School Readiness Assessment Systems 2017-2018

Applicant: Jeffco Public School on behalf of North Carolina

Part I: **Application Introduction** No Points

Part II: **Application Materials and Documentation**

> Section A: Minimum Requirements ☐ Pass

Section B: **Quality Indicators**

Section C: Additional Preferred Attributes

GENERAL COMMENTS

Strengths:

- The proposed instrument was developed through a ten-state consortium that engaged experts in assessment in its development.
- Overall the assessment is well thought out and provides practical examples for teachers.
- The focus on formative assessment is a strength and aligns with the Colorado vision for p-3 assessment.

Weaknesses:

- This was a difficult application to assess. The information required to provide ratings on the criteria was not presented in a clear and organized fashion.
- It appears that the applicant is proposing both a KEA and an ongoing assessment. The distinction between these two was unclear throughout the application. All supporting materials appeared to be focused on the ongoing assessment.
- Concerns about how districts will access support.
- Evidence of reliability and validity from previous studies of this instrument in ten states were referenced but not presented.

	Undetermined by review t	eams
RECOMMENDATION:	Recommended	Not Recommended

Selection Criteria and Evaluation Rubric

Part I: Application Introduction

Cover Pages

Complete applicant information and include as the first pages of the application.

Part II: Application Materials and Documentation

The following criteria will be used by reviewers to evaluate the application as a whole. In order for the application to be reviewed all minimum requirements in Section A must be addressed. An application that receives a score of No on any indicators in Section A will not be recommended.

Section A: Minimum Requirements			No	
1)	The assessment tool has strong psychometric properties. There is strong evidence to show that		Х	
	the assessment is valid and reliable as required by statute. Study methodology is sound.		^	
2)	The assessment tool assesses all of the statutorily required domains. The assessment the areas			
	of physical well-being and motor development, social and emotional development, language and	Х		
	comprehension development, and cognition and general knowledge.			
3)	The assessment tool enables districts to meet Colorado's Kindergarten School Readiness Data			
	Reporting Requirements. The assessment can provide the number of students who demonstrate			
	readiness characteristics of entering kindergartners in the required domains. The assessment can			
	provide reports in aggregate for the district as a whole, and disaggregated by school, by free or	X		
	reduced lunch eligibility status, race and ethnicity, and gender to meet <u>Colorado's Kindergarten</u>			
	School Readiness Data Reporting Requirements.			
4)	The assessment tool is research-based. The academic and developmental content assessed is	Х		
	based on child development and education research as required by statute.	^		
5)	The assessment tool promotes methods appropriate for young children. The assessment:			
	• Is an appropriate combination of observational, authentic, and age-appropriate tasks;			
	Is completed by familiar adults;	Χ		
	 Occurs in children's everyday routines, activities, and places; and 			
	Provides ongoing information to teachers to inform instruction.			
6)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	assessment system meets Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA), the Family			
	Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA),			
	Uninterrupted Scholars Act Guidance, and Colorado's student data transparency and security			
	statute (Colorado Revised Statutes 22-16-101 et. al.).			
Re	viewer Comments:			
	1) Validity and reliability data is not included. Page 17 references that there is data from multip	le states; h	nowever,	
	this data is not provided within the documents. Additional information is required.			
	2) The number of items seems low. Only 1 math item (counting) is included in the KEA, and only 3 literacy items			
	(book orientation, print awareness, and letter naming)			
	3) Unsure how data reporting will be addressed, but we assume it is possible.			
		Г		
	undetermined	Pass	□ Fail	

	ection B: Quality Indicators	Inadequate Not Addressed or Met No Criteria (information not provided)	Minimal Met One Criterion (response requires additional clarification)	Adequate Met Most Criteria (complete response, many need some additional clarification)	High Met All Criteria (concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)
	The assessment is aligned. The assessment aligns with widely held expectations for learners. There is evidence of, or a potential for, alignment to the Colorado Academic Standards and Colorado's Early Learning and Development Guidelines. There is evidence of or a potential for, alignment to the Colorado READ Act approved assessments.		Х		
2)	The assessment increases opportunities to learn. It is formative and ongoing. Reliable and valid use of the assessment informs instruction and intervention. It provides useful information for teachers and families. It yields information that can be used to inform continuous quality program improvement planning.			Х	
3)	The assessment rating system is clear. Assessment items and rating criteria are clear and coherent. There is readily available guidance to help teachers make accurate rating decisions.			Х	
4)	The assessment allows for authentic based assessment strategies. The use of performance based strategies is an integral element of the system, such as the use of portfolios, work samples to document children's knowledge and skills. The assessment permits the convergence of information from classroom team members, family members and other adults in the children's lives in order to inform rating decisions.				х
5)	The assessment system has features that make broad participation likely. The assessment is affordable and easily accessible to any interested school. The assessment system is easy to learn and use. There is readily available guidance to support assessment system users. The system offers time saving features for teachers. It is feasible for administrators and teachers to sustain functional and reliable use.			Х	

Reviewer Comments:

- 1) The 10 constructs included in the KEA are mapped to Colorado Academic Standards, but information about how the additional constructs in the ongoing formative assessment align to the Colorado Academic Standards is missing.
- 2) The reviewers would rate this item as high based on the appendix materials for the ongoing formative assessment but the application does clearly explain how the 10 KEA items would meet this criterion.
- 3) On page 17, the applicant states that students will scored based on whether they fall into developmentally appropriate bands. However, information about where these developmentally appropriate bands fall on the construct progressions is not clearly provided.
- 5) The assessment is free if districts do not use the TS Gold platform, but the data entry costs these districts will incur should not be overlooked. Based on the materials provided, it is unclear if the system is easy to learn and use. The reviewers found the information provided to be a lot to wade through and have concerns about whether kindergarten teachers and administrators will be able to efficiently learn to use this assessment tool well. It is unclear how Colorado users would access support for the assessment system if not using the TS Gold platform. Will North Carolina provide support? Will Teaching Strategies only provide technical support, or are there PD coursed and support for the constructs?

S	ection C: Additional Preferred Attributes	Inadequate Not Addressed or Met No Criteria (information not provided)	Minimal Met One Criterion (response requires additional clarification)	Adequate Met Most Criteria (complete response, many need some additional clarification)	High Met All Criteria (concise and thoroughly developed, high quality response)
1	The assessment system includes a method for ensuring quality use. There are adequate opportunities for informal and formal access to professional development resources. Reliable use of the assessment can readily be gauged and quality use issues identified and addressed. The assessment system provides administrators with methods for monitoring completion and other indicators of quality use.		х		
2	The system has the capability to build on assessment practices in use in Colorado preschool programs.		Х		
3) The assessment increases opportunities for supporting alignment of assessment and instruction within the preschool through 3 rd grade continuum.			х	
4	*For assessments with online functionality: The assessment system has a secure high quality online system for recording electronic portfolio as well as entering assessment results. The online system has the capacity to produce real time readily accessible reports of assessment results that can be used by teachers and administrators to inform instruction and communicate with families. Technical support is available to users.	Х			

Reviewer Comments:

- 1) In the materials provided, it is difficult to distinguish what supports are available for the KEA versus the ongoing assessment.
- 2) This was not discussed in the application.
- 3) The assessment is presented as a K-3 assessment. The ability to align with assessment and instruction in preschool is unclear.
- 4) Access to the TS Gold system was not provided. We were unable to assess the functionality of the online system.