

STAR Reading

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 coefficients are high for generic, split-half and test-retest</p> <p>Overall reliability of scores was .95.</p> <p>Highest at grades 10, 11, and 12. Split-half .92 (no grade indicated) and lowest was .88 at first grade.</p> <p>Alternate form reliability is .91. Sample size are very large, especially at grades 1-3 (over 10,000)</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet–</b></p> <p><b>Partially Meets –</b></p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>
	<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> </ul>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate</p>	<p>Lowest SEM 36, 41 and 48 in grades 1-3 respectively.</p>	<p>Does not meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest).</li> </ul>	<p>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> Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>		Exceeds - III
	<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 of educators who will administer and score the assessment.</li> <li>Inter-rater reliability coefficients exceed .7.</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.</p>	NA	<p>Does not meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>

		(2)		
	<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)</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>Reliability has been disaggregated by student subcategories, however, Kindergarten was not included in this sample</p> <p>Analyze the SEM for various sub groups, including Black, Hispanic, and White. Same is done for Split-half reliability. ELL students in sub-groups are not described.</p>	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – II</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - I</p>
Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability	<p>If alternative forms are provided, all forms have demonstrated evidence of equivalence or comparability such as test-retest, parallel form and internal 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>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</p>	<p>NA</p> <p>Computer adapted test. Can be administered frequently at different times and frequencies depending on student needs.</p>	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>

	<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>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 correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2)</p>		
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 students for reading concerns.</li> <li>• Content specifications for each grade-level, including a complete description of the test content, purpose(s), and intended use(s), and</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 information for the criterion is provided.</p>	<p>Descriptions of the measures as well as a blueprint are provided. However, there is concern that the items will not adequately address the needs of Kindergarten students. Additionally, research indicates that the most predictive measures of reading success for all students are the more specific skills of letter naming, phonemic awareness and phoneme-grapheme correspondence. This assessment appears to be aligned to the more text-based standards rather than the predictive foundational skills.</p> <p>Blueprint is provided.</p>	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - II</p>

	<p>assessment blueprint as appropriate, is provided.</p>	<p>Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>Validity measures are high. .67 and higher.</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>Does Not Meet – Evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>Partially Meets – partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds – most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong</p>		<p>Does Not meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>

		evidence. (2)		
	If appropriate, findings from alignment studies to demonstrate alignment with Colorado Academic Standards for Language Arts and resolution for any resulting concerns.	<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>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>
	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.</p>	Studies of construct validity have been completed. However, as mentioned previously, there is concern regarding the Kindergarten skills.	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – I</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - II</p>

		(1) <b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b> –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
Evidence of criterion/predictive validity accurately identifying students with “ <i>significant reading deficiency</i> ”	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> ”  <b>Evidence includes:</b> <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 irrelevant criteria. Predictive validity correlations above .7.</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)	High predictive validity for 3-6, however, nothing reported for K-2  The rater’s noted a concern because of the lack of application at kindergarten and the lack of early literacy focus. The test is designed for students who have a 100 word reading vocabulary.	Does Not Meet – I  Partially Meets – I  Meets or Exceeds - I
Determination of cut-scores based upon well-designed pilot study	The assessment has established cut-scores for decision making about students’ “ <i>significant reading deficiency</i> ” using	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> -evidence was not provided for this criteria or	Concerns regarding Kindergarten scores as it	Does Not Meet –  Partially Meets – II

	<p>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> <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>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 2data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>appears this was designed for 1-12 grade students and Kindergarten students were not included in the norming sample</p> <p>Kindergarten is of concern because this was not designed for them.</p>	<p>Meets or Exceeds - I</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 information for</p>	<p>Again, there is concern as to how accurate classification of kindergarten students will be as this was designed for 1-12.</p> <p>Kindergarten is a concern</p>	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – II</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - I</p>



		<p>the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>		
	<p>Acceptable, recognized procedures are followed for setting cut-scores.</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>Does Not Meet –  Partially Meets –  Meets or Exceeds - III</p>
	<p>SEM estimates are reported for cut-scores with guidance for score interpretation.</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) <b>PARTIALLY</b></p>		<p>Does Not Meet –  Partially Meets – II  Meets or Exceeds - I</p>

		<p><b>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>		
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> </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</p>		<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culturally diverse students were included throughout the entire process of test development. For example in the samples of pilot students, in cognitive interviews, etc.</li> <li>• The content of the reading materials does not favor mainstream culture.</li> </ul>	strong evidence. (2)		
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>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</p>
Standardization of materials and procedures for	Administration protocol is scripted and provides precise guidelines;	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> -evidence was not provided for this		Does Not Meet –

administration	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>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>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</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>Does Not Meet-</p> <p>Partially Meets –</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - III</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.			Does not Meet –  Partially Meets –  Meets or Exceeds- III
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.	Not addressed in depth	Does Not Meet –  Partially Meets- I  Meets or Exceeds - II

		(2)		
Accommodations clearly stated and described for Second Language Learners	<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 for student who do not speak Spanish (Spanish version)</p> <p>Not addressed in depth</p>	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – II</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - I</p>
Scores are easily interpreted to determine a “significant reading deficiency”	<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</p>	<p>According to this assessment it does not appear that any Kindergarten students would ever be identified with a significant reading deficiency in the fall as the cut score for grade level proficiency is 0.</p>	<p>Does Not Meet –</p> <p>Partially Meets – II</p> <p>Meets or Exceeds - I</p>

		<p>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>Concern regarding kindergarten appropriateness and early literacy skills addressed</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>Cannot find cost</p>	<p>Does Not Meet – I  Partially Meets – I  Meets or Exceeds - I</p>
<p>Reports provide guidance for interpretation useful</p>	<p>Information is displayed in a format and language that is understandable to</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>-evidence was not</p>		<p>Does Not Meet –</p>

to educators, administrators, and parents	educators, administrators and parents; <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>	provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) <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>		Partially Meets –  Meets or Exceeds - III
---	---	---	--	---

Strengths:

- 1) Computer administration and scoring provide high efficiency
- 2) Very well aligned to Colorado Academic Standards and Common Core State Standards
- 3) Strong reliability and validity
- 4) Strong connection to Colorado Academic Standards and Common Core State Standards
- 5) Information is well organized and easily accessible in the provided binder
- 6) Evidence of test reliability and tables in the technical manual are comprehensive
- 7) The RFI includes P – 3 CAS alignment that is easily accessible
- 8) Multiple reports are available, include a parent component, are meaningful and accessible

Weaknesses:

- 1) The first page of the RFI states that this assessment is for 1-12 grade students.
- 2) Norming was not done with Kindergarten and cut scores are 0 for Kindergarten students indicating that this assessment cannot be used to identify Kindergarten students with a Significant Reading Deficiency.
- 3) Does not meet the purpose of a screener for kindergarten-grade 3



- 4) Early literacy skills does not go low enough for kindergarten (phonemic awareness)
- 5) None at this time

**Recommended: X**

**Not Recommended: X X**