Thank you for your request to our REL Reference Desk regarding phonemic assessments. The information below represents the most rigorous research available. Researchers consider the type of methodology used in the research whenever possible and give priority to research reports that employ well described and thorough methods. The resources were selected based on the date of the publication with a preference for research from the last ten years. Additional criteria for inclusion include the source and funder of the resource.

**Question:** What research exists for reliable, valid, and time-efficient phonemic awareness assessments?

   Source: Internal Search Database  
   This article is available for purchase through SAGE Publications: [http://ldx.sagepub.com/content/44/4/313](http://ldx.sagepub.com/content/44/4/313)  
   From the abstract: “The goal of the current study was to compare two forms of dynamic assessment and standard assessment of preschool children's phonological awareness. The first form of dynamic assessment was a form of scaffolding in which item formats were modified in response to an error so as to make the task easier or more explicit. The second form of dynamic assessment was direct instruction of the phonological awareness tasks. The results indicate that preschool children's phonological awareness can be assessed using standard assessment procedures, provided the items require processing units larger than the individual phoneme. No advantage was found in reliability or validity for either dynamic assessment condition relative to the standard assessment condition. Dynamic assessment does not appear to improve reliability or validity of phonological awareness assessments when preschool children are given tasks that they can perform using standard administration procedures.”

From the abstract: “The study assessed the ability of English phonemic awareness measures to predict kindergarten reading performance and determine factors that contributed to growth trajectories on those measures for English Only (EO) and English language learner (ELL) students. Using initial sound fluency (ISF), phoneme segmentation fluency (PSF), and a combined phoneme segmentation task (CPST), students' beginning of kindergarten scores were used to predict end-of-kindergarten Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) and reading (WRMT-R/NU). Regression analyses revealed that ISF and CPST early in kindergarten predicted variance in NWF and WRMT-R/NU. PSF did not predict reading performance over ISF or CPST. While gender was a significant factor in the growth curves across the measures, results revealed no significant difference for EO and ELL students.”

3. **Introducing the CVC Spelling Assessment: Helps Track Gains as Kindergarten and First Grade Students Learn the Alphabetic Principle.** 2011; Oldrieve, R.; California Reader, Vol. 45, Issue 1, 11 pages.
Source: General Internet Search Using Google
From the abstract: “Various researchers have found that spelling assessments are strong predictors of future success in phonemic awareness, reading, spelling, and writing. In order to monitor a student's spelling development over several years, many spelling inventories use a few words of varying difficulty; from simple consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) words such as hop to multi-syllable words such as elephant. This article introduces the CVC Spelling Assessment. With its narrower focus, the CVC Spelling Assessment tracks a beginning reader's progress from invent spelling words based on the most prominent consonant sound in a CVC word, to invent spelling the word based on both the initial and final consonants, to invent spelling a CVC word with both consonants and a middle vowel. Results from the CVC Spelling Assessment can be analyzed both qualitatively and/or quantitatively. It is especially effective for Response to Intervention (RTI) because it differentiates between at-risk students who are slowly but steadily responding to phonemic awareness interventions, and those who are just not "getting it."”

4. **"I'm Not Stupid": How Assessment Drives (In)Appropriate Reading Instruction.** 2009; Dennis, D.V.; Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Vol. 53, No. 4; 8 pages.
Source: Internal Search Database
This article is available for purchase through Wiley Publications:
http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1598/JAAL.53.4.2/abstract;jsessionid=2500823D55D6A503ABCA318704B15D1B.d02t01
From the abstract: “Middle school students who score below proficient on state reading assessments are often placed in remedial reading programs that focus on phonics and
decoding skills and do not acknowledge students' literate abilities. The purpose of this study is to demonstrate the reading abilities of young adolescent readers. Five assessments measuring phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension were administered to 94 students who scored below proficient on a state reading assessment. Cluster analysis revealed four distinct groups of striving adolescent readers. The varying abilities and needs of these populations are presented through profiles of four students, and implications for tiered instructional interventions are discussed.”

Search Process:

Key words and search strings used in the search:
“phonemic” AND “assessment” OR “awareness”

Search databases and websites:
Institute of Education Sciences Resources (IES): Regional Educational Laboratory Program (REL); IES Practice Guides; What Works Clearinghouse (WWC); Doing What Works (DWW); Institute of Education Sciences (IES); National Center for Education Research (NCER); National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE); National Center for Special Education (NCSER); National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Search Engines and Databases: EBSCO Databases; ERIC; Google, Google Scholar

Additional Resources: The Education Trust
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