The READ Act Interim Assessment Review Recommendations

HB 12-1238

The Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act

COLORADO
DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION
cde

Background on the READ Act Assessment Requirements

- The READ Act requires use of an interim assessment to determine whether a student has a Significant Reading Deficiency (SRD) in grades K through 3.

- For the 2013-14 school year, districts may continue to use the interim assessments allowed under CBLA (DIBELS, DRA2, and PALS), or they may begin to use one of the new, approved assessments upon approval during the February, 2014 SBOE meeting.

- For students identified with a Significant Reading Deficiency, the READ Act requires teachers to use a diagnostic assessment to determine the specific area of reading skill deficiency for the child.

Background on the READ Act Assessment Requirements

- The READ Act also gives districts the option of using a summative reading assessment in grades K through 2.

- Last spring, the State Board approved a list of diagnostic assessments that districts are required to use in relation to the READ Act and a list of optional summative reading assessments.

The Review Process

- In July 2013, CDE brought together a group of stakeholders to create a rubric for the Request for Information (RFI) for the interim assessments.
  - Comprised of reading associations, assessment specialists, teachers, principals, and a National Reading Assessment Specialist

READ Act Interim Assessment Approval Process

- **September 2013:** Vendors submitted assessments to CDE for consideration
- **October and November 2013:** READ Act interim assessment review committee met to review assessments
  - Comprised of 18 educators from across the state including teachers, assessment specialists, reading specialists, and instructional coaches
  - Facilitated by a National Reading Assessment expert
- **December 2013**: CDE staff present results of review process to State Board of Education
- **February 2014**: State Board of Education votes to approve list of interim assessments

READ Act Interim Assessment Review Process

- Teams of 2-3 reviewers were formed to review submissions against the rubric.
- The review team had to reach consensus on the rating for each criterion in the rubric and on the overall recommendation for inclusion in the resource bank.
- Each submission was reviewed by at least two review teams.
- If a submission did not gain consensus across two review teams, an additional review was conducted by another review team which did not see the results of the first review.
- The group completed the evaluation rubric and submitted as a PDF to CDE staff.
- CDE staff reviewed the rubrics to ensure that comments and marks are consistent with the rubric and had no indication of bias.

Assessment Review Criteria

Requirements
The assessment…
Has strong psychometric properties
Is scientifically research-based and produces valid and reliable data
Is proven to measure students' reading skills in the 5 components of reading and oral language
Has progress monitoring capabilities
Accurately identifies students with a Significant Reading Deficiency
Has efficiency of use including scoring and interpretation; cost effective
Desired Attributes
Includes reports for parents as well as educators
Has at least one assessment that is normed for students who speak Spanish

English Assessments Reviewed

14 English literacy assessments were reviewed

Assessment Name	Publisher
Benchmark Assessment System	Heinemann Publishing
ISIP Early Reading	Istation
Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment (DORA)	Let's Go Learn
Measure of Adequate Progress (MAP) and Measure of Adequate Progress for Primary Grades (MPG)	Northwest Evaluation Association
Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)	PALS Marketplace
Classworks Reading / English Language Arts Universal Screener	Curriculum Advantage
i-Ready	Curriculum Associates
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Next (DIBELS Next)	Cambium Learning/Amplify
Developmental Reading Assessment 2nd Edition (DRA2)	Pearson Education
Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST)	University of Minnesota
aimsweb	NCS Pearson, Inc.
STAR Reading Enterprise	Renaissance Learning
STAR Early Literacy Enterprise	Renaissance Learning
Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (STEP)	UChicago Impact, LLC

Spanish Assessments Reviewed

Eight Spanish literacy assessments were reviewed

Spanish Assessments	Publisher
Indicadores Dinámicos del Éxito en la Lectura (IDEL)	Cambium Learning/Amplify
Evaluación del Desarrollo de la Lecturea, Segunda Edición (EDL2)	Pearson
Sistema de Evaluación de la Lectura	Heinemann
ISIP Early Reading Spanish	Istation
Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment (DORA) Spanish/EDELL	Let's Go Learn
PALS Español	PALS Marketplace
aimsweb Spanish Reading	Pearson
STAR Reading Spanish	Renaissance Learning

Interim Assessments Recommended through the Review Committee Process

Outcome of Review:

Seven English assessments and three Spanish assessments were recommended through the review committee process

English Assessments	Spanish Assessments
aimsweb	
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Learning Skills Next (DIBELS Next)	Indicadores Dinámicos del Éxito en la Lectura (IDEL)
Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST)	
i Ready	
ISIP Early Reading	ISIP Early Reading Spanish
Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)	Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening Español
STAR Early Literacy Enterprise	

Interim Assessments Not Recommended through the Review Committee Process

Outcome of Review:

Seven English assessments were not recommended through the review committee process.

Assessment vendors can appeal these results in writing to CDE staff within 14 days of receiving notification. CDE has 30 days to review and respond to the appeal.

Assessment	Criteria Not Met
Benchmark Assessment System *Heinemann Publishing*	The assessment was not created to be an interim assessment. No evidence was provided that it met the criteria of validity and reliability; no psychometric studies were conducted.
Classworks Reading /English Language Arts Universal Screener *Curriculum Advantage Publishing*	Did not meet the criteria of validity and reliability; did not assess the foundational skills of reading; no standard for establishing students with a significant reading deficiency.
Developmental Reading Assessment 2nd Edition (DRA2) *Pearson Education*	Did not meet the criteria of validity and reliability; norming sample for determination of students with a significant reading deficiency was not adequate.
Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment DORA *Let's Go Learn Publishing*	No evidence was provided that it met the criteria of validity and reliability; no psychometric studies were conducted. No standard for establishing students with a significant reading deficiency.
Measure of Adequate Progress (MAP) and Measure of Adequate Progress for Primary Grades (MPG) *Northwest Evaluation Association*	No evidence of reliability for various subgroups of students; no evidence provided on accurately identifying students with a significant reading deficiency; progress monitoring tool is not available.

Interim Assessments Not Recommended through the Review Committee Process (Continued)

Outcome of Review:

Five Spanish assessments were not recommended through the review committee process. Please note that the law requires both the English and Spanish equivalent to be approved. If the English version is not approved, the Spanish cannot be approved.

Assessment	Criteria Not Met
STAR Reading *Renaissance Learning*	No standard or norming samples for determination of students with a significant reading deficiency was provided; lacking data and evidence for kindergarten students.
Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (STEP) *UChicago Impact, LLC*	No adequate evidence to demonstrate validity and reliability; no evidence provided to determine students with a significant reading deficiency.
Evaluación del Desarrollo de la Lecturea, Segunda Edición (EDL2) *Pearson Education*	English version was not approved. Time intensive. Cut score information was established for DRA2 and applied to EDL2 rather than establishing cut scores for EDL2. Field testing with the EDL2 was not specifically described.
Sistema de Evaluación de la Lectura *Heinemann*	Adequate evidence of reliability and validity was not provided. No alternative forms for progress monitoring. No evidence provided to describe the process used to establish cut points.
Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment (DORA) Spanish/EDELL *Let's Go Learn*	Adequate evidence of reliability and validity was not provided. No indication of cut scores for determining a significant reading deficiency.

Outcome of Review Continued:

Interim Assessments Not Recommended through the Review Committee Process (Continued)

Assessment	Criteria Not Met
aimsweb Spanish Reading *Pearson*	Adequate evidence of reliability and validity was not provided for the Spanish version although it was provided for the English version.
STAR Reading Spanish *Renaissance Learning*	English version was not approved. Lacking data and evidence for kindergarten students.

Next Steps

- **January 2014:** Review appeals submitted by assessment vendors.
- **February 2014**: The State Board of Education votes on the recommendations presented by CDE.
- Conduct additional Request for Information and review process prior to 2016 to allow new or revised assessments to be considered.
- Districts will have until **July 1, 2016** (as allowed in statute, C.R.S. 22-7-1209) to transition to the approved interim assessments.