

2026 Call for Submissions of Academic Screening Tools

The **National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII)** is a technical assistance center funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs and housed at the American Institutes for Research. The Center brings together many of the nation's leading experts in data-based individualization (DBI) to deepen understanding of intensive intervention and improve how it is implemented in schools.

Rigorous research demonstrates that educating students with persistent academic and behavioral needs requires validated, evidence-based instruction that is further individualized using DBI. NCII views DBI as the engine that drives a continuous, iterative process linking assessment and intervention until a student demonstrates an adequate response. Grounded in this evidence base, NCII supports state and local leaders, educators, faculty, and professional development providers in building the capacity needed to implement intensive intervention effectively.

The primary goals of this call are to:

- solicit information about existing academic screening tools;
- evaluate the quality of the evidence that demonstrates these tools' efficacy; and
- provide information to stakeholders to support successful implementation of academic screening.

In addition to the general call for academic screening tools, this review cycle includes **two optional supplemental review components** focused on tools used to identify **students at risk for reading difficulties**, including dyslexia, and tools administered in English that have evidence supporting their appropriate use **with English learners (ELs)**.

Information for these supplemental review components will be collected using the online tool submission form **and** supplemental form documents. Vendors whose tools are designed for or appropriate in these specific contexts may choose to provide one or both supplemental forms. These forms offer additional information about the tool's appropriateness for identifying reading difficulties (including dyslexia) and/or for use with ELs. Supplemental materials will only be considered when paired with a complete academic screening submission; they cannot be reviewed independently. This approach ensures that all tools, regardless of supplemental areas, are evaluated first against a common set of high-quality academic screening criteria. Vendors can submit supplemental forms for tools that were reviewed in a previous review cycle;



however, they may need to revise the existing tool submissions to satisfy the supplemental review requirements. Vendors can email ToolsChartHelp@air.org with any questions about updating existing submissions to meet these requirements.

Results from these reviews will be posted on the Academic Screening Tools Chart and NCII website and shared with a range of partners, including state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, technical assistance centers and professional development providers, and relevant professional organizations. This dissemination supports informed selection and use of academic screening tools across contexts and strengthens implementation within a multi-tiered system of supports.

The submission deadline for academic screening tools is **February 11th, 2026**.

Criteria for Review of Academic Screening Tools

For the purposes of this call, NCII defines academic screening as follows.

*The National Center on Intensive Intervention defines academic screening as a process using tools with convincing **evidence of classification accuracy, reliability, and validity** to identify students who may require intensive intervention efforts to meet their academic needs.*

Evidence-based academic screening tools in accordance with this definition and meeting the specifications that follow are invited to respond to this call.

For detailed information on the review standards and rating criteria, see the Academic Screening Rating Rubric and FAQs on our website here:

<http://www.intensiveintervention.org/tools-charts/review-process>.

Academic Screening Tools Submission Criteria

Submissions of evidence-based academic screening tools must meet the following criteria.

1. Documentation of the tool's effectiveness must be based on direct evidence¹ rather than indirect evidence.
2. The tool must have the following classification data:

¹ Direct evidence refers to data from a study based on the tool submitted for evaluation. Studies that use data from the use of another tool, even if it is similar, are considered indirect evidence and will not be considered as adequate evidence for the purposes of this review.



- a. Number of students in your sample who represent a true positive classification, a false positive classification, a false negative classification, and a true negative classification; and
 - b. Area Under the Curve (AUC) derived from a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve analysis.
3. Classification data analyses must be conducted using cut points identifying students in need of intensive intervention (i.e., cut points between the 10th and 20th percentile using a local or national normative sample).
 4. The tool's outcome variable must match the construct the screening tool measures (e.g., reading outcome for reading screeners or math outcome for math screeners).

Center staff will review submissions upon receipt to ensure that these minimum criteria are met. Only submissions that are determined to meet all criteria will be assigned for review.

Optional Dyslexia Supplemental Review Criteria

Forty-nine states have passed legislation related to dyslexia; some states with legislation require that local education agencies identify students at risk for reading difficulties, including dyslexia, using academic screening tools. To support states and educators in identifying students with reading difficulties that align with common state criteria outlined in legislation, NCII is requesting additional information on academic screening tools submitted to the Academic Screening Tools Chart.

Submissions for the optional dyslexia supplemental review must meet the following criteria, developed in collaboration with the National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL).

1. A corresponding academic screening tool has been submitted for full review under the current review cycle or a previous review cycle. Previous submissions may need to be revised with additional evidence to satisfy the requirements below.
2. Tools using composite scores that require several subtests to be administered to identify risk of reading difficulty to educators must provide reliability and validity evidence for the subtests submitted under the dyslexia criteria.
3. Tools that allow subtests to be administered independently and provide a risk of reading difficulty independent of the composite must provide classification accuracy evidence in addition to reliability and validity evidence for their subtests. These subtests should be included as separate tool submissions.
4. Documentation, using the supplemental form, of the tool's subtests aligned with the following reading constructs for students in Kindergarten, First, and Second Grades:



- a. Phonemic awareness
 - b. Alphabetic knowledge
 - c. Phonics
 - d. Oral reading fluency
 - e. Vocabulary
 - f. Comprehension
 - g. Rapid automatized naming
5. Identification, using the supplemental form, of which aligned subtests are included in the composite used to identify risk of reading difficulties, including dyslexia.

Optional English Learner Supplemental Review Criteria

NCII has recognized a need for more information on assessment tools that can identify the academic needs of English learners. To support educators and states in identify academic needs for these students, vendors are invited to submit evidence on English academic screening tools that include English learners. Optional submissions should provide evidence of classification accuracy, reliability, and validity to identify English learners who may require intensive intervention supports. For this call, tools should be tied to external tools delivered in English and include English learners as defined by the state criteria in which evidence for the tool is collected.

Submissions for the optional English learner supplemental review must meet the following criteria.

1. Corresponding academic screening tool submitted for full review under the current review cycle or a previous review cycle. Previous submissions may need to be revised with additional evidence to satisfy the requirements below.
2. A sample constructed of English learners only is added to the cross-validation evidence of classification accuracy data section of the main submission.
3. Reliability and validity evidence disaggregated for English learners is included in the main submission.
4. Sample information, including students' country of origin, language of instruction, and English language proficiency status are provided using the supplemental form, when available.



Submission Process

Online Submission Portal

NCII uses an online [submission portal](#) that allows submitters to provide data using a fillable, dynamic form. New submitters must create an account to use the system. Returning submitters with tools listed on our charts will gain access to revise and resubmit prior submissions.

Supplemental Forms

If a vendor chooses to submit one or both supplemental forms as part of their submission, completed forms should be submitted via email to ToolsChartHelp@air.org. Forms should be submitted as Microsoft Word documents using with a subject line “[Name of Tool] Supplemental Form Submission.”

Any questions about the submission process or requirements should be directed to ToolsChartHelp@air.org. All submission materials, including online submissions and any supplemental forms, must be received by the February 11th deadline.

Review Process

The TRC review process consists of the four steps below. For a detailed explanation, visit our website: <http://www.intensiveintervention.org/tools-charts/review-process>.

1. All submissions will be checked for completeness by NCII staff. Required documentation must accompany the submission to be reviewed by the TRC.
2. All complete submissions will undergo a review by the Center’s Technical Review Committee of nationally renowned experts on academic screening. For further information about the committee members and their roles in the review process, please visit our website.
3. The review process will be conducted in two phases. Submitters will be notified of initial results and comments after the first phase of review. If presented evidence is found to be insufficient after the first phase, submitters may submit additional evidence or clarification. This additional information will be used to re-review and finalize results during the second phase of review. **Once the review has begun, withdrawal will not be permitted.**
4. Final TRC decisions as to the technical adequacy of submitted tools will be posted on the NCII website and disseminated through NCII to states, districts, schools, and NCII’s partners for implementation.



This resource was produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Award No. H326Q210001. Celia Rosenquist serves as the project officer. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this document is intended or should be inferred.

