

## IMPORTANCE OF REREADING ASSESSMENT

Vazirakhon Rustamovna Ochilova

Basic doctoral student

UzSWLU

email: [vazira.ochilova@gmail.com](mailto:vazira.ochilova@gmail.com)

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7162494>

**Annotation:** this article is described to give a clear image of a student's reading performance and to help inform instruction, a range of assessment styles, and frameworks. Therefore, the goal of this article was to evaluate studies on the use of suitable assessments to pinpoint at-risk students and forecast performance on high-stakes outcome examinations for school graders.

**Keywords:** decision-making, evidence-based education, instruction and intervention, assessment procedures, universal screening, and progress tracking. There are many different forms of evaluations that are intended to assist students to describe their learning and receive feedback on what they have learned. Summative, intermediate, and formative assessments are a few of the typical types (Bulky, Olah, & Blanc, 2010; Perie et al., 2007). Summative evaluations analyze learning at a specific point in time and record learning across a predetermined time period, which may be a quarter, unit, midterm, final, or year (Popham, 1999; Stiggins, 2004).

This kind of evaluation is the “roadmap of academic needs” and is frequently utilized for literacy accountability, such as high-stakes state reading examinations (Stiggins, 2004). Summative evaluations aid in identifying pupils who are adept at the abilities evaluated but offer little insight into the sub-skills. According to Bennett (2011) and O'Reilly et al. (2012), interim evaluations can give important information about the sub-skills that the student has not yet mastered to the required performance level. Similar to summative evaluations, interim assessments are conducted sporadically throughout the course of the academic year spanning a considerable amount of time.

Formative assessments are briefer in duration, frequently provide information on how pupils are functioning, and encourage learning as they go (Chappuis, 2009; Good, 2011; Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski, & Herman, 2009; Stiggins & Knight, 1997). Formative assessments are used to “...elicit, analyze, and apply evidence about student accomplishment by teachers, learners, or their peers to make judgments about next steps in instruction” (Wiliam, 2011 p. 24). In order to help teachers and students determine which learning objectives have been reached, formative evaluations are used (Brookhart, 2011; Bulkey et al., 2010).

This style of assessment includes a limited range of learning objectives and focuses on increasing learning and the learning process (Ardoin et al., 2004; Buffum, Mattos, & Weber, 2009; Jenkins & Jewell, 1993; Ruiz-Primo, 2011; Wiliam, 2011). (Perie et al., 2009). These evaluations may take the form of presentations, exit tickets, quizzes, progress monitoring, continuing observations, and class discussions. A significant strategy for directing literacy instruction and spotting kids who may not reach predetermined reading competency levels is the use of formative testing (Bennett, 2011; Shepard, 2009).

Reading tests are academic accountability measures that pupils are required to take at various grade levels. Reading tests are regarded as “high stakes” exams that concentrate on understanding the primary idea, cause and effect, and comparison (Good et al., 2001; McGlinchey & Hixson, 2004). The goal of the reading assessment is to pinpoint a reading proficiency level on results that show the student's level of success in reaching the reading standards and that the instructor may use to assist with direct instruction. In order to achieve the goals and objectives stated by the state board of education, this would guarantee that kids are reaching the grade level criteria.

The majority of the time, reading evaluations are given to the entire class using standardized methods and are criterion-referenced. Through interpretation, analysis, and critical thinking, reading evaluations may include multiple-choice, short-answer, and extended-response questions based on fiction, poetry, and nonfiction readings.

**In conclusion**, shared leadership, databased decision-making, a tiered continuum of supports, evidence-based education, instruction and intervention, assessment procedures, universal screening and progress tracking, and family participation are crucial components of assessment. According to Yovanoff et al. (2006), it is crucial that the measures utilized are successful at predicting reading comprehension because assessments and instruction work hand in hand.

### References:

1. Applegate, M. D., Applegate, A. J., & Modla V. B. (2009). “She’s my best reader; she just can’t comprehend”: Studying the relationship between fluency and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 62, 512-521.
2. Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: a critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(1), 5-25.
3. Brookhart, S. (2011). Educational assessment knowledge and skills for teachers.
4. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 30(1), 3-12.

5. Buly, M. R., & Valencia, S. W. (2002). Below the bar: Profiles of students who fail state reading assessments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(3), 219- 239.