

# Let's Go Learn

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><b>Evidence includes:</b> 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"> <li>• Split-half reliability</li> <li>• Coefficient alpha</li> <li>• Test-retest reliability</li> <li>• Classification consistency</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –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>☑ Reliability information provided for each sub-test rather than for each grade assessment. ☑ Sample size concerning</p> <p>There's no mention of split-half reliability or coefficient alpha. Very small sample size, no indication of what grade levels each student was. Phonemic Awareness had a low reliability score.</p> <p>CAL Read Correlation study – It is unclear what is correlated with what (it seems that DORA is being correlated with established measures, but it's not completely clear). Sample size is too small to have confidence in the validity of the statistics. Coefficient alpha for phonemic awareness is low. Test-retest reliability: The delta seems too</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: III</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: III</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>

			<p>high for High-frequency words, Word meaning, and Silent reading considering that 0.5 is a half-year change. However, we are not sure what an acceptable Delta would be.</p> <p>Pages 18, 23, 27, and 29- small sample size of 1,000 students with “n” reported as 21 for concurrent validity tests with GORT. Sample size for reliability tests was even smaller at 225 students. Test-retest reliability is provided, but other forms of reliability are not tested. Tests are not conducted by grade level, as there is only one version of the assessment (computer adaptive). Reliability tests were conducted on the subtests, and the sample size was larger and more significant.</p> <p>Low population and developed 2003. Word meaning is low in comparison to other measures. Strong is sight word familiarity, word recognition, and silent reading All sub tests</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			exceeded .7 with the highest being spelling, except for phonemic awareness being .45	
	<p>Standard error of measurement or standard estimate of error is reported</p> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores.</li> <li>SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest).</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> -- Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>P. 29 SEM were reported for subtests</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of score ranges and cut-scores for</p> <p>Their mentioned of standard error they gave has nothing to do with cut scores. What was the cut score?</p> <p>There are no cut scores listed.</p> <p>No cut scores are provided. Therefore, the standard error of measurement for the cut scores is unknown.</p> <p>No cut scores for each grade level The mean is calculated from the delta</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>
	<p>Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted. Study sample used to establish inter-rater reliability represents test administrators.</p> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted for each grade level and are based on a representative sample</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or</p>	<p>Inter-rater reliability studies not evident for each grade level</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, for all subtests except phonemic awareness</p> <p>There was no representation sample of educators. Could not find</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS I</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>

	<p>of educators who will administer and score the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inter-rater reliability coefficients exceed .7.</li> </ul>	<p>data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>inter-rater reliability coefficients</p> <p>There are no inter-rater reliability studies cited.</p> <p>Not included in the proposal</p> <p>Did not find inter-rater reliability</p>	
	<p>Studies have been conducted to establish reliability with all subcategories of students who will take the assessment.</p> <p><b>Evidence Includes:</b>  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><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)  <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>Information regarding subcategories of students not reported</p> <p>Group of monitored students are not detailed down to subgroups.</p> <p>Only one study was completed. This study was not broken into subcategories of students. The makeup of the sample group was not evaluated.</p> <p>Information about subcategories of students is not provided.</p> <p>No sub categories for students</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>
<p>Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or</p>	<p>If alternative forms are provided, all forms have demonstrated evidence of equivalence or comparability such as test-retest, parallel form and internal</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not</p>	<p>Comprehension .05 reliability  ☐ Variability with sample size significant, by a factor of 6.6</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: I</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: IIIII</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR</b></p>

comparability	<p>consistency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical reviews indicate all forms for each grade level have demonstrated evidence of comparability and content specifications.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient forms are provided to allow for progress monitoring between interim assessments.</li> <li>Split-half reliability.</li> <li>Coefficient alpha reliability.</li> </ul>	<p>demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –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>☒ Technical reviews by grade level are not included</p> <p>There is only one form of each assessment, except comprehension which has 3 forms</p> <p>Page 23- Three versions of comprehension are provided, but there is only one version for all other tests because it is computer adaptive.</p> <p>. 3 versions of the test for comprehension 1 version of the assessment; but computer adaptive</p>	<b>EXCEEDS:</b>
Content and Construct Validity				
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><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clear description is provided that demonstrates the purpose of the assessment is to screen</li> </ul>	<p><b>Rating</b></p> <p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most</p>	<p>Description describes need to assess students using various subtests to gather a clear picture of student reading needs</p> <p>☒ Summaries are provided for each subtest, though not for each grade-level; purpose and intended use is expressed for each sub-test</p> <p>☒ Creators of the assessment believe that it provides a well-</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: III</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: III</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b></p>

	<p>students for reading concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>rounded view of a student's reading needs.</p> <p>No mention of cut scores- ranges to noted No clear purpose is stated No content specifications are noted for each-grade level</p> <p>Without cut scores, it is unclear how we would determine a significant reading deficiency. Description on page 4 seems more diagnostic than screening. Content specifications are listed for each subtest, not each grade level.</p> <p>Word analysis subtests were not compared because of incompatibility. No indication that the assessment is meant to identify struggling readers. No indication that this test is meant to be a screener. Sub-tests are described, with some tests more specifically described than others. For example, the reader is unclear as to how the child is tested on sight word recognition. What is the child asked to do? How does</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

			<p>the child demonstrate the word is known?</p> <p>No cut scores for each grade level Had description of each sub tests</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><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field testing populations should be clear and should mirror the school/district demographics.</li> <li>Statistics used to establish the reading levels are reported with both ELL and Non-ELL populations.</li> <li>Findings from a content review by field experts, including teachers in tested grade levels.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>Flesch-Kincaid leveling system used to establish levels of passages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Sentence length and complexity information evident for three grade levels (elementary, middle and high school)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No subcategory information provided-ELL</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of a content review by field experts.</li> </ul> <p>Field testing populations are noted in general terms, no subgroups are identified. No statistics were established for reading levels for both ELL and non-ELL populations. No evidence of who reviewed this assessment</p> <p>Flesh-Kincaid was used to determine reading level, but there is no information about field tests or content review by field experts.</p> <p>Information about leveling is provided. No information is provided</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: I</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: IIIII</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b></p>

			<p>regarding field testing and use with various populations, as a previously established leveling system was used.</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><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)  <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Score: 0 DOES NOT MEET  <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence regarding alignments with CAS</p> <p>No study present indicating alignment to Colorado Academic Standards.</p> <p>No information about CAS is provided.  Construct validity: participants were in grades 2-6 (not K-3).  Sample sizes were low.</p> <p>No direct connection to the standards is made although the items tested align with the foundational skills of the standards.  Construct validity information is provided, but the information relates to diagnostic assessments rather than other interim assessments.</p> <p>No alignment studies to CAS</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>



			Dated citations, etc.	
	There are studies of construct validity, such as convergent and discriminant analysis, demonstrating correlations of .7 or above.	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>☐ Score: 0 DOES NOT MEET</p> <p>☐ No evidence of correlation to similar assessment</p> <p>The reliability score for Phonemic Awareness alone is an issue in regards to validity.</p> <p>Phonemic awareness was only .45 6 out of 7 domains are above .7 There was evidence of correlation to LGL Reading assessment</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: II</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: IIII</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b></p>
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><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear definition of the criterion or measure that were used to establish concurrent validity.</li> <li>• Studies with similar assessments that demonstrate the assessment measures reading ability, not other</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for</p>	<p>☐ P. 22 – correlation to SP &amp; WRAT .85 reliability n=21</p> <p>☐ Correlation to GORT .65 n=21</p> <p>☐ Clear explanation not evident</p> <p>☐ Concerned about reliability of sample size</p> <p>Nothing is mentioned about predictability or identifying children with significant reading deficiencies.</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: II</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b></p>

	<p>irrelevant criteria. Predictive validity correlations above .7.</p>	<p>the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>Concurrent validity, but not predictive validity cited. No cut scores are listed to establish criterion for SRD.</p> <p>Concurrent validity, but not predictive validity cited. No cut scores are listed to establish criterion for SRD.</p> <p>Page 22 – Very small sample size. Studies were not conducted with similar assessments, as GORT is a paper/pencil assessment and Let’s Go Learn is an online assessment. No mention of how this assessment accurately identifies students with SRD.</p> <p>Although evidence was provided, the assessment was not similar; small population group</p>	
<p>Determination of cut-scores based upon well-designed pilot study</p>	<p>The assessment has established cut-scores for 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><b>Evidence indicates:</b></p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or</p>	<p>Cut scores not evident in document  <input type="checkbox"/> Document tells which states and how many students in sample  <input type="checkbox"/> Sample includes students from 4 states-CA, CO, HI, VA- six districts total  <input type="checkbox"/> Sample 17,856; other findings (construct validity)</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS:</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes a description of the process used to establish the cut points.</li> <li>A full description of the norming sample.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and 2data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>used a sample of 21</p> <p>Cut scores not evident-</p> <p>Nothing mentioned- we are unclear what the scoring system is.</p> <p>No cut scores are listed; no demographics indicated.</p> <p>The description seems more diagnostic rather than a test used for screening to identify SRD. No indication of cut-scores. Norming sample description is not provided.</p> <p>Does not have cut scores</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><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most</p>	<p>No demonstrating values that exceed .8</p> <p>There is nothing in the RFI that indicates this analysis was done.</p> <p>The test doesn't "classify" students. The test was designed to give relative strengths and weaknesses of the child as a reader rather than using cut scores to classify a student into a particular ranking based on</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS:</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b></p>

		information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	performance. No cut scores	
	Acceptable, recognized procedures are followed for setting cut-scores.	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b> -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	No cut scores No cut scores are listed. There are no cut scores for this assessment. No cut scores	<b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIIII</b> <b>PARTIALLY MEETS:</b> <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS:</b>
	SEM estimates are reported for cut-scores with guidance for score interpretation.	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b> -partial evidence was provided related to the	No cut scores No cut scores are listed; no information about score interpretation is included. Score interpretation is not provided. Cut scores are not provided.	<b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIIII</b> <b>PARTIALLY MEETS:</b> <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS :</b>

		<p>criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.(1)  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided.  Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	No cut scores	
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><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addressed issues of equity of utility for all populations.</li> <li>• Results of bias reviews and plans that have addressed any concerns.</li> <li>• At least two to three types of classification, reliability, and validity study data have been disaggregated by subgroups and meet the criteria.</li> <li>• Culturally diverse students were included throughout the entire process of test development. For example in the samples of pilot students, in</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0)  <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided.  Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>No specific information about the districts chosen or diversity of population  ☑ P. 29 “ Variability was low, meaning that the LGL Reading Assessment is very precise and can be re-administered with low bias. Sample size n=225; still concerned about low sample size</p> <p>Only Spanish and English were addressed, lack of evidence around all populations</p> <p>No evidence cited.</p> <p>Study results were not disaggregated by subgroups. Cultural bias was not addressed.</p> <p>Population was not described.</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>

	<p>cognitive interviews, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The content of the reading materials does not favor mainstream culture.</li> </ul>			
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><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>No mention of third party reviews</p> <p>No evaluation was completed by a third party.</p> <p>Evidence of a third-party evaluation was not provided.</p> <p>Not included</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET : IIIIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>
Administration and Scoring				
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><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided</p>	<p><b>Scripts are available in the appendices online</b></p> <p>☐ <b>Specific windows not stated; Online user guides states need for 10-12 of instruction between testing periods; doesn't provide norms for certain times of</b></p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET II</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: III</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS: I</b></p>

		<p>related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p><b>the school year; if not a diagnostic does the assessment need</b></p> <p>☑ <b>Online assessment; paper-pencil oral reading fluency sub-test provided</b></p> <p>☑ <b>Ability to print out online administration guide</b></p> <p>No hard copy administration manual is provided, but it could be printed from the online version.</p> <p>Online protocol makes the test standardized. No administration windows are identified. No manuals are provided.</p> <p>No administration window</p>	
Efficiency of administration	The amount of time needed to administer the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided.	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR</b></p>	<p><b>Time spent on administration is variable as it is an computer adaptive assessment (FAQ document)</b></p> <p>☑ <b>Again this depends on the student</b></p> <p>The amount of teacher time is reasonable; the amount of student time is excessive for a screener.</p> <p>Time to administer is not provided.</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: II</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>

		<b>EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
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.		The online system completes all of the scoring. No information is provided regarding scoring. Online step by step instructions are provided.  How is it scored?	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b>  <b>PARTIALLY MEETS: IIIII</b>  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS: I</b>
Accommodations clearly stated and described for students with disabilities and students with special needs (504, etc.)	The differing needs of students with disabilities are specifically addressed.  <b>Evidence includes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any accommodations do not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test.</li> <li>Specific administration guidelines are provided for implementing any accommodations.</li> <li>How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in the training materials or program.</li> <li>Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based.</li> </ul>	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b> -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	Not seeing accommodations  No accommodations are listed; students with disabilities are not addressed.  Readers were unable to find this information.  Not evidenced	<b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIIII</b>  <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>  <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>



<p>Accommodations clearly stated and described for Second Language Learners</p>	<p>The accommodations directly address the linguistic needs of the student.</p> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any accommodation does not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test.</li> <li>Specific administration guidelines are provided for implementing any accommodations.</li> <li>How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in the training.</li> <li>Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>No accommodations mentioned</p> <p>Second language learners are not specifically addressed.</p> <p>Readers were unable to find this information.</p> <p>Not evidenced</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>
<p>Utility</p>				
<p>Scores are easily interpreted to determine a “significant reading deficiency”</p>	<p>Scores clearly specify whether a student is categorized as having a “significant reading deficiency”.</p> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Score ranges or a scale is provided.</li> <li>Guides for interpretation of scores are provided.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for</p>	<p>Students are sorted into reading profile classifications  ☐ Guides for interpretation not found. . .</p> <p>No ranges provided- noted as a grade level “low 3<sup>rd</sup>”, what does that mean?  No guides for interpretation or significant reading deficiency identification</p> <p>No information about interpretation of</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: IIIII</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS I</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>

		<p>the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>scores is provided. No overall score is given for screening; all evaluation is at the subtest level. No score ranges are provided. Criteria for low, med, high are not provided.</p> <p>The application doesn't refer to identification of a significant reading deficiency. No score ranges are provided.</p> <p>No cut scores</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><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0) <b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b> -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence (1) <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>are online</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Time away from instruction ranges from 35-60 minutes</li> <li>☑ Classroom teacher could administer</li> <li>☑ \$20 per student for DORA</li> </ul> <p>Student data entered as student completes the assessment</p> <p>\$499.00 for 33 students to be tested at BOY, MOY, and EOY. Cost is prohibitive. Site licensing may be more affordable, but costs are not listed. Computer access for all students may be an obstacle in some schools. Data entry to set up students one-by-one seems</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET: II</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: III</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS: I</b></p>

			<p>time intensive. Time away from instruction is excessive for a screening assessment.</p> <p>Cost is not addressed in the application.</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"> <li>• Data reports are easily read and interpreted.</li> <li>• Clear description of how to interpret results.</li> <li>• Reports provide trajectory for student progress.</li> <li>• District, school, classroom, and student reports provided.</li> <li>• Reports available in real-time.</li> <li>• Reports can be exported to data-base formats.</li> <li>• Reports available in languages other than English.</li> <li>• Customer service is available provided for users.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>While reports show a student’s gains between assessments, there is no indication of overall expected score for a student based on grade level and point in time. How were “low,” “medium,” and “high” determined? While the parent report summarizes a child’s skills, there is no information about the child’s performance relative to expectation for grade level and point in time. No trajectory reports are provided.</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b></p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS: IIIIIII</b></p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b></p>

**Strengths:**

- Interactive for students
- Ease of teacher administration
- Computer-based
- Online scoring
- Easy to use, administer, and score
- Online format allows for ease of administration

**Weaknesses:**

- Minimal information regarding sub-group reliability/validity

Minimal information regarding cut-scores, testing windows

Cut points were not identified

Reporting of reading levels and seriousness of reading deficiency not identified

No cut scores

Not valid and reliable

Not efficient or effective as a screening measure

Validity not well-established

Applicant should consider formatting the application according to the order within the rubric. The application appears to be a generic one used for multiple purposes. It was difficult to find specific components required within the rubric.

No indication was provided to demonstrate expected performance and no cut scores were provided for use in determining a significant reading deficiency, an important requirement of the interim assessments to be selected for the state.

**Recommendations:**

**Recommended \_\_\_\_\_ Not Recommended X X X X X**