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**Background**

House Bill 12-1238, the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act (Colorado READ Act) was passed by the Colorado Legislature during the 2012 legislative session. The READ Act repeals the Colorado Basic Literacy Act (CBLA) as of July 1, 2013, keeping many of the elements of CBLA such as a focus on K-3 literacy, assessment, and individual plans for students reading below grade level. The READ Act differs from CBLA by focusing on students identified as having a significant reading deficiency, delineating requirements for parent communication, and providing funding to support intervention. Interim assessments are a required part of the READ Act and are to be administered to students in grades K-3 three times per year. The READ Act requires that at least one interim assessment shall be available in Spanish.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this Request for Information (RFI) is to solicit reading interim assessment tools for inclusion on the 2013-2014 *Read Act Colorado State Board of Education Approved List of Interim Assessments*, pursuant to C.R.S. 22-7-1209. The State Board of Education approved list will be available to Colorado schools and school districts via the Colorado Department of Education’s website: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/index.asp>. Districts and schools may voluntarily choose from the approved list for their use of an interim assessment. This RFI does not include a provision for expenditure of state funds to providers on the list, and there is no guarantee that providers will be selected by schools/districts. The state may revise its criteria over time as needed.

The main purpose of interim assessments in the Colorado READ Act is to identify “students with a significant reading deficiency” in grades K-3. Interim assessments are administered to all students three times each school year. Those students identified as having a “significant reading deficiency” must then have diagnostic assessments administered to pinpoint those students’ specific area(s) of weakness, and provide in-depth information about students’ skills and instructional needs. Students identified with a significant reading deficiency are required to have an intervention plan called READ Plan. The students’ READ Plan will include targeted, scientifically-based or evidence-based intervention instruction to address and remediate the students’ specific diagnosed “reading skill deficiencies”. Then, once instruction has begun, teachers must use progress monitoring assessments to determine whether students are making adequate progress and to determine whether instruction needs to be adjusted.

**Eligibility Requirements**

To be included on the list of *READ Act Colorado State Board of Education Approved List of Interim Assessments*, providers must have interim reading assessments that first meet the minimum threshold criteria in Part A below, followed by the criteria in Part B below. If a Spanish interim assessment is submitted, it must also meet the additional requirements outlined in the final criteria under, “Spanish.”

**PART A:**

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

**PART B:**

* The instrument has validity, reliability and consistency in scoring and includes alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability.
* The instrument demonstrates evidence of content and construct validity and evidence of criterion/predictive validity that accurately identifies students with a “significant reading deficiency.”
* There is a determination of cut-scores that has been based upon a well-designed study. The assessment has cultural validity, and fairness and bias issues have been addressed, the assessment is accessible to all learners, considers minimizing language load and the format is not a barrier to student performance.
* The assessment demonstrates a standardization of materials and procedures for administration.
* The assessment must be “user friendly.” The amount of time needed to administer the assessment, as well as score the assessment, is reasonable and balanced to information provided.
* The differing needs of students are specifically addressed and accommodations are clearly stated and described for students with disabilities and for Second Language Learners.
* All costs for materials are inclusive including any additional data platform or storage costs.
* The assessment is designed such that, time away from instruction is minimal; no additional personnel are required; training is readily available including on-line formats; materials for training are provided or easily accessible; reports provide guidance for interpretation and are useful to educators, administrators, and parents.

**Eligibility Requirements for Spanish Assessment**

In addition to the eligibility requirements for an English interim assessment, any assessment that is a simple, direct translation of an English assessment will not be considered.

**Review Process**

The format outlined below must be followed in order to assure consistent application of the evaluation criteria. An electronic version and 3 hard copy versions of the proposal must be submitted to Herrera\_M@cde.state.co.us by October 11th, 2013 at 4:00 pm. The hardcopy submission must be postmarked no later than October 8th, 2013. The electronic version should include all required pieces of the proposal as one document. Faxes will NOT be accepted. Incomplete proposals will NOT be considered.

The written submission of the proposal will be reviewed by a team of readers with experience in the content areas outlined in this Request for Information. Proposals will be scored using the attached rubric. Applicants with successful written proposals, that have met all criteria, may be asked (and must agree) to participate in an in-person interview. These applicants will be notified of the date and time of the interview by November 1st, 2013. The interview will be used to ask follow-up questions and provide any necessary clarification. Each applicant must agree to travel to Denver for an in-person interview (if necessary) with the team of readers beginning on November 11th, 2013. Interviews will take place at the Colorado Department of Education office building at 201 E. Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203. Applicants that do not meet the qualifications will be notified and may appeal the decision and/or reapply in future years.

**Timeline**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Week of September 9th, 2013 | Request for Information available on the CDE website |
| October 11, 2013 | Proposal must be received by CDE (postmarked Tuesday, October 8, 2013). |
| October 24, 2013 | CDE will review proposals. |
| November 1, 2013 | CDE will notify successful applicants of the possible, in-person interview date. |
| November 11th and 12th, 2013 | Possible in-person interviews at CDE. |
| November 13rd or 14th , 2013 | CDE will present to the State Board of Education their recommendations for approval and inclusion on the approved list of interim assessments. |
|  |  |
| December 3rd or 4th , 2013 | The Colorado State Board of Education will vote to adopt approved list of interim assessments.  |
| December 9, 2013 | Applicants will be notified of the status of their proposal. |
| December 13, 2013 | The Colorado Department of Education will post to their website the State Board approved list of interim reading assessments. |

**Required Format**

Proposals should include the RFI required elements outlined below. Do not send the full RFI as part of the organization’s proposal.

* All pages must be standard letter size, 8-1/2” x 11” using no smaller than 12 point type.
* Publishers who have an interest may submit no more than a two-page narrative which addresses the criteria for approved interim assessments. The criteria for approval may be found in the Eligibility Requirements section of this RFI and on the following website: http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/resourcebank.asp
* Use document footer with the name of the entity and page numbers.
* Use 1-inch margins.
* All interested publishers must submit the interim assessment, or provide access to the assessment they wish to have included on the approved list, via a web source with access clearance, in its entirety. Supplemental materials such as technical adequacy reports should also be submitted. All materials submitted will become the property of the Colorado Department of Education.
* Proposals will only be considered complete when the following have been received; electronic document in PDF format, separate technical reports referred to in the proposal, supplemental materials, and a copy, or electronic access to, the specific assessment.

All supplemental and assessment materials should be sent to:

Colorado Department of Education

Attn: Office of Literacy; Marisa Herrera, Program Assistant

201 E. Colfax Ave. #409

Denver, Co. 80203

**Required Elements**

A complete proposal includes:

Part I: **Cover page**

Part II: **Detailed description outlining how the assessment meets the referenced criteria**

Part III: **Copy of the assessment in its entirety**

Part IV: **Supplemental or ancillary materials designed for the assessment**

Part V: **Spanish assessment (optional); detailed description outlining how the assessment meets the referenced criteria**

**Mail on or before, Tuesday, October 8, 2013**

**Or**

**Hand-deliver completed proposals by 4 p.m. on October 11, 2013 to:**

**Marisa Herrera**

**Colorado Department of Education**

**Office of Literacy**

**201 E. Colfax Avenue, #405**

**Denver, CO 80203**

**Submit an electronic copy of the proposal to:**

Herrera\_M@cde.state.co.us

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

**2013-2014**

|  |
| --- |
| **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)

 |

**Proposal #**

**Reviewer:**

**READ Act Colorado State Board of Education**

**Approved List of Interim Assessments**

 **Part I:** Proposal Form/Cover Page

**Part II:**

Validity, Reliability and Consistency in Scoring \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/10

 Evidence of Content and Construct Validity \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/22

 Administration of Scoring \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/10

 Utility \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/6

 Spanish Assessment (if submitted) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/20

 **TOTAL** (all areas without Spanish): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/68

 **TOTAL** (all areas with Spanish): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_/88

**Additional Materials to be Reviewed and Considered When Calculating Scores Listed Above:**

**Part III:** Copy of the Assessment

**Part IV:** Any Supplemental Materials

 **Total Points:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/68 possible**

 **Total Points (with Spanish):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/88 possible**

**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)

**Recommendations:**

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

**Signature of Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Colorado State Board of Education Approved List of Interim Reading Assessments**

| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Rating** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Validity, Reliability and Consistency in Scoring:** |   |  |  |
| **1. Evidence of test reliability and consistency in scoring**  | Results of reliability studies are reported for each grade assessment**Evidence includes:** The studies are appropriate given the purpose of the measure.For each grade-level, studies provide evidence of:* Split-half reliability
* Coefficient alpha
* Test-retest reliability
* Classification consistency
 | **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. Correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2) |  |
|  | Standard error of measurement or standard estimate of error is reported**Evidence includes:** * 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).
 | **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 --**Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2) |  |
|  | Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted. Study sample used to establish inter-rater reliability represents test administrators. **Evidence includes:*** 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.
 | **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) |  |
| Studies have been conducted to establish reliability with all subcategories of students who will take the assessment.**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. | **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) |  |
| **2. Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability** | If alternative forms are provided, all forms have demonstrated evidence of equivalence or comparability such as test-retest, parallel form and internal consistency.* Technical reviews indicate all forms for each grade level have demonstrated evidence of comparability and content specifications.

**Evidence includes:*** Sufficient forms are provided to allow for progress monitoring between interim assessments.
* Split-half reliability.
* Coefficient alpha reliability.
 | **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 correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2) |  |
| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Rating** | **Notes** |
| **Content and Construct Validity** |  |  |  |
| **1. Evidence of content and construct validity**  | Evidence reported to demonstrate the assessment helps correctly identify students with *“significant reading deficiencies”* 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.**Evidence includes:*** 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.
 | **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) |  |
|  | Reading levels are reported for passages and how levels were established. Reading levels of assessment passages have been field-tested or have other evidence.**Evidence includes**:* 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.
 | **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) |  |
|  | If appropriate, findings from alignment studies to demonstrate alignment with Colorado Academic Standards for Language Arts and resolution for any resulting concerns. | **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 are studies of construct validity, such as convergent and discriminant analysis, demonstrating correlations of .7 or above. | **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) |
| **2.** **Evidence of criterion/predictive validity accurately identifying students with *“significant reading deficiency”***  | Evidence reported to demonstrate that the assessment has established criterion and/or predictive validity to correctly identify students with and without a *“significant reading deficiency.”****Evidence includes:**** 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.
 | **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) |  |
| **3.** **Determination of cut-scores based upon well-designed pilot study**  | The assessment has established cut-scores for decision making about students’ “*significant reading deficiency”* using adequate demographics representing (i.e., 10%ELL and 25% F/R lunch), appropriate criterion assessment, adequate sample size, and appropriate statistics.**Evidence indicates**: * 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.
 | **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) |  |
|  | 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.  | **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) |  |
| 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) |  |
| 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) |  |
| **4. 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:** * 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 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.
 | **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) |  |
| **5.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. | **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) |  |
| **ADMINISTRATION & SCORING** |  |  |  |
| **1. 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. | **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) |  |
| **2. Efficiency of administration**  | The amount of time needed to administer the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided. | **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) |  |
| **3. 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. | **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) |  |
| **4. 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.**Evidence includes:*** 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.
 | **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) |  |
| **5. Accommodations clearly stated and described for Second Language Learners**  | The accommodations directly address the linguistic needs of the student.**Evidence includes**: * 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.
 | **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) |  |
| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Rating** | **Notes** |
| **UTIILITY** |  |  |  |
| **1. Scores are easily interpreted to determine a *“significant reading deficiency”***  | Scores clearly specify whether a student is categorized as having a *“significant reading deficiency”.* **Evidence includes:*** Score ranges or a scale is provided.
* Guides for interpretation of scores are provided.
 | **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) |  |
| **2. 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 platform or storage costs; minimal data entry is required. | **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) |  |
| **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;* 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.
 |  **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) |  |

**Spanish Interim Assessment Rubric**

**Additional Criteria**

| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Ratings** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Translation and adaptation procedure** |  |  |  |
| 1. **Translation has been provided by highly qualified personnel.**
 | Provide documentation on the translation team used to translate and adapt the test. Include the qualifications of the individuals who translated the test.The translation team should preferably include:• translators who are native speakers in the target language • specialists in reading in the target language• bilingual educators (not to be confused with English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers or teachers of Spanish as a foreign language) in the target language. | **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) |  |
| 1. **Pilot test sampling appropriately considers language diversity**
 | The translated test was piloted with a representative sample of speakers of the target language in the United States. | **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) |  |
| 1. **Consistency of appearance between the English language and the target language version of the test**
 | Formatting should remain consistent with the English language test version. Specifically, the font size of a translated test version should not be smaller than the English version. General ideas should be consistent with the English language test version. | **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) |  |
| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Ratings** | **Notes** |
| **Psychometric and measurement considerations:** |  |  |  |
| **1. Construct validity for translated test versions**  | Provide documentation to demonstrate that the test specifically identifies students with a “*significant reading deficiency*” in their native language. (i.e., test developers consider what constitutes a proficient reader in the target language rather than directly translating the measures of a proficient reader in English into the target language). Evidence is provided that the reading constructs measured by the test are relevant to the target language. As appropriate, information is reported on the procedures used to screen, select, and adapt the items of the test so that they are relevant and applicable to the target language. | **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) |  |
| 1. **Demonstrated comparability**
 | Evidence is provided on the psychometric comparability of measures in English and measures in the target language. | **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) |  |
| 1. **Documentation on the interpretation of scores and the scaling of scores**
 | Scaling information is provided to ensure appropriate interpretability of scores across language versions of the test so that educators and administrative officials know how to correctly interpret the scores obtained by the students in the translated version of the test. For example, do teachers need to scale the score of the translated test version in order to compare it with the English language version? If so, what kind of documentation is provided to assist teachers in this scaling process? | **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) |  |
| 1. **Evidence provided regarding investigation into potential item bias**
 | Appropriate differential functioning items analyses across equivalent items have been conducted to examine bias for the same items across the two language versions. For example, for each item, is there a bias against students tested in the target language?Item bias reviews have been conducted and subsequent changes have been made based on recommendations.  | **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) |  |
| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Ratings** | **Notes** |
| **Equity and fairness considerations on the translated test version** |  |  |  |
| 1. **Consideration of appropriate dialect**
 | The translation provides documentation to show that the translated test version does not privilege any dialect of the target language over others (e.g. Iberic Spanish - Spanish from Spain - is not privileged over Mexican or Puerto Rican dialects). Specifically, the translation procedures took into account the wide variety of dialects of the language speakers in the United States. | **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) |  |
| **2. Appropriate cultural adaptation**  | Documentation is provided to show that items have been adapted to address cultural differences inherent to language. Cultural adaptations go beyond the superficial features of the contextual information provided by the items. For example, the items do not simply mention “Juan,” instead of “John,” as characters. Instead, consider how students’ experience may influence their interpretation of the items. Provide appropriate context for items to increase students’ access to the intended interpretation of the items. | **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) |  |
| **3. Address stereotypes** | The cultural adaptation of the test is not based on stereotypes about cultures. | **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) |  |