E. M. H. Assink & D. Sandra (Eds.), *Reading complex words: Cross-language studies* (pp. 1-25). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Nagy, W. E., & Anderson, R. C. (1984). How many words are there in printed school English? *Reading Research Quarterly, 19*(3), 304-330. doi:10.2307/747823

Suggested Vocabulary Activities

The Bridge of Vocabulary 2 by Judy K. Montgomery offers an explicit set of vocabulary intervention activities that are tied to evidence-based research and to academic standards. These activities were developed for both general and special education professionals to use together as part of an interprofessional practice model. They can apply to individual student intervention or groups of students up to and including full classroom usage.

Based on the group's average age of 8:2, you may want to review the following sections in *The Bridge of Vocabulary 2* for additional intervention activities.

***The Bridge of Vocabulary 2* Upper Elementary (UE) Topic List**

Antonyms & Synonyms

Classification & Categorization

Compound Words

Meaning & Usage

Storytelling

Word Parts (Prefixes, Suffixes, & Roots)

Word Play

Reference:

Montgomery, J. K. (2019). *The bridge of vocabulary* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, MN: NCS Pearson.

End of Report