



I'm not robot



**Continue**

## Fountas and pinnell benchmark assessment guide

NEW - 3rd edition! Using the complete Fountain & Pinell reference assessment systems to determine students' independent and instructive reading levels by f&p™ level gradient, teachers are able to: observe and quantify the reading behaviors of students Involved them in comprehension conversations that go beyond retelling informed decisions that connect evaluation with responsive teaching. Explore what BAS is, what's included, is implemented, and get access to samplers, research, webinars, and more. Browse Fountain & Pinell Literacy™ downloadable study guides, order forms, promotional materials, research, tools, samplers, webinar videos and more. © Heinemann. A division of Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. Skip to the main content The third edition of the best-selling, one-to-one, comprehensive review to determine students' independent and instructive reading levels by the F&p™. A message from literacy leaders Irene Fountain and Gay Su Pinnell about the 3rd edition:In our ongoing work in schools, we have noticed many teachers administering and scoring understanding. It became clear that obtaining strong behavioral evidence of understanding using talk as evidence was new or unfamiliar to many teachers. Many teachers did not have sufficient opportunities for continuous professional development in standardized administration and scoring. It was clear that we needed to create additional guidelines and structures to make administration and scoring more standardized among teachers. We have therefore created more detailed evaluation guidelines. We've also created new comprehension conversation headings to more clearly define the criteria for each understanding score. With clear guidelines and headings, we are confident that teachers will achieve consistency. The new guidelines and the heading will allow teachers to stare at their students' reading behaviours and strengthen the link from assessment to instruction. With refinement comes reflection—reflect on evaluation analysis and observations, and engage in a discussion with colleagues to plan rich and comprehensive literacy experiences that meet students where they are and bring them forward with intent and precision. My district, like many others, uses Fountain and Pnell's Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) as a primary measure of student reading progress. But if you had doubts about the assessment and how The BAS data is often used, you're on to something... Limited Materials A Benchmark Assessment System F&p Kit gives us only two books (one fiction and one nonfiction) for each level of so we end up using the books over and over again. We see the problem with these limited materials when readers struggle to memorize predictable texts or get stuck because they lack background background the two cards at a certain level. Heinemann has issued three editions of the evaluation, but has not yet produced additional texts. Providing more evaluation books is a challenge because the texts are not authentic, but rather evaluation materials written for purpose. Making more than one book available at a certain level would draw attention to the levelling inconsistencies in existing materials. Most of us instinctively know books in BAS are not consistent at some level and not progressively difficult along levels. In fact, we will strategically select from the book choices. I've heard my colleagues say, I use the book Lose Tooth because it's so much easier than the one about the zoo. (both level E) or I skip G and go directly to H. The common core recommends that we use objective measures (Lexile, Dale-Chall and Flesch-Kincaid are cited in Appendix A of the CCSS) to assess the complexity of the text. Due to the lack of transparency regarding its formula, the F&p leveling system is particularly absent in the CCSS recommendations. Lexles, repeatedly cited in the ANNEXEs of the CCSS, analyse the written text and characteristics that make it a complex objective, such as the decodability, the length of the sentence, the choice of words. According to Lexiei, the bass level E book at the Zoo is more similar to the Level H Book Trucks than the Companion Level E card provided in the evaluation kit. An objective leveling system confirms our own suspicions about books. Selecting the Zoo bass book may lead us to believe that a student reads at level E, but a closer look shows that the same child might as well do by reading the H-level book, Trucks. These names can mean the difference between a student being at or below the grade level and can have an impact on a student's perception of ability, both for the student and for the teacher. As we evaluate using BAS, we listen to a student reading and take Reading Records which we expect later to analyze to determine which of the three sources of information – meaning, syntax, visual – the child used to identify words. This attention to the infirm three-cueing theory distracts us from the fact that an error is simply proof that the child was unable to apply phonetic to accurately read the word. Although oral-passing reading rate and accuracy are good measures of general reading ability, as they measure the speed of word recognition and accuracy, the classification of miscues is uncertain, invalid, and a waste of teacher's time. - The whole language lives on assessing students with BAS takes about 20 minutes per student, but more reliable oral reading fluency assessments takes just 1 minute. While there are other problems to consider in terms of setting levels of reading instruction, in terms of reliability, could make more sense to focus on more technical sound sound Available. It may be surprising to many teachers that some of the most valid and reliable measures of a student's overall reading level include simple measures of accuracy and speed of word recognition, in and out of context (Rasinski, 2000; Torgesen, Wagner, Raskette, Burgess, & Hecht, 1997). - Towards the peaceful coexistence of test developers, policy makers, and teachers listening to read students is important for several reasons, but the books and scoring sheets provided in BAS are not time-derid we are asked to devote them. According to Heinemann, the Reference Assessment System was tested on the field typical students, but included in their study only proficiency English students who were already reading at the grade level (and very few of them at that!) By excluding various students from their study, Heinemann ignored the demographics of our classrooms and missed important factors in determining the difficulty of the text. Assessment books are typical experiences of middle-class children (e.g. sleepovers and farm trips). Images in books allow some students to shut up for words (e.g. climbing and snowplow), while students without that background knowledge and vocabulary must sound the words out. The Book Of Trucks is not a good indicator whether an English student will be able to read other books labeled H by Fountains and Pinell because it is currently written and is more decoding (despite the snowplow!), even compared to the other BAS Level H book, which includes complicated-to decode irregular past-tense verbs. Educators are on shaky ground when a test is used in a way or for a purpose other than that for which it was intended. If a test has been developed specifically for a particular population (e.g. preschoolers, native English speakers), then it is imperative that the test be used exclusively for those who were designed to evaluate. - Towards the peaceful coexistence of test ing developers, policy makers, and teachers say that I was to use the evaluation only on competent English speakers who are reading at the grade level and I ignored miscue analysis, could the bass work then? Well, working to do what? Trying to use the data collected from BAS led many of us to make training decisions Irene Fountains and Gay Su Pinell have spoken out against: What BAS Data tells us: What Fountainand and Pinell Say: He reads at level H. The truth is that children can read books on a wide variety of levels, and in fact they experience many different levels of books throughout the day. A child who reads a G-level book about bubbles during evaluation will be able to G-level books about polar bears, friendship, and transportation. ... we have decades of research demonstrating the extent to which students' vocabulary knowledge relates to their understanding of reading. If a child does well on level, it should be evaluated on the next. A gradient is not a precise sequence by which all students move. [...] You may want to skip one level if you feel that students need even more challenges. It is important for a student to increase the level over time. The idea is not simply to move up levels, but to increase their reading width by applying their strategies to several different types of texts. After each student's reading level has been determined, students of similar levels should be grouped together. A gradient is not and has never been intended to be a way to classify or label students, whose background experiences and progress rate will vary greatly. I never wrote about leveling students. The reading level of a student should be communicated to the child so that they can select only the right cards. We certainly never set out for children to focus on a label for themselves in choosing books in classroom libraries. Classroom libraries should invite places where children are attracted to subjects and genres, authors and illustrators they love. And while students choose books that interest them, the teacher is there to help them learn to make good choices, so that the books they select are the ones they can read and enjoy. If a child chooses a book that is too hard for them to read, they can stretch and enjoy this book for a while. The evaluation data should be used to determine which leveled books are needed in the classroom library and which students should read which books. Organizing books by level doesn't help students get involved in books and pursue their own interests. Fountain and Pinell have repeatedly stated that a leveling system is simply a tool that a teacher uses to match students with books. But district administrators love evaluation because they generate data that seems easy to understand (an H-level reader is more qualified than an E-level reader) and seems easy to act (Label and level your library and ask students to pick from the right compartments.) Irene Fountainand and Gay Su Pinell knew that reading an E-level book didn't mean that the child would be able to read other level books as well, and yet their names are on an assessment that sells this myth. As teachers, we are required to spend precious time to administer this poorly constructed assessment for students for whom it has not been designed and to use the data in ways that limit students' choice and even limit their access to grade-level content. It is time for us to insist on being given evaluations and be given the flexibility to use more authentic methods to match our diverse students with texts they can read. For more from Fountain and Pinell: Pinell: Pinnell:

