Pearson Aimsweb Spanish

| **Criterion** | **Specific Indicators** | **Ratings** | **Feedback from Reviewers** | **Tally of Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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) | Part V: Page 25 states that Aimsweb has been trans-adapted for the spanish version by highly qualified personnel. No identification of experts or qualification listed. It was developed specifically in spanish.for Spanish- There is no mention of Spanish test reliability in the technical manual or in the proposal  | Does not meet – Partially Meets - IIMeets or Exceeds- I |
| 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) | No information provided2 The program states on p 25: The passages were written by experienced educators and field-tested, revised, andresearched by experienced educational researchers. The technical manual describes both the passage construction process and the outcomes with respect to field-testing and relations to a variety of readability formulate and alternate form reliability.There is no mention of Spanish test SEM estimates in the technical manual or in the proposal  | Does not meet – IPartially Meets - Meets or Exceeds-II |
| 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) | 2 - The tests that make up each level are parallel to those on English and have the same formatting however it is not a translation of the English test. It was written to align to the characteristics of the Spanish language The *AIMSweb MIDE (spanish)*  is a standardized test. Therefore, specific directions must be used during testing to have confidence in the reliability, validity, and comparability of the results. They are the same in both languagesStated in the proposal, but we couldn’t actually access the Spanish test to verify  | Does not meet – Partially Meets - Meets or Exceeds- III |
| **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) | No technical manual providedOn page 25 Spanish Reading-CBM passages were written by experienced educators and field-tested, revised, and researched by experienced educational researchers. The technical manual describes both the passage construction process and the outcomes with respect to field-testing and relations to a variety of readability formulate and alternate form reliability.It should be noted that the ***AIMSweb MIDE***measures address the skills identified by the Early Childhood Research Institute. The original measures of those skills have become known as DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills). The *MIDE* measures have beenadapted to more appropriately measure phonemic awareness and phonics skills as they are acquired by Spanishspeaking children.There is no mention of reliability with subcategories of students for the Spanish test in the technical manual or in the proposal  | Does not meet – IPartially Meets - Meets or Exceeds- II |
| 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) | No technical manualNo specific tests listedThe English and spanish assessments are parallel but separate assessments. The spanish version is not a direct translation.  The technical manual describes both the passage construction process and the outcomes with respect to field-testing and relations to a variety of readability . In the case of children learning to read in Spanish, the measures designed for Spanish speakers focus on the syllable rather than the individual phoneme. The assessment tools and the reading skill area identifiedby the National Reading panel used in the *AIMSweb MIDE* measures are shown in data tables. | Does not meet – )Partially Meets - IMeets or Exceeds- I |
| 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) | No technical manual. not translated no scaling needed  | Does not meet – Partially Meets - Meets or Exceeds- III |
| 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) | No Technical Manual. We did not find any evidence of this. The Spanish version of the R-CBM**aims**web measure does not privilege any dialect over others and embraces the wide variety ofSpanish dialects spoken in the United States. Cultural differences are resolved by culturaladaptations appropriate to the comprehensive (not superficial) meaning of the informationused in the measure. Consequently, language and concepts in the measures are not based onstereotypes of Spanish culture.The *MIDE* measures have beenadapted to more appropriately measure phonemic awareness and phonics skills as they are acquired by Spanishspeaking children | Does not meet – IIPartially Meets - Meets or Exceeds- I |
| **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) | No documentation. not translated from English Written in spanish The *AIMSweb MIDE (spanish)* Letter Sounds is a standardized test. Therefore, specific directions must be used during testingto have confidence in the reliability, validity, and comparability of the results.They do address this in Part 5 of the proposal, but we couldn’t actually access the Spanish test to verify  | Does not meet – Partially Meets - IMeets or Exceeds- II |
| **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) | The Spanish version of the R-CBM**aims**web measure does not privilege any dialect over others and embraces the wide variety ofSpanish dialects spoken in the United States. Cultural differences are resolved by culturaladaptations appropriate to the comprehensive (not superficial) meaning of the informationused in the measure. Consequently, language and concepts in the measures are not based onstereotypes of Spanish culture.They do address this in Part 5 of the proposal, but we couldn’t actually access the Spanish test to verify  | Does not meet – Partially Meets - IMeets or Exceeds- II |
| **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) | The Spanish version of the R-CBM**aims**web measure does not privilege any dialect over others and embraces the wide variety ofSpanish dialects spoken in the United States. Cultural differences are resolved by culturaladaptations appropriate to the comprehensive (not superficial) meaning of the informationused in the measure. Consequently, language and concepts in the measures are not based onstereotypes of Spanish culture.They do address this in Part 5 of the proposal, but we couldn’t actually access the Spanish test to verify  | Does not meet – Partially Meets - IMeets or Exceeds- II |

Strengths:

1. Test is offered and they say it is not a direct translation
2. They say that the test follows Spanish reading indicators such as syllable awareness rather than English indicators

Weaknesses:

1. No technical data provided for the Spanish version
2. There is no real data for the Spanish assessment- only cut scores are provided in Spanish
3. We could not access the Spanish test. Some indicators are still English based instead of Spanish ie. Letter names. Plus a one minute test cannot provide enough information-even for a screener

Recommended: Not Recommended: X X X