

READ Act Colorado State Board of Education
Approved List of Interim Assessments
2018-2019

PART I: COVER PAGE *(Complete and attach as the first page of proposal)*

Name of Entity:

Contact Person for the Proposal:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

Webpage:

Email:

Name of the Interim Reading Assessment:

Please check the components of the assessment included in the proposal:

=

- Assessment
- Technical Adequacy Report
- Supplemental Materials
- Other (Please explain)

Acknowledge that the assessment meets minimum threshold criteria:

- Assessment measures change in early reading ability across a school year and across grade-levels
- Assessment can be administered no less than three times each school year from Kindergarten through Grade 3
- Assessment has established cut-scores that identify students with “significant reading deficiencies across the school year.
- Assessment has been psychometrically reviewed by the vendor or outside evaluator

Proposal # _____

Reviewer: _____

**READ Act Colorado State Board of Education
Approved List of Interim Assessments**

Part I: Proposal Form/Cover Page

Part II: Evaluation Summary

Criterion	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Reliability and Consistency in Scoring		
Evidence for Validity		
Administration and Scoring		
Utility		
Spanish Assessment (if submitted)		

Additional Materials to be Reviewed and Considered When Evaluating Criteria Listed Above:

Part III: Copy of the Assessment

Part IV: Any Supplemental Materials

GENERAL COMMENTS: *Please indicate support for scoring by including overall strengths and weaknesses. These comments are used on feedback forms to applicants.*

Strengths:

(1) _____

(2) _____

Weaknesses:

(1) _____

(2) _____

Holistic Recommendation:

Recommended _____

Not Recommended _____

Signature of Reviewer _____ **Date** _____

Colorado State Board of Education Approved List of Interim Reading Assessments

Section 1: Reliability and Consistency in Scoring

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
<p>1. Evidence of test reliability</p>	<p><i>Results of reliability studies are reported for each grade assessment and provide evidence for adequate reliability.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes: Reliability studies and data were appropriate given the purpose of the measure.</p> <p>For tests built on classical test theory, potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split-half reliability • Coefficient alpha (Internal Consistency) • Test-retest reliability <p>For tests developed using item response theory, appropriate evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest). • Indices of item discrimination 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	and difficulty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total test information 		
2. Evidence for consistency in scoring	<p><i>For assessments that depend on examiner ratings, inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted.</i></p> <p>Potential 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 are reasonable for the grades and skills assessed. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	
3. Evidence for representative samples in reliability studies	<p><i>Studies that provide evidence for reliability include representative samples.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence Includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies that provide evidence for reliability include representative samples and include important subgroups, such ELLs, non-ELLs, students with and without reading difficulties. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
		is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence.	
4. Alternate forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability	<p><i>If alternative forms are provided, all forms have demonstrated evidence of equivalence or comparability.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient forms are provided to allow for progress monitoring between interim assessments. • Split-half reliability. • Coefficient alpha reliability. • Test-retest correlations. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Section 2: Evidence for Validity

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
<p>1. Evidence of content and construct validity</p>	<p><i>Evidence reported to demonstrate that the assessment measures reading ability appropriately.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that demonstrates that the assessment tasks are appropriate for the evaluation of reading concerns. • There are studies of construct validity, such as convergent and discriminant analysis, demonstrating correlations that are reasonable for the grade and skills assessed. • Reading levels of passages are appropriate for specified grade/reading level and were established based on appropriate procedures with representative samples. • Where appropriate, assessment demonstrates alignment with Colorado Academic Standards for 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	Language Arts and resolution for any resulting concerns.		
<p>2. Evidence that resulting classifications are valid for identifying students with “significant reading deficiency”</p>	<p><i>Evidence reported to demonstrate that classifications resulting from the test and application of the cut score are valid for decision making.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description of the criterion or measure that were used to provide evidence for valid classifications. • Cut scores were established based on appropriate procedures and study design, including appropriate criterion assessment, adequate sample size, and appropriate statistical analyses. • Evidence for classification accuracy for identifying students with a “significant reading deficiency” including evidence for adequate sensitivity and specificity. • Evidence from studies of convergent and discriminant analysis. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SEM and/or confidence intervals are reported to assist with cut score interpretation.• Evidence that the norming sample was representative and appropriate.		

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
<p>3. Evidence that the assessment is free of bias.</p>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed issues of equity for all populations. • Results of bias reviews and plans that have addressed any concerns. • Validity studies have been disaggregated by important subgroups and indicate equivalent technical adequacy. • Evidence from studies of test dimensionality, differential item functioning, or predictive validity. • Culturally diverse students were included throughout the process of test development. • The content of reading materials does not favor any specific culture. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Section 3: Administration and Scoring

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
<p>1. Evidence for standardization of procedures and materials.</p>	<p><i>There is evidence for clear and precise administration guidelines.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The administration protocol is scripted. • Protocol provides clear guidelines • Administration windows are clearly identified. • Scoring procedures are clear. • Basal and ceiling administration and scoring rules are provided. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	
<p>2. Evidence for efficiency in administration and scoring.</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the amount of time necessary to administer and score the protocol is reasonable.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the estimated time of administration is reasonable and balanced to the information provided. • Evidence that the estimated 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	<p>time for scoring is reasonable and balanced for the information provided.</p>	<p>is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence.</p>	
<p>3. Evidence for usability.</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the assessment can be administered by a Colorado school teacher.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the administration and scoring guidelines are easy to interpret and implement. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	
<p>4. Potential accommodations are clear and appropriate for students with disabilities and students with special needs (504, etc.)</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that procedures for accommodating students with disabilities and/or special needs are clear and appropriate.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that potential accommodations do not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test. Specific administration 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	<p>guidelines are provided for any administration or scoring accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that training materials include specific guidelines on administration or scoring accommodations. • Evidence that accommodations are research or evidence-based. 	<p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence.</p>	
<p>5. Potential accommodations are clear and appropriate for second language learners</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that procedures for addressing the linguistic needs of the student are clear and appropriate.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that potential accommodations do not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test. • Specific administration guidelines are provided for any administration or scoring accommodations. • Evidence that training materials include specific guidelines on administration or scoring accommodations. • Evidence that 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	accommodations are research or evidence-based.		

Section 4: Utility

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
<p>1. Ease of interpretation</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that resulting scores are easily interpreted to determine if a student demonstrates “a significant reading deficiency”.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and examiner materials include clear instructions for the determination of whether the student potentially demonstrates “a significant reading deficiency”. • Cut points, score ranges, and/or confidence intervals are clearly specified for specific age/grade ranges and administration windows. • Evidence that resulting scores will be easy to interpret for teachers. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	
<p>2. Utility of reports</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that reports summarizing assessment results are useful and understandable for administrators, teachers, and parents.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reports are easily read and interpreted including a 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/or data provided</p>	

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
	<p>clear description of how to interpret results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports provide trajectory for tracking student progress. • District, school, classroom, and student reports are provided. • Reports available in real-time. • Reports can be exported to data-base formats. • Reports available in languages other than English. 	<p>demonstrates weak evidence.</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence.</p>	
<p>3. Cost effectiveness</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the costs associated with purchasing materials, assessment training, and administration and scoring are reasonable.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the price of materials is reasonable and comparable to similar assessments. • Evidence that the time for training, test administration, and scoring is reasonable and comparable to similar assessments. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

Section 5: Spanish Language Consideration

Criterion	Specific Indicators	Rating	Reference Page/Notes
<p>1. Development procedures</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the test was developed by highly qualified personnel following appropriate procedures.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development team includes expertise in Spanish language and literacy. • Development team followed appropriate procedures in developing the Spanish language version of the test. • Test items were back-translated to English. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

<p>2. Spanish language norming sample</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the test was normed with a representative sample of Spanish speakers.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that the sample utilized for norming the assessment is representative of Spanish-speaking student population in Colorado with regards to ethnicity, country of origin, socio-economic status, and/or other demographic characteristics. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	
<p>4. Comparability of test scores</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the scores resulting from the Spanish version of the test are comparable to scores resulting from the English version of the test.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resulting scores utilize a consistent scale. • Cut points, confidence intervals, and indices of risk are consistent across both languages of the assessment. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	

<p>5. Consideration of bias</p>	<p><i>There is evidence that the Spanish version of the assessment is free of bias related to poor translation, dialectical differences, cultural differences, or damaging stereotypes.</i></p> <p>Potential evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence that translated items have been evaluated for potential bias. • There is evidence that dialectical differences in Spanish have been considered and minimized. • There is evidence that the assessment is culturally appropriate. • There is evidence that the assessment is free of damaging stereotypes. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.</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.</p>	
--	---	---	--