

Istation ISIP ER

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 or coefficient alpha present.</p> <p>Page 41 Test is adaptive – students do not respond to a common set of items(excluding Coefficient alpha as a measure)</p> <p>Test-retest reliability – 0.927 to 0.970 (n=416) See table 7, p. 42</p> <p>Test-retest completed across seven sections from Oct. to Feb.</p> <p>Internal Consistency high and stable over time(up to 5 months apart)</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-1</p> <p>Meets or exceeds- 3</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 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not</p>	<p>Reviewers are not able to locate this information and the technical manual was downloaded from</p>	

	<p>ranges and cut-scores.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest). 	<p>demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS -- Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>the internet Not reported No standard of error of measure included due to adaptability of assessment</p>	<p>Does not meet-4 Partially meets- Meets or exceeds-</p>
	<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) 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</p>	<p>Computer administered assessment Computer administered assessment Page42 States there was inter-rater reliability but does not provide data to correlate at grade level or specific coefficient. States IRR is within two points of all administrators. Due to adaptive, non-identical assessments, inter-rater reliability is difficult to determine.</p>	<p>Does not meet-1 Partially meets- Meets or exceeds-3</p>

		evidence. (2)		
	<p>Studies have been conducted to establish reliability with all subcategories of students 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>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>Reliability was reported but not broken up by demographics groups.</p> <p>Page 38</p> <p>All subcategories of students are represented in the reliability and validity report</p> <p>Noted that studies were based off of one school district in North Texas.</p>	<p>Does not meet-1</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-3</p>
Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability	<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>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</p>	<p>Evidence of parallel forms, but not given about how often the test can be given.</p> <p>Computer based has bank of questions instead of alternate forms.</p> <p>This assessment is based on IRT not classical test theory, therefore it does not need</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-2</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-2</p>

	<p>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. 	<p>demonstrates weak evidence. (1) 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>alternative forms</p> <p>Since no student receives the same assessment, multiple forms are inherent in the program.</p> <p>Page 2 –states ISIP ER assess students automatically each month or on demands, as desired to measure progress throughout the school year</p> <p>Coefficient alpha is noted as difficult to measure due to adaptability of test from student to student.</p> <p>Data shows comparability at each grade level to assessments</p>	
<p>Evidence of content and construct validity</p>	<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>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</p>	<p>Statistics given about content validity of test.</p> <p>Page 1-web-based assessment of critical early reading skills that are predictive of later reading success</p> <p>Page 13 -Shows subtest</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-4</p>

	<p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description is provided that demonstrates the purpose of the assessment is to screen students for reading concerns. • 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>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>administration for teach grade level</p> <p>Page 14- Description of each subtest contains purpose and intended use of each.</p>	
	<p>Reading levels are reported for passages and how levels were established. Reading 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>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</p>	<p>Partial evidence showing they are reliable, does not show how they were made.</p> <p>Not evident in the technical manual or technical report</p> <p>The RFI and technical manual report that readability has been established using a “commonly accepted readability formula” but it does not say what this formula is. It also does not address whether these passages were field tested and which populations they were tested with.</p>	<p>Does not meet-2</p> <p>Partially meets-2</p> <p>Does not meet-</p>

		<p>demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2)</p>	<p>There is also no mention of a content review by a field of experts related specifically to the passages.</p> <p>Page18- To publisher, each of these passages was carefully written to conform to specific word level features follow linear story grammar structure and have readability according to a commonly accepted readability according to a commonly accepted readability formula for the end grade level in each grade.</p> <p>Demographics mirror school/district</p> <p>Levels of assessment passages are not reported</p> <p>Page 35- Field expert and</p>	
	<p>If appropriate, findings from alignment studies to demonstrate alignment with Colorado Academic Standards for Language Arts and resolution for any</p>	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not</p>	<p>Alignment to both CAS are provided on the Istation web page</p> <p>No evidence of alignment to</p>	<p>Does not meet-2</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or</p>

	<p>resulting concerns.</p>	<p>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>Colorado Academic Standards.</p>	<p>exceeds-2</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) 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</p>	<p>Items previously tested for constructed validity were used to create. Author failed to demonstrate that this new test maintains construct validity.</p> <p>Not all correlations are at or about .70</p> <p>Page 42 Studies listed under validity section. However under multiple external measures, a correlation of .7 or higher is not always evident.</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets- 3</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-1</p>

		suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
Evidence of criterion/predictive validity accurately identifying students with <i>“significant reading deficiency”</i>	<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>Not all correlations are at or about .70</p> <p>Clear definition of criterion used to establish concurrent validity and the ranges of percentiles for the SRD are provided. However predictive validity is only included as a range of 0.59-0.82 on “a variety of reading test” with no explicit information provided.</p> <p>Criterion definitions use to establish validity for each measure compared page 40-41.</p> <p>Validity correlations of .7 or above are shown for significant number of external measures</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-2</p> <p>Meets or exceed-2</p>
Determination of cut-scores based upon well-designed pilot study	The assessment has established cut-scores for decision making about students’ <i>“significant reading deficiency”</i> using adequate demographics	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not	<p>Very clear percentiles.</p> <p>Three tiers of normative grouping based on percentile rank.</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-</p>

	<p>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>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>Full description of norming sample which includes students from 24 states.</p> <p>Know demographics information is detailed.</p> <p>Large representative sample.</p>	<p>Meets or exceeds-4</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>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is</p>	<p>Correlations, .7 .9</p> <p>Not clearly evident.</p> <p>No studies of classification accuracy are provided.</p> <p>Contains information on measures including criterion-referenced points, norm-referenced points and lexile scores to create an accurate analysis.</p> <p>Values are not shared to demonstrate</p>	<p>Does not meet-2</p> <p>Partially meets-1</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-1</p>

		provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	values that exceed .8	
	Acceptable, recognized procedures are followed for setting cut-scores.	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)	Uses percentiles. Acceptable procedures for setting tiered cut scores based on percentile rank and use of standards deviations	Does not meet- Partially meets- Meets or exceed-4
	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)	Could not find. Standard error or measurement estimates are not evident to reviewers. No evidence of	Does not meet-4 Partially meets- Meets or

		<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>	SEM estimates.	exceeds-
Universal Design	<p>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.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed issues of equity of utility for all populations. • Results of bias reviews and plans that have addressed any concerns. • At least two to three types of classification, reliability, and validity study data have been disaggregated by subgroups and meet the 	<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</p>	<p>Child frequently in game format, no evidence of bias reviews.</p> <p>Norming samples included a large percentage of culturally diverse students. However, statistics were not disaggregated by group to indicate that it is equally reliable and valid for all subgroups.</p> <p>Does not identify normed score based on disaggregated groups. Proof of bias control is not clear.</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-3</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-1</p>

	<p>criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	strong evidence. (2)	<p>Disaggregated subgroups include race, gender, and placement.</p> <p>Sample includes students from 24 states with appropriate representation; this qualifies as an adequately diverse population.</p>	
Third party evaluation conducted	Evidence reported to demonstrate that an independent, qualified third party has provided a thorough and unbiased evaluation of the quality of the assessment.	<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>Reviewers did not find evidence of this proposal.</p> <p>A panel of experts was used to review items for bias, however the overall assessment and study was not reviewed by an outside party.</p> <p>ISIP has documented independent reviews and studies from school districts comparing ISIP to state assessment and other widely accepted assessments.</p>	<p>Does not meet-2</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-2</p>

<p>Standardization of materials and procedures for administration</p>	<p>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>	<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>Computer administered.</p> <p>Script provided in online teacher manual. Guidelines are provided for materials to be created.</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-4</p>
<p>Efficiency of administration</p>	<p>The amount of time needed to administer the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided.</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</p>	<p>Time to administer is around 30 minutes.</p> <p>Notice time limit for answering questions.</p> <p>Progress monitoring time shortened if only monitoring specific subtest...</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-4</p>

		<p>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>		
Efficiency of scoring	The amount of time needed to score the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided; computer-assisted scoring is available; procedures for calculating scores are clear; scores can be stored and reported electronically.	<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>Immediate scoring as student takes assessment on computer.</p> <p>Efficient, storable computer-assisted.</p>	<p>Does not meet- Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceed-4</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 the training materials or program. 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)</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>Accommodation are addressed, however they are minimal at best and only provided for two populations of students.</p> <p>Supplemental materials contains adequate accommodations and modification for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceed-4</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 	<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>No accommodations listed for students other than a Spanish version of the test. Students speaking languages other than Spanish are not addressed.</p> <p>Specific guidelines for administering assessment with accommodations not located in technical manual or teacher guide.</p>	<p>Does not meet-1</p> <p>Partially Meets-1</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-2</p>

	accommodations are research or evidence-based.	EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	ELL accommodations given for lesson but not assessments.	
Scores are easily interpreted to determine a <i>“significant reading deficiency”</i>	<p>Scores clearly specify whether a student is categorized as having a <i>“significant reading 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 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>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially Meets-</p> <p>Meets or exceeds-2</p>
Cost effective: Materials, administration costs including personnel, scoring, and training	Materials are provided or easily accessible; time away from instruction is minimal; no additional personnel required; all costs inclusive including any additional data	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not	\$5.50 per student	<p>Does not meet-</p> <p>Partially meets-</p>

	platform or storage costs; minimal data entry is required.	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)		Meets or exceeds-3
Reports provide guidance for interpretation useful to educators, administrators, and parents	Information is displayed in a format and language that is understandable to educators, administrators and parents; <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 	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	Real time report, identify level of risk, shows growth, group in tiers are useful, results for classroom and by student. No districts reports provided	Does not meet- Partially meets- Meets or exceeds-3

	available provided for users.	suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
--	-------------------------------	---	--	--

Strengths:

- 1) Cost effective, can test whole class at once, screen for levels of risk. English version SRD is clear, reports are clear.
- 2) Computer based assessment and scoring streamlines administration and scoring procedures
- 3) An alignment with CAS and CCSS is provided on Istation web page.
- 4) Computer administration allows for standard administration and easy scoring.
- 5) Provides instructional materials to assist teachers in meeting student needs.

Weaknesses:

- 1) Not effective for monitoring.
- 2) Could not find SEM.
- 3) Statistical measurements such as SEM and construct validity are not readily evident.
- 4) Third party evaluation is not evident.
- 5) Not a stand-alone interim assessment. It is built to be used as an intervention curriculum with an assessment built in.
- 6) Requires school to have computers available for all students for testing purposes.

Recommend: XXX

Not recommend: XX