

Compilation of reviewers' comments and ratings for DRA2

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>The data was grouped together for coefficient alpha, it's not representing individual grade levels.</p> <p>1--- Sample 112 Students for test---retest mean scores were used rather than students' actual scores, alpha (internal consistency) not by reliability, grade level</p> <p>No grade level specified data.</p> <p>Coefficient alpha is reported by passage level, not grade level.</p> <p>Small sample size for test-retest reliability.</p> <p>Studies are poorly constructed (small sample</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially meets</b>—1,1</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>—</p>

			<p>size, subjective) and evidence is very weak or does not support claims.</p> <p>Coefficient Alpha provided for oral fluency and comprehension for DRA2 Levels 4-80; oral fluency range 0.5-0.8; comprehension range 0.5-0.8</p> <p>☑ Test-retest reliability is high, with little error associated with time sampling; sample range 90-112; ranges .93-.99</p> <p>☑ No evidence in technical report for split-half reliability or classification consistency</p> <p>☑ Examiners must follow assessment guidelines</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> <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 evidence. (0)</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>—partial evidence was provided related</p>	<p>No evidence</p> <p>There is no evidence of standard error of measurement.</p> <p>Does not report.</p> <p>Not found</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>--</p> <p><b>Meets or Exceeds</b>--</p>

	for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest).	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. Correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2)		
	<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)</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.</p>	<p>The inter-rater reliability coefficient data reported was not exceeding .7</p> <p>0--- inter---rater sample was 30 students. Kappa values of .57 for fluency, .65 for comprehension, not by grade level</p> <p>Coefficient – first order is .5 – fluency .6 – comprehension Sample of educators was not representative.</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>— 1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially meets</b>—1</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>—</p>

		<p>Correlations demonstrate ranges of .7 or higher. (2)</p>	<p>Evidence is based on small study sample of atypical test administrators. Coefficients do not meet threshold.</p> <p>Fluency. 66 Comprehension .72 Raters were existing users of the DRA2 Rater expert v. non-expert scorers Fluency 79% Comprehension 89%</p>	
	<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</p>	<p>No evidence of subcategories</p> <p>0 Not by subgroup</p> <p>No subcategories.</p> <p>No evidence</p> <p>Gender, ethnicity, free or reduced lunch, district type, grade level data shared ELL information not listed on APPENDIX A</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially meets</b>--1</p>

<p>Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability</p>	<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>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>strong evidence.</p> <p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>—evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p>	<p>0,2---4 per level</p> <p>The technical manual notes differences in two cases (p.38).</p> <p>No research that shows alternative forms are equivalent.</p> <p>Evidence for passage levels, not grade levels.</p> <p>Multiple forms for progress monitoring exist, but evidence of reliability is lacking.</p> <p>2-4 passages available at each DRA2 level; fiction and nonfiction</p> <p>☐ Passage equivalency-very little variability between passage variation; no significant differences between the difficulties of passages at the various levels.</p> <p>☐ The passages at each level are equivalent and can be used interchangeably</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1,1</p> <p><b>Meets or Exceeds</b>--1</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Content and Construct Validity</b>				
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 assessment blueprint as appropriate, is 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 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 clear description provided</p> <p>Specifications per grade level are not included</p> <p>0---construct validity (face validity) was measured based on how teachers felt about whether or not the test measured what it was supposed to measure, based on teacher perception (66 teachers)</p> <p>The purpose for the test is not to determine students with SRDs.</p> <p>Multiple forms for progress monitoring exist, but evidence of reliability is lacking.</p> <p>Clear description provided that demonstrates the purpose of the assessment, p. 10</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>—1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1,</p>

			<p>☑ Description of test content, purpose and intended goals evident for DRA2 levels</p> <p>Assessment is designed to measure reading growth, not screen students for significant reading deficiency.</p> <p>General reading ability is measured, but is not useful for designing successful remediation and intervention</p> <p>No grade-level equivalencies for text levels</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-</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</p>	<p>No evidence found</p> <p>0—can't find</p> <p>No evidence found</p> <p>Teacher description of what a borderline reader should be able to do.- evaluative rather than empirical.</p> <p>No evidence of</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>—1, 1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially meets</b>—1</p> <p><b>Meets or exceeds</b>--</p>

	<p>ELL populations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Findings from a content review by field experts, including teachers in tested grade levels.</li> </ul>	<p>information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>procedure for establishing passage levels and no evidence of passage levels being field-tested on populations that mirror demographics</p> <p>Based on Reading Recovery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Multiple passages for each reading level</li> <li>☑ Teacher ratings of the DRA2:.</li> </ul> <p>Measurement of Reading and Usefulness- range 81-97% agreed useful for measurement of reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ ELL information is not evident</li> </ul> <p>11 teachers made the decision for passage levels for K-2. 9 teachers for 3-5</p>	
	<p>If appropriate, findings from alignment studies to demonstrate alignment with Colorado Academic Standards for Language Arts and resolution for any resulting concerns.</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>— evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p>	<p>Validity is reported at .6</p> <p>1--- Teachers used CCSS to identify What students Should be able</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>—1</p> <p><b>Partially meets</b>— 1,1,1</p> <p><b>Meets or</b></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>To do or not do With given grade level To establish prof. benchmarks</p> <p>Publisher believes they are aligned to CAS and CCSS</p> <p>Teachers identified CCSS standards that students should be able to do at time of assessment</p> <p>Minimally and/or weakly addresses alignment to foundational skills because it's all based on word analysis</p> <p>No evidence provided for alignment with Colorado Academic Standards</p>	<p><b>exceeds---1</b></p>
	<p>There are studies of construct validity, such as convergent and discriminant analysis, demonstrating correlations of .7 or above.</p>		<p>Validity is reported at .6</p> <p>Internal validation (factor analysis) is not sufficient for construct validity</p> <p>Defines</p>	<p><b>Does not meet—1,1,1</b></p> <p><b>Partially Meets--1</b></p>

			<p>construct validity, but does not provide clear data or evidence to demonstrate correlation of .7 or above.</p> <p>Fluency &amp; Comprehension .41, Fluency &amp; Total .78, Comprehension &amp; Total .89</p> <p>Majority of fluency and comprehension constructs compared to external assessments fell below .7 and sample size was extremely small</p> <p>Defines construct validity, but does not provide clear data or evidence to demonstrate correlation of .7 or above.</p>	
<p>Evidence of criterion/predictive validity accurately identifying students with <i>“significant reading deficiency”</i></p>	<p>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></p> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear definition of the criterion or measure</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</p>	<p>Reported at .6 and .63</p> <p>0---123 students in 10 schools(not sure about grades), to Dibels and Grade,31 kids In sample when 123 total</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>--1</p>

	<p>that were used to establish concurrent validity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies with similar assessments that demonstrate the assessment measures reading ability, not other irrelevant criteria. Predictive validity correlations above .7.</li> </ul>	<p>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>Sample is broken town To grades 1---3, No Kindergarten data.</p> <p>Sample size is 31. Predictive validity correlation is below .7.</p> <p>Very small sample (31) and below threshold on grades 1-3 comprehension and fluency predictive validity.</p> <p>Gray's Oral Reading Test (GORT) DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF), Gates MacGinitie Reading Test</p> <p>☑ Fall DRA2 scores predicted Spring GRADE Comprehension and DIBELS Oral Fluency scores.</p> <p>☑ Correlation coefficients ranged from .51 to .89</p> <p>☑ Limited sample at grades 1-3- correlation moderate for luency and high for comprehension</p>	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>☑ Correlations for grades 4-6 were large</p> <p>☑ Overall predictive of other measures of reading, p. 55</p>	
Determination of cut-scores based upon well-designed pilot study	<p>The assessment has established cut-scores for decision making about students' "<i>significant reading deficiency</i>" using 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><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>Adequate demographic breakdown is not included</p> <p>There is not a full description of the norming sample (p.49)</p> <p>0---based on What teachers Believe and Teacher perceptions of grade level reading skills for students. Cut points are determined by "expert judgments"</p> <p>Sample size is 31. Predictive validity correlation is below .7.</p> <p>Highly subjective establishment of cut-scores. Cut-scores were established by a small group of teachers who described the attributes of a</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1,1,1</p>

		<p>borderline proficient student for each grade level. Subjective agreement was used to correlate the designated cut-points to the DRA2 national data bank. Furthermore, subjective feedback from classroom teachers whether they felt the cut-scores matched their students was gathered.</p> <p>Establishment of cutpoints for DRA2 book levels shared</p> <p>☑ Clear cut points within tech manual, p. 50</p> <p>☑ Appendix A</p> <p>☑ Scores of DRA2 and establishing SRD , p. 28</p> <p>☑ N=1676 student in grade K-8</p> <p>☑ Word Analysis-ELL populated represented</p> <p>There are cut scores but there</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>were created by a teacher work group not empirical evidence based on a norming sample not based on student data but on teacher perception No disaggregated student subgroups</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 the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>No evidence</p> <p>0--- 31 kids, GRADE and Dibels predictive validity, not sufficient to determine if students were classified, not sufficient to determine students were classified accurately. Did they ever Validate their Scale (based On teacher perceptions)with another test? (.69,.65 GORT With 66 students)</p> <p>No evidence of studies of classification accuracy analysis.</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>— 1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>— 1</p>

			<p>No evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☒ Measurement of Reading values range from .60-.92</li> <li>☒ Usefulness of DRA2 values range from .58-.76</li> <li>☒ Teachers and literacy professionals – criteria of MA degree with specialization in literacy</li> <li>☒ 4 years of successful teaching under a professional license</li> </ul>	
	Acceptable, recognized procedures are followed for setting cut-scores.	<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</p>	<p>They confirmed benchmark scores, but not the cut scores for SRD</p> <p>0 teacher judgment</p> <p>Subjective not empirical.</p> <p>Highly subjective establishment of cut-scores. Cut-scores were established by a small group of teachers who described the attributes of a borderline</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>— 1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—</p> <p><b>Meets or Exceeds</b>--1</p>

		<p>data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>proficient student for each grade level. Subjective agreement was used to correlate the designated cut-points to the DRA2 national data bank. Furthermore, subjective feedback from classroom teachers whether they felt the cut-scores matched their students was gathered.</p> <p>Benchmark Setting Procedure evident, p.47, p. 49 (d)</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)</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>No evidence</p> <p>0</p> <p>Not found</p> <p>No evidence of SEM</p> <p>SEM not recorded.</p> <p>P. 40 contains test-retest reliability including standard deviations</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>—1,1,1,1,1</p>



		Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
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> <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</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>0--- Samples sizes Are not sufficient, no Evidence found To address bias, fairness, etc.</p> <p>No information provided for student samples by subgroup. No bias studies provided. Small minority sample size.</p> <p>Small sample that does not report cultural validity or address test bias</p> <p>Cultural validity is not addressed</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1</p>

	culture.			
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>0—not found</p> <p>No evidence present</p> <p>No qualified third party evident.</p> <p>Bias and thoroughness of evaluation by 3rd party unknown. Results not evident.</p> <p>Teachers and literacy professionals – criteria of MA degree with specialization in literacy</p> <p>☐ Not evident if unbiased evaluators</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1</p>
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.	<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</p>	<p>1---</p> <p>Given 3x a year, electronic materials and database, some concerns regarding standard procedures, example, teacher is not told when to supply words, by a standardized approach (3 second pause)</p> <p>Some evidence</p>	<p><b>Partially meets</b>—1,1,1</p> <p><b>Meets or Exceeds</b>—1,1</p>

		<p>information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>of scripted protocol and standardized scoring of oral reading fluency, but not provide precise or concise guidelines. No clear admin. window evident.</p> <p>Administration protocol is scripted</p> <p>☑ Fall, Winter, Spring admin windows</p> <p>☑ Materials are provided</p> <p>☑ CD versions of Blackline Masters and hard copies</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 Exceeds</b>—most information for the criterion is</p>	<p>0---10---15 conference time, total time 40---80 min/child</p> <p>Administered individually can take up to 40 minutes per student</p> <p>Administration time is extensive and not balanced to information provided.</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1</p>

		<p>provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>Depending on level, time for administration varies</p> <p>☒ No time limit; primary grades impact on instructional time would be minimal</p>	
Efficiency of scoring	<p>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.</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>1---Online database, fluency is scored on a rating determined by a teacher. Rubrics are used. Requires teacher familiarity scoring for comprehension, same for written answers.</p> <p>Extensive admin. time, no electronic scoring, rubric laborious and subjective</p> <p>Need for calibration for scoring</p> <p>☒ Computer-assisted scoring not available</p> <p>☒ Procedures for calculating on each blackline master for each</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1,1,1,1</p>

			DRA2 level  ☑ Online data management system available	
Accommodations clearly stated and described for students with disabilities and students with special needs (504, etc.)	<p>The differing needs of students with disabilities are specifically addressed.</p> <p><b>Evidence includes:</b></p> <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>	<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>Accommodations are addressed, but not specifically addressed in regards to research or evidence based</p> <p>p. 93 – Accommodations need to align with IEP goals</p>	<p><b>Does not meet</b>--1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—1</p> <p><b>Meets or Exceeds</b>—1,1,1</p>
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> </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</p>	<p>P. 93- accommodation allowed is “Reading the directions in the student’s native language (if available)</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet</b>—1</p> <p><b>Partially Meets</b>—</p> <p><b>Meets or Exceeds</b>—1,1,1,1</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in the training.</li> <li>Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based.</li> </ul>	<p>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>Scores are easily interpreted to determine a “significant reading deficiency”</p>	<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 demonstrates weak evidence.(1)</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>—most information for the criterion is provided. Information and Data provided Suggests. (2)</p>	<p>0--- Designed to Assess a student’s indep/reading level, not designed to show level of risk</p> <p>No evidence provided</p> <p>Lack of predictive validity.</p> <p>Small sample size.</p> <p>Scores specify advanced, independent, instructional, intervention levels</p> <p>☑ DRA2 continuum supports interpretation of scores</p> <p>Validity of setting cut</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>— 1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>—</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>--1</p>

			scores is weak so difficult to interpret scores based on weak data	
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.	<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>2</p> <p>Time away from instruction is not minimal</p> <p>Potential personnel required to cover classrooms while assessing</p> <p>Time away from instruction is significant.</p> <p>Administration time and personnel is extensive.</p> <p>\$320 for comprehensive package</p> <p>☑ Additional \$90.97 per year per classroom for access to DRA2 and EL2.</p> <p>☑ Heavy data entry required</p>	<p><b>DOES NOT MEET</b>—1,1</p> <p><b>PARTIALLY MEETS</b>—1,1</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>--1</p>
Reports provide guidance for interpretation useful	Information is displayed in a format and language that is understandable to	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> ---evidence was not provided for this	1--- Reports provided at all levels, may not provide	<b>DOES NOT MEET</b> —1  <b>PARTIALLY</b>

<p>to educators, administrators, and parents</p>	<p>educators, administrators and parents;</p> <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>	<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>sufficient info beyond instr. reading level</p> <p>Would need to purchase the online portion to have access to the reports</p> <p>Unable to find trajectory reports</p> <p>No trajectory provided. Reports for individuals and classroom only.</p> <p>Data reports are do not provide specificity for practical use.</p> <p>Online reports available</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Broken down by level of mastery and component of reading</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historical reports available</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> District, school, classroom, and student reports provided</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Online customer service</p> <p>Not evident Reports in other</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b>—1,1,1,1</p> <p><b>MEETS OR EXCEEDS</b>--</p>
--------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------



			languages real time exported to data-based formats and trajectory	
--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**STRENGTHS:**\_\_ Aligned to Common Core, \_Accommodations were clearly described.\_ Alignment to Common Core State Standards; Representative of typical classroom instruction; Multiple texts at multiple levels; Self reported that teachers like it

**WEAKNESSES:**\_No predictive validity, Cut scores were not determined through a reliable process, Cut scores were not determined by a norming sample of student performance, but by teacher perception.\_\_ Sample sizes were small. Self-reported that teachers like it.\_ Lack of research that provides evidence of reliability, validity, and utility. \_\_ Time-consuming and costly 3. Not designed as a screening tool; Time spent administering/scoring; Ease of use questionable; highly dependent on professional development to ensure calibration

**Recommend**\_\_\_\_\_

**Not Recommend**\_\_X\_X\_X\_X X