

Heineman Benchmark Assessment System - English

| Criterion | Specific Indicators | Rating | Feedback from Reviewers | Tally of rating |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Validity, Reliability and Consistency in Scoring | | | | |
| Evidence of test reliability and consistency in scoring | <p>Results of reliability studies are reported for each grade assessment</p> <p>Evidence includes: The studies are appropriate given the purpose of the measure. For each grade-level, studies provide evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split-half reliability • Coefficient alpha • Test-retest reliability • Classification consistency | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. Correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2)</p> | <p>No evidence of split-half reliability, coefficient alpha, or classification consistency. The test-retest reliability noted in the Field Study is actually referring to inter reliability not test-retest reliability. There was mention of comparison to an outside measure but not reported for each grade level. There is no down to by grade level results.</p> <p>Need external correlation to other fiction and non-fiction tests Fluency/accuracy can be measured objectively Comprehension and writing could be scored objectively</p> <p>Test-retest reliability not reported for each grade. Fiction and non-fiction were correlated to each other, which is not true test-retest reliability. No sample size included.</p> <p>No evidence of the number of subjects</p> | <p>Does Not Meet– IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>in the study, how the reliability coefficient was determined, no split-half reliability, no grade-level evidence, No technical manual. Research is not provided</p> <p>The only measure of reliability reported is test-retest reliability and this reliability is calculated by comparing fiction passages to non-fiction passages. This is not true test-retest reliability as different passages were compared rather than the same passages.</p> | |
| | <p>Standard error of measurement or standard estimate of error is reported</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores. • SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest). | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS -- Information and data provided suggests acceptable or</p> | <p>There's no mention of standard error of measure.</p> <p>Could not find SEM in proposal</p> <p>Lack of reporting offfield test results (ie reliability coefficient)</p> <p>Mentions that many people were trained in giving tests, but did not give information about the actual reliability of their results</p> <p>No SEMS given for cut scores</p> | <p>Does not meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | strong evidence. (2) | Did not report No evidence of cut scores, or standard error of measure. There are scores on a fluency rubric but no evidence of research to support the scores on the rubric. No information provided | |
| | <p>Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted. Study sample used to establish inter-rater reliability represents test administrators.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted for each grade level and are based on a representative sample of educators who will administer and score the assessment. • Inter-rater reliability coefficients exceed .7. | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>What is noted as test-retest is actually evidence of some inter-rater reliability. However we are not seeing evidence of inter-rater reliability studies with results by grade level or a co-efficient of .7</p> <p>Did not find</p> <p>No evidence of inter-rater reliability – not addressed in application or manual</p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Does not meet – IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| | Studies have been conducted to establish reliability with all subcategories of students | DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or | There's no evidence to show this information within the technical manual. | Does Not Meet – IIIII Partially |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>who will take the assessment.</p> <p>Evidence Includes: Studies that demonstrate reliability has been established from scoring samples of students that include: Non-ELLs with and without reading deficiencies and ELLs with and without reading deficiencies.</p> | <p>information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>There is no comparison of ELLs with reading deficiencies versus ELLs without reading deficiencies.</p> <p>Did not see in-depth description of study sample to understand the demographics and reliability was not given for groups studied</p> <p>Specific subgroups were not identified. No reliability was reported.</p> <p>No evidence of subcategory students who took the test.</p> <p>No information provided</p> | <p>Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| <p>Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability</p> | <p>If alternative forms are provided, all forms have demonstrated evidence of equivalence or comparability such as test-retest, parallel form and internal consistency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical reviews indicate all forms for each grade level have demonstrated evidence of comparability and content specifications. <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient forms are provided to allow for progress monitoring | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR</p> | <p>The additional forms mentioned are actually more a diagnostic v. alternative benchmark/interim assessments.</p> <p>Statistical evidence not reported for alternative forms</p> <p>Fiction and non-fiction data was provided within their system only. There was no evidence to show comparison fiction to fiction and non-fiction to non-fiction.</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>between interim assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split-half reliability. • Coefficient alpha reliability. | <p>EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2)</p> | <p>Sufficient forms are provided to allow for progress monitoring.</p> <p>Alternative forms are mentioned in the application however there is no research and no test-retest information on the alternative forms. The forms are used for further diagnostics implying that they are not parallel forms.</p> <p>The purpose of an interim assessment is to check student progress 3 times a year. This assessment does not have 3 separate forms for multiple administrations. It also does not have progress monitoring forms.</p> | |
| Evidence of content and construct validity | <p>Evidence reported to demonstrate the assessment helps correctly identify students with “<i>significant reading deficiencies</i>” so that successful remediation and intervention can be provided; studies have been conducted with similar assessments to show that the assessment measures reading ability, not other irrelevant criteria.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description is provided that | <p>Rating</p> <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion</p> | <p>There is a description provided that the purpose is to screen however the content specifications for each grade level are not present.</p> <p>Specific information not given in their statistical evidence</p> <p>Field testing and independent data analysis were demonstrated to</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>demonstrates the purpose of the assessment is to screen students for reading concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content specifications for each grade-level, including a complete description of the test content, purpose(s), and intended use(s), and assessment blueprint as appropriate, is provided. | <p>and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>be both reliable and valid measures of assessing students’ reading level” is mentioned, but again, no specifics were given about the result</p> <p>Data provided for grades 3-8 only.</p> <p>No cut score to determine if a student has a SRD</p> <p>No evidence of content or construct validity other than a narrative description saying that it was determined to be reliable and valid after a study.</p> <p>The RFI states that validity has been studied, but no evidence has been provided. Additionally, it appears as though all information reported regarding the validity of the assessment and the leveling of students is qualitative, not quantitative. This information is not sufficient for the identification of students with a Significant Reading Deficiency.</p> | |
| | <p>Reading levels are reported for passages and how levels were established. Reading</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – Evidence was</p> | <p>No evidence of field testing for the reading levels</p> | <p>Does Not meet – IIII</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | <p>levels of assessment passages have been field-tested or have other evidence.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field testing populations should be clear and should mirror the school/district demographics. • Statistics used to establish the reading levels are reported with both ELL and Non-ELL populations. • Findings from a content review by field experts, including teachers in tested grade levels. | <p>not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>Partially Meets – partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds – most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>Field testing was done, but specifics about sample are not given</p> <p>Specific info about ELLs and non-ells not given</p> <p>We were not able to find a comparison of ELL and non-ELL</p> <p>No evidence of how the levels were established - again a narrative describing but no evidence is presented. No description of the sub-categories of students</p> <p>No explanations of how levels were determined was provided.</p> | <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| | <p>If appropriate, findings from alignment studies to demonstrate alignment with Colorado Academic Standards for Language Arts and resolution for any resulting concerns.</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> | <p>No mention of the Colorado Academic Standards for Language Arts</p> <p>General statement given about review</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>of standards in 7 states</p> <p>Information found online about Common Core Standards which shows connections between the assessment and standards</p> <p>Cannot find convergent analysis for SEL specifically</p> <p>No mention of the Colorado Academic Standards</p> <p>The narrative says the standards of multiple states were “examined” however no evidence is given.</p> <p>The RFI states that this has been done, but no evidence was provided.</p> | |
| | <p>There are studies of construct validity, such as convergent and discriminant analysis, demonstrating correlations of .7 or above.</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data</p> | <p>There is no data to support the correlation of .7 or above.</p> <p>.764 correlation with Iowa Test of Basic Skills. The correlation with other tests mentioned fell significantly below the .7 mark</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>No evidence given!</p> <p>The information provided does not address true construct validity.</p> | |
| <p>Evidence of criterion/predictive validity accurately identifying students with “<i>significant reading deficiency</i>”</p> | <p>Evidence reported to demonstrate that the assessment has established criterion and/or predictive validity to correctly identify students with and without a “<i>significant reading deficiency.</i>”</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear definition of the criterion or measure that were used to establish concurrent validity. • Studies with similar assessments that demonstrate the assessment measures reading ability, not other irrelevant criteria. Predictive validity correlations above .7. | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>No evidence</p> <p>Statistical evidence not given about predictive validity</p> <p>No evidence of longitudinal studies required for predictive validity.</p> <p>No cut score to determine significant reading deficiency.</p> <p>No evidence of studies , no criterion to identify SRD students</p> <p>Again, no evidence was provided in regards to predictive validity</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| <p>Determination of cut-scores based upon</p> | <p>The assessment has established cut-scores for</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence</p> | <p>Does not include a description of the</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| <p>well-designed pilot study</p> | <p>decision making about students' "<i>significant reading deficiency</i>" using adequate demographics representing (i.e., 10% ELL and 25% F/R lunch), appropriate criterion assessment, adequate sample size, and appropriate statistics.</p> <p>Evidence indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a description of the process used to establish the cut points. • A full description of the norming sample. • The norming sample is a large representative national sample of students at the same grade level and is representative of the testing population according to gender, ELL status, special needs status and F/R lunch status. | <p>was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and 2data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>process to establish cut points A full description of the norming sample is not present. No evidence of a large norming sample.</p> <p>No established cut scores.</p> <p>No research provided / testing with small student population of 498 students but again it is in a narrative form with no research evidence</p> <p>Cut scores for this measure were based only on the Fountas & Pinnell leveling system, not on externally proven measures of reading ability.</p> | <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| | <p>Studies of classification accuracy analysis provide evidence that the measure appropriately identifies students as indicated in the description of purpose of the assessment, demonstrating values that exceed .8 or higher.</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> | <p>There is no study of classification accuracy (no numerical data given).</p> <p>Specific information not given for SEL (Spanish version) Due to subjectivity of scoring rubric (comprehension and writing) overall level could be inaccurate or skewed based on teacher bias, knowledge,</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>training</p> <p>No information to identify students was provided</p> <p>No evidence provided</p> <p>It is stated in the RFI that the purpose of this assessment is for diagnosis, not screening. Additionally, no classification accuracy research is provided.</p> | |
| | <p>Acceptable, recognized procedures are followed for setting cut-scores.</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>There were levels mentioned, but no cut scores.</p> <p>See above box</p> <p>No cut scores.</p> <p>No evidence provided</p> <p>The cut scores in this assessment are to determine a reading level, not a level of risk and they were determined by a field test of teachers, not through valid, recognized research procedures.</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | SEM estimates are reported for cut-scores with guidance for score interpretation. | DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.(1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2) | There were no SEM reported SEM not given No cut scores. No SEM measures reported Not reported | Does Not Meet – IIIII Partially Meets – Meets or Exceeds - |
| Universal Design | Evidence reported to demonstrate that the assessment has cultural validity, that fairness and bias issues have been addressed; the assessment is accessible to all learners, considering minimizing language load; the format is not a barrier to student performance. Evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed issues of equity of utility for all populations. Results of bias reviews and plans that have | DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR | There is an indication of diverse populations being included in the field testing, however there is no evidence of bias reviews, equity for all populations, or any type of classification, reliability, and validity study data have been disaggregated by subgroups and meet the criteria. By not using translations indicate that | Does Not Meet – III Partially Meets – II Meets or Exceeds |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | <p>addressed any concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least two to three types of classification, reliability, and validity study data have been disaggregated by subgroups and meet the criteria. • Culturally diverse students were included throughout the entire process of test development. For example in the samples of pilot students, in cognitive interviews, etc. • The content of the reading materials does not favor mainstream culture. | <p>EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>Spanish version could be helpful</p> <p>Specific information not given that supports their claims</p> <p>There are not two to three types of classification and reliability</p> <p>No third party evaluation.</p> <p>No evidence</p> <p>This information is not provided</p> | |
| <p>Third party evaluation conducted</p> | <p>Evidence reported to demonstrate that an independent, qualified third party has provided a thorough and unbiased evaluation of the quality of the assessment.</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided</p> | <p>There is no third party</p> <p>Not given</p> <p>No third party evaluators – they claim the field testers were objective so count as a third party</p> <p>Though this assessment was field tested, that is not the same as a third-party evaluation.</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2) | | |
| Standardization of materials and procedures for administration | Administration protocol is scripted and provides precise guidelines; administration windows are clearly identified; materials are provided or clear guidelines are provided if materials are to be created; includes both electronic and hard copy administration manual that is clear and concise. | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>Use prompts “as needed” is concerning which shows that standardization could vary depending on test.</p> <p>Scripts are included and online materials, several books given per level</p> <p>Administration protocol is scripted. No administration windows. Materials are provided. Electronic and hard copy admin manuals are provided.</p> <p>There are some scripted directions, not all the way through. There are electronic and hard copy administration, and the test can be given four times a year although the time in between is unclear.</p> <p>Though administration is somewhat standardized they do not follow a fully standardized</p> | <p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – IIII</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - I</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | | | procedure. | |
| Efficiency of administration | The amount of time needed to administer the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided. | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>There is not sufficient information provided</p> <p>Efficiency is dependent on teacher’s knowledge</p> <p>Does not tell how long test takes to administer</p> <p>Time intensive for a screener</p> <p>The time frame is dependents on the training of the assessor as stated in the manual and takes 20-30 minutes again depending on the training of the assessor.</p> <p>Though the administration time is not provided in the RFI and we were unable to find it in the manual, based on the number of tasks it seems that the time may be more extensive than is appropriate for a screening assessment. It is possible that use as a diagnostic measure would be more appropriate.</p> | <p>Does Not Meet- IIII</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| Efficiency of scoring | The amount of time needed to score the assessment is reasonable and balanced to | | The amount of time it takes to administer is not | Does not Meet – II |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | <p>the information provided; computer-assisted scoring is available; procedures for calculating scores are clear; scores can be stored and reported electronically.</p> | | <p>mentioned</p> <p>Concerns about subjectivity of scoring which would take teachers more time</p> <p>No indication of how scores can be stored and reported electronically</p> <p>Procedures for accuracy and rate were standardized</p> <p>Training for scoring is intensive and time consuming</p> <p>They do have computer storage of scores / teacher still hand scores and then can enter the information into the assessment on-line system</p> | <p>Partially Meets – II</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds- I</p> |
| <p>Accommodations clearly stated and described for students with disabilities and students with special needs (504, etc.)</p> | <p>The differing needs of students with disabilities are specifically addressed.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any accommodations do not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test. Specific administration guidelines are provided for implementing any accommodations. How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.</p> | <p>There is nothing noted</p> <p>Accommodations are not necessary</p> <p>No specific accommodations provided</p> <p>The assessment states that no accommodations are needed as the assessment meets each student at their level.</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets-</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | <p>the training materials or program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based. | <p>(1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>This is not addressed in this assessment. The manual states that “no accommodations are necessary.”</p> | |
| <p>Accommodations clearly stated and described for Second Language Learners</p> | <p>The accommodations directly address the linguistic needs of the student.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any accommodation does not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test. Specific administration guidelines are provided for implementing any accommodations. How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in the training. Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based. | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>NA</p> <p>No Accommodations are necessary</p> <p>Not in the English Version</p> <p>No – they state there are no accommodations needed for any student and there is no evidence of research with ELL students.</p> <p>Again, the assessment states that no accommodations are necessary</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| <p>Scores are easily interpreted to determine a “significant reading</p> | <p>Scores clearly specify whether a student is categorized as having a “significant reading</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information</p> | <p>There are no cut scores, just levels.</p> <p>No guide given about determining</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – IIIII</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p><i>deficiency”</i></p> | <p><i>deficiency”.</i></p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score ranges or a scale is provided. • Guides for interpretation of scores are provided. | <p>does not demonstrate evidence.(0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>SRD</p> <p>No cut scores</p> <p>Score ranges on the instructional to independent reading ability - determine 3 levels based on their accuracy and comprehension rubric score to only determine a level. No evidence of relation to a significant reading deficiency.</p> <p>The purpose of this assessment is to determine the instructional reading level of a student. Assessments used to determine a Significant Reading Deficiency must use measures at grade level, not independent reading level.</p> | <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |
| <p>Cost effective: Materials, administration costs including personnel, scoring, and training</p> | <p>Materials are provided or easily accessible; time away from instruction is minimal; no additional personnel required; all costs inclusive including any additional data platform or storage costs; minimal data entry is required.</p> | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR</p> | <p>Is in person training extra?</p> <p>\$355 1 year per teacher subscription for online storage then \$30 per year per user</p> <p>\$355 for one classroom kit. Additional costs for data system. Time away from instruction is significant.</p> | <p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – IIII</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds -</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>It is \$355.00 , but the time away from instruction is extensive as it is 30 minutes per student (at the least) and given individually.</p> <p>While it is not completely cost prohibitive, it is more expensive than many interim assessment.</p> | |
| <p>Reports provide guidance for interpretation useful to educators, administrators, and parents</p> | <p>Information is displayed in a format and language that is understandable to educators, administrators and parents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reports are easily read and interpreted. • Clear description of how to interpret results. • Reports provide trajectory for student progress. • District, school, classroom, and student reports provided. • Reports available in real-time. • Reports can be exported to data-base formats. • Reports available in languages other than English. • Customer service is available provided for users. | <p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p> | <p>No sample for online reports were provided</p> <p>If you buy the data CD, parent reports are available. Reports provide: trajectory, district must provide own data for comparison. Reports available in Spanish.</p> <p>Not available in real time, there are school and district reports, there is a trajectory and the reports show the scores once the teacher enters the results, there are reports that show the entire class is doing but only in terms of independent and instructional levels.</p> <p>Reports are available but they do not appear to provide the depth of information that</p> | <p>Does Not Meet – I</p> <p>Partially Meets – III</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - I</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | would be helpful in interpreting results. | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Strengths:

- 1) Administration is scripted within the testing manual.
- 2) It's clear that efforts were put forth to create authentic Spanish materials which could be helpful to teacher distinguish reading abilities for linguistically diverse students.
- 3) Assessment is designed to place students on a continuum
- 4) Provides both fiction and non-fiction reading samples
- 5) There is a possibility that this would be acceptable as a diagnostic measure, but as an interim assessment it is not appropriate

Weaknesses:

- 1) There is no evidence of cut scores.
- 2) There is no predictability of risk
- 3) Statistical evidence was lacking in the RFI to support this assessment in the given areas
- 4) Very weak psychometrically. Evidence of reliability was lacking.
- 5) No cut scores to determine a significant reading deficiency.
- 6) No evidence of research – the application was turned in as a narrative and no technical manual to validate claims in the application
- 7) Scoring is subjective, the alternative forms mentioned are used as a diagnostic. No timeline for assessments, no accommodations for students. Not researched on a wide variety of subcategories of students.
- 8) There is no evidence that research has been completed to determine the reliability and validity of this assessment.
- 9) The purpose of this assessment is not to be a screener for risk of reading failure, but rather a diagnostic measure to determine student reading level.

Recommended:

Not Recommended: X X X X X