



2019 Selection Criteria for Results Matter Assessment Tools

Purpose

The purpose of this revision is to create a more inclusive set of approved assessment tools that balance the need for valid and reliable results for CDE's special education Annual Performance Report and Performance Plan with ease of implementation and usefulness for instructional and intervention planning across diverse populations.

Criteria

The criteria are set at three levels: required, minimum, and quality. The required level includes statutory requirements only. While the rationale for this revision is to increase the pool of assessment tools, CDE needs to ensure that all tools meet requirements laid out in the following laws: Children's Online Privacy Protections 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 Act (C.R.S. 22-16-101 et. al). Additional indicators outlined in the required section of the revised criteria relate to required data reporting specifications used in Colorado programs: a unique child identifier, custom funding source, and school district fields in child records and an export function. If an applicant cannot demonstrate any function within these criteria, scoring will stop and the tool will not be reviewed.

Minimum criteria, for the purpose of the revised reviews, is defined as the applicant having met the required criteria plus criteria that are critical for Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) federal reporting. These include evidence of alignment to OSEP's three functional preschool outcomes under Indicator B7, the ability to convert results to the Indicator B7 child outcome entry and exit ratings and progress categories, and evidence of the tool's validity for informing instruction and summative reporting for children with and without disabilities.

Preferred criteria are defined as indicators that demonstrate best practice in assessment. These criteria include topics such as involving families in the assessment process, appropriateness for children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and alignment to curriculum and early learning guidelines, as well as feasibility of implementation. These criteria are not required but may inform decision-makers on cost, feasibility of implementation, and other aspects of program administration.

Application Requirements

Applicants will be required to submit evidence for each indicator. Applications should follow the headings (required, minimum, preferred) and respond to each corresponding criterion and indicator when responding. Evidence for each indicator could include technical and administration manuals, peer reviewed literature, screenshots from online systems or written plans. Please see the example in Appendix A.



Required Criteria

Reviewer instructions: Reviewers will examine evidence for each indicator and assign a rating of “yes” if the applicant meets the indicator. The applicant is required to meet all indicators in this section in order to continue on to minimum criteria review.

Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
<p>1. The assessment system has secure online functionality and meets all applicable state and federal privacy and security laws.</p>	<p>The system meets the requirements of the following laws: 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 (C.R.S. 22-16-101 et. al.)</p>	<p>Publisher reports security features that align to COPPA, FERPA, PPRA and CRS. These include limited access to student files based on role, platform security features such as IT administrators.</p>
<p>2. Vendor has demonstrated its database infrastructure can accommodate reporting requirements of Colorado Preschool Program and Preschool Special Education.</p>	<p>Applicant has evidence that the online system can accommodate, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. a state unique child identifier, B. a custom funding source in child records, C. a custom school district fields in child records, D. statewide child-level data exports required for annual reporting. 	<p>Flat files with critical fields like child name, birth date, and assessment ratings on individual objectives.</p>



Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
<p>3. The assessment tool and system provide information to meet Colorado’s requirements for federal reporting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The assessment tool aligns with the three OSEP functional outcomes required under Indicator B7 (Preschool Outcomes) b. The assessment system must have the capacity to convert results to the OSEP Indicator B7 child outcome entry and exit ratings and progress categories for preschoolers with disabilities. OR <i>Vendor shows evidence of commitment to meet this indicator.</i> c. The system must have the capacity to convert results to the Early Childhood Outcomes Center 9-point child outcomes rating scale for all children at each assessment point. OR Vendor shows evidence of commitment to meet this indicator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Documented crosswalk that demonstrates alignment to all three OSEP outcomes. b. Documentation of conversion from assessment scores to progress categories OR written plan with timeline to implement conversion c. Documentation of conversion from assessment scores to progress categories OR written plan with timeline to implement conversion



Minimum Criteria

The criteria below are designed to rate minimum standards for assessment quality and reporting. Applicants will provide evidence for each indicator. Reviewers will judge how well the applicant’s response matches the indicator and rate each indicator with either a “yes” applicant meets the requirements of the indicator or “no” applicant does not meet the requirements of the indicator. Reviewers will then assign an overall rating for the criterion:

- **“Does not meet”** - The application does not provide sufficient evidence for at least one indicator.
- **“Partially meets”** - The application may meet one or more of the indicators that describe the criterion, but does not adequately address all indicators.
- **“Meets”** - The application provides sufficient evidence for all indicators.

These ratings shall be applied to each overall criterion, not each individual indicator. Applicants must receive a rating of “partially meets” on every criterion in this section to be considered for inclusion on the menu of approved Results Matter assessments.

Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
4. Assessment tool has evidence of validity for informing instruction to support children’s development¹	a. Evidence of tool’s use for instructional purposes such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • informing instructional strategies, • informing lesson planning, • curriculum linkages, • progress monitoring 	a. Publishers provide description of how tool is used for instructional purposes. b. Publisher furnishes studies that show evidence for tool’s use in informing instruction (correlational or descriptive studies with controls) c. Studies that show associations between tool’s use to inform instruction and child’s progress or outcomes

¹ This criterion describes the highest priority of the Results Matter system. Applicants are encouraged to provide their highest quality evidence for their tool’s validity related to this area.



Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
<p>5. Assessment tool has evidence of validity for OSEP reporting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appropriate to use for OSEP (B7) annual reporting b. Appropriate for use in other accountability reporting at the aggregate level (e.g., program, school, district, region, state). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Studies that demonstrate appropriate distribution of outcomes scores compared to national data b. Studies that demonstrate appropriate criterion-validity for accountability purposes.
<p>6. Valid for universal use among Colorado Preschool Program and Preschool Special Education Program participants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Valid for use among preschool children ages 3-5 who are at-risk and children with disabilities b. Unbiased measurement for children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Validation studies that show expected trends for children who may be at-risk and children with identified disabilities, including variability among young children with disabilities. b. Demographic characteristics of validity samples. c. Analysis that results in little to no significant differences between subgroups that could be attributed to construct irrelevant variance. d. Evidence of positive differential item functioning results where appropriate.
<p>7. Assessment tool uses authentic methods to collect evidence for scores</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence is collected by adults familiar to the children assessed. b. Evidence is collected through observation of children's behaviors and actions c. Majority of evidence for score is collected during regular activities and routines d. Evidence can be gathered from multiple sources and team members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Instructions in administration manual



Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
<p>8. Assessment tool has evidence of internal consistency and inter-rater reliability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tool measures all of its developmental domains reliably b. Tool has sufficient specificity to reliably track child progress c. Publisher has a documented process for implementing and measuring the scorer’s accuracy compared to a master coach/ trainer/scorer. d. Publisher identifies minimum training requirements necessary to implement assessment reliably. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Results from reliability testing show acceptable consistency of scores across multiple uses and settings b. Analysis results show expected patterns for child growth over time. These could be growth model analysis or item-difficulty thresholds. c. Evidence of standard written protocol for measuring agreement with an anchor including decision- rules and a minimum of percent- agreement results. d. Written training requirements and rationale for requirements (preferably statistical evidence)



Preferred Criteria

The criteria below are designed to rate standards for assessment quality and reporting. They are meant to inform decision-makers on cost, feasibility of implementation and other aspects of program administration. Applicants will provide evidence for each indicator. Reviewers will judge the how well the applicant’s response matches the indicator and rate each indicator with either a “yes”, applicant meets the requirements of the indicator or “no”, applicant does not meet the requirements of the indicator. Applicants are required to respond to each indicator to inform reviewer and program decisions.

Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
<p>9. Assessment system allows for the following claims:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Informing families of their child’s developmental status b. Promotes improved teacher practices c. Assessment tool aligns to research-based preschool curricula d. Assessment aligns to Colorado Academic Standards for preschool and the Colorado Early Learning and Development Guidelines e. Informing interventions and progress monitoring for children with IEPs f. Appropriate and responsive to multi-lingual/ multi-cultural families g. Has adaptations and accommodations for children with significant disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence of family supports should be present. For example, family portal to assessment results, family discussion forms that include assessment results, or other evidence that families can access their child’s status. b. Studies that show associations between teacher use of the assessment and their reports of tailored instruction. c. Crosswalk evidence of alignment to curricula, evidence of teaching strategies from specific curricula that are connected to assessment results. d. Alignment study results that illustrate item- level alignment between assessment tool and guidelines. e. Evidence of associations between use of tool results and specific interventions over time and across multiple administrations. f. Evidence of family assessment activities or discussion questions that are applicable in multiple languages and have been field tested with multi-lingual/ multi-cultural families and found to be appropriate for use across multiple circumstances. g. Evidence either in administration manual or technical reports that illustrate the comparability of score interpretations when assessment tasks are adapted to fit the needs of children with disabilities (i.e., evidence that changes to assessment activities do not alter the construct) .



Criterion	Indicators	Evidence
<p>10. Assessment tool/system has evidence for feasibility of implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Overall time to complete assessment is manageable for teachers b. Cost to implement the assessment is available to the public (reviewer note: if cost data is available upon request, rate “yes”. Districts should be informed when cost structures have dependencies based on volume, travel, trainer availability, etc.) c. Assessment tool promotes team based process. d. Tool supports users to make connections between assessment data, standards, curriculum and their practice. e. Training for new users is accessible and available throughout the year. f. Assessment system has multiple platform from which to collect and score child information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence that the assessment can be integrated into teacher’s daily activities. Also includes estimated number of hours to complete scoring and reliability certification. b. Provide costs for the following assessment system components: c. Cost per child for online subscription d. Cost per teacher for initial training e. Cost per teacher for ongoing training f. Cost per teacher for reliability certification g. Cost per unit for physical materials required to complete the assessment h. Administration manual or training materials that outline how the tool can be used in a teaming situation. i. Evidence of training objectives or activities designed to link assessment results to standards, curriculum and teaching practices. j. Evidence of ongoing in-person trainings in state or ongoing online trainings teachers can attend on-demand. k. Trainers are available in the state. l. Appropriate for use across multiple browsers, or operating systems