

Texas Education Agency

Miscellaneous Document

Request for Kindergarten Assessment Instruments, Including Multidimensional Assessment Tools

Filing Date. February 15, 2017

Filing Authority. Texas Education Code, §28.006

Description. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is notifying publishers, school districts, charter schools, and other organizations that kindergarten assessment tools (English and Spanish) may be submitted for review for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Kindergarten Assessment Instruments*. The *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Kindergarten Assessment Instruments* will be available in spring 2017 so that school districts and open-enrollment charter schools may order instruments for implementation in the 2017-2018 school year. Instruments selected for the commissioner's list will remain on the list for a minimum of two school years. Inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Kindergarten Assessment Instruments* will be evaluated in terms of psychometric properties (reliability and validity), administrative features, scoring, and efficiency (e.g., cost, time to administer, feasibility of implementation). TEA will give priority to multidimensional assessments; unidimensional assessments will also be considered (see criteria as follows).

Texas Education Code (TEC), §28.006, authorizes the commissioner of education to develop recommendations for school districts to use multidimensional assessment tools to measure and monitor students' developmental skills. In accordance with the TEC, §28.006(b), the commissioner shall include on the commissioner's list at least two multidimensional assessment tools. A multidimensional assessment tool on the commissioner's list must (a) test at least three developmental skills, including literacy, or (b) test at least two developmental skills, other than literacy, and be administered in conjunction with a separate reading instrument that is on the list of approved assessment tools. Other developmental skills include (1) social and emotional development, (2) language and communication, (3) gross and fine motor development, (4) mathematics, and (5) cognitive development.

Criteria Specific to Kindergarten Assessment Instruments. Publishers, school districts, charter schools, and other organizations will be responsible for submitting kindergarten tools to be considered for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Kindergarten Assessment Instruments*. Submissions must include a concise summary of the evidence base for each requested component in this request along with a brief discussion of how the instrument aligns with the cited research. Submissions must include supporting documentation. See the following

Guidelines for the Implementation of TEA Criteria for the Evaluation of English and Spanish Kindergarten Assessment Instruments for additional information.

Guidelines for the Implementation of TEA Criteria for the Evaluation of English and Spanish Kindergarten Assessment Instruments

1. The instrument must be intended for use in kindergarten. Kindergarten tools may be limited to kindergarten entry (screening measures) or may assess entry and also track progress throughout the school year (progress monitoring).

Screening measures are brief assessments of skills that are important early indicators of later school competence.

These provide information on entry-level skills at the beginning of the kindergarten year. *Progress monitoring* refers to brief measures that are conducted on a routine basis to provide information on what children are learning and rates of improvement across the kindergarten year. As progress monitoring measures are brief, teachers can conduct them at least three times across a school year and learn which students are or are not demonstrating adequate progress. Results of measures should be predictive of comprehensive standardized measures.

2. Teachers must use a standardized measure to assess student performance. This means the assessment has a common set of questions, tasks, and materials and the child's score is based on a normative sample of children.

3. Whenever possible, skill levels of children who speak a language other than English should be assessed in both their home language and English. Measurement of home language skill level is essential when children are enrolled in bilingual instructional programs. In particular, assessments that are able to assess students in both English and Spanish are preferred.

4. The cumulative assessment time must not exceed 60 minutes per student. Some criteria may be measured through observation, informal assessments, reflection, collection of children's work in portfolios, or checklists. Informal assessments may not be the primary method for monitoring children's progress.

5. A measure must directly assess five domains of health and wellness development, language and communication, emergent literacy - reading, emergent literacy - writing, and mathematics, as they are specified in the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines respectively.

Criteria for Review: Multidimensional Assessments. In order to be considered for review, multidimensional instruments must measure at least three domains of development, including literacy. Assessments that measure more than three domains are preferred.

Criteria for Review: Unidimensional Assessments. In order to be considered for review, unidimensional instruments must fully measure all the concepts in the respective domain. This means that a score for individual concepts within the domain must be provided as well as a single composite score for the domain. For example, an assessment that measures only expressive vocabulary will not be considered as a full assessment of language and communication.

6. The measure should have a scoring structure that yields a separate score for each domain included for kindergarten. For this review, an instrument is only considered to "assess" a domain if it provides a score for that domain.

7. The assessment tool may be individually administered, may be group administered, and/or may consist of an observation checklist. Domain scores for each individual child must be provided.

8. Administration of the instrument by a classroom teacher must be allowable. Specifically, the qualifications for those who administer and interpret the instrument (as specified in publisher's guidelines) should be within the coursework and/or licenses typically completed by teachers certified to teach in Texas public schools.

Administration procedures requiring timing, the establishment of basals and ceilings, complex judgments, and/or subjective ratings that require the special training of a diagnostician are inappropriate for teacher administration.

9. If the instrument is norm-referenced, it must have a representative norming sample in terms of the sample size and the groups represented. Norm-referenced tests must be representative of the population of students in the grade(s) for which the measure is intended. Criterion-referenced decisions about criterion mastery, non-mastery, risk, and impairment have special requirements for reliability and validity (see Guidelines 10 and 11).

10. At a minimum, a measure must possess adequate reliability as demonstrated by independent research. For tests built using classical test theory, this should include internal consistency and alternate form and/or test-retest reliability data as appropriate for the measure's purpose and intended use. Evidence of alternate-form reliability should be submitted.

For tests developed using item response models, suitable psychometric data from the test development process should be submitted, including, but not limited to, the standard error of measurement, indices of item discrimination and difficulty, and total test information. Classifications resulting from criterion-referenced tests must be shown to be reliable. Instruments that depend on examiner ratings must demonstrate appropriate forms of inter-rater reliability.

11. Decisions based on test results must be supported by validity evidence established by independent research. Evidence of construct, content, criterion validity (concurrent or predictive), and discriminant and convergent validity are appropriate, depending on the purpose and intended uses of the measure. Classifications resulting from criterion-referenced tests must be shown to be valid and must demonstrate both sensitivity and specificity. Submissions should include evidence of internal consistency reliability (e.g., alpha coefficients) and construct/criterion validity (e.g., correlations with measures of similar and/or dissimilar constructs, results of confirmatory factor analyses). Evidence of predictive validity should be submitted for measures that claim to predict future status or the likelihood of subsequent success.
12. Normative and technical data for the instrument must be no more than 15 years old (2001 or later).
13. Instruments that include reliable and valid measures of phonological awareness and single-word decoding will satisfy the commissioner's requirements related to the identification of risk for disability or dyslexia, pending further research and further communication from TEA.
14. Assessments in English and/or Spanish may be submitted for review.

Instructions

1. Please complete the form included in this document. Provide written response to all inquiries, and attach any supporting technical evidence using the prompts provided in each section.

Figure-Kindergarten Submission Form

2. Email this completed form with all attachments embedded to core@smu.edu no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017.
3. Submit three paper copies of the form, including all attachments, to the SMU Center on Research and Evaluation at the address provided in this notice no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017 (submissions must be received at this time).
4. Submit two jump drives, including electronic versions of the submission form and all supporting documentation, to the SMU Center on Research and Evaluation at the address provided in this notice no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017 (submissions must be received at this time).
5. Clearly mark packages with the following: name of submitting agency, date of submission, contact name, contact phone number, and contact email address. A confirmation of receipt of all required materials will be emailed to the contact email address provided.

6. Submissions that do not include all required materials (email of form and attachments, three paper copies of form and attachments, two jump drives with form and attachments, and supporting materials) or submissions that are not received by the deadline will not be reviewed.

Please note that all submissions will be reviewed using the *Guidelines for the Implementation of TEA Criteria for the Evaluation of English and Spanish Kindergarten Assessment Instruments* and responses to the questions provided in the kindergarten submission form. Further, online or electronic tests submitted for evaluation must include online access information (e.g., web address, login, password) and/or an installable copy of the software. At least three (3) paper versions of all submission materials (the submission form) and all supporting attachments must be received by the deadline. Submissions must include the name, direct line phone number, and email address for a primary contact person who can be contacted in the event reviewers need to ask questions or request more information pertaining to the submission. Delays in responding to reviewers' questions may result in an incomplete review; products with incomplete reviews will not be considered for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Kindergarten Assessment Instruments*.

Proposals must be submitted to:

SMU Center on Research and Evaluation

Attn: Dylan Farmer

3140 Dyer St # 750511

Dallas, TX 75205

A rolling review will be implemented and instruments will be reviewed in the order they are received. To be considered for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Kindergarten Assessment Instruments*, all materials, including paper versions and jump drives, must be received no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017.

Further Information. For clarifying information, contact the TEA Office of Early Childhood Education at (512) 463-8886.

Issued in Austin, Texas, on February 15, 2017.

Cristina De La Fuente-Valadez

Director, Rulemaking

Texas Education Agency

Texas Education Agency

Request for Information (RFI) Form

Kindergarten Assessment Tool

* English and Spanish versions of a tool should be submitted separately for review.

In this section you will be asked to describe the general features of your tool.

Title of Instrument:

Brief summary of this tool (200 words max):

Publisher:

Languages:

English

Spanish

Other

Intended use:

Screening

Progress Monitoring

Price per student:

Format (choose all that apply):

Paper and Pencil

Survey

Other

Observation

Online

Computer Adaptive Test

Please describe the training required for test administrators including estimated amount of time for training. (200 words max)

What age levels are appropriate for this tool?

How long does it take to administer each test (per student)?

How long does it take to score each test (per student)?

In this section you will be asked to describe the content areas your tool measures.

Are you submitting a unidimensional or multidimensional assessment?

Unidimensional Multidimensional

What developmental domains and concepts does your tool measure?

Health and Wellness Development

Language and Communication

Emergent Literacy - Reading

Emergent Literacy - Writing

Mathematics

Please describe in detail, what domains and concepts your tools measure. If applicable, what OTHER developmental domains and concepts not listed above does your tool measure?

In this section you will be asked to describe how the tool is administered.

What is the test administration format?

One-on-one (one student at a time)

Group format (multiple students at one time)

Please provide a brief description of the administration, including who may administer the test (e.g., teachers, teaching assistants, etc.) and what is required of the student. (250 words max)

In this section you will be asked to describe how the tool is scored.

Describe the scoring of the instrument. (Please provide information about the type of scores [e.g., raw score, t score, percentile, performance category, etc.] as well as how each underlying concept, individual domain and the full assessment are scored [e.g., does each domain receive an individual score and is there a score for the entire assessment?]) (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

How is the tool scored (note: this refers to how scores are generated not how the tool is administered):

Manual – paper only.

Computer – for example, web-based entry of scores.

Computer automated – for example, test is administered on the computer and automatically scored.

Option for either of the previous.

In this section you will be asked to describe psychometric features of the tool. For each question below, please attach supporting documentation (such as a technical report, white paper, manuscript, etc). In your 500 word written description please refer to specific documents as well as page numbers to help expedite careful review. Submit any/all supporting documents.

If you are submitting a progress monitoring tool, please provide evidence of the tool's ability to monitor kindergarten progress (for example, sensitivity to student improvement, end of year benchmarks, number of alternate forms and evidence of comparable difficulty, etc.) (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Please provide evidence of classification accuracy (the extent to which a tool is able to accurately classify students into “risk” categories). Specifically, please provide evidence about the external measures used as an outcome, children in the study used to evaluate classification accuracy, alignment with an RTI approach, cut-points, and/or sensitivity/specificity. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe the generalizability of the assessment (the extent to which results from one population can be applied to another population; please describe the size and diversity of the norming/validation sample). (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of test-retest reliability. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of inter-rater reliability. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of internal consistency (coefficient alpha). (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Please submit suitable psychometric data from the test development process (ex; factor analysis; IRT including but not limited to the standard error of measurement, and indices of item discrimination and difficulty). (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of validity, or the extent to which the tool accurately measures what it is intended to measure. Please include evidence of content validity, construct validity, and predictive validity. (1500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

In this section you will be asked to describe how the tool can be used for formative purposes/data-based individualization.

Does your tool offer the following features?

Decision rules for making changes to instruction.

Yes

No

Decision rules for increasing student performance goals.

Yes

No

Evidence that tool use results in improved student achievement.

Yes

No

Evidence that tool use results in improved teacher planning.

Yes

No

Please describe your responses. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

In this section you will be asked to describe how scores and reports may be used by various interested parties (ex, if there are various “views” of results that can be accessed).

Does the tool allow for the following “views” of results? (check all that apply)

Individual student

Whole classroom

Whole school

Parent view

Please describe how scores can be disaggregated and reported separately for sub groups. (500 words max)

Are you also submitting a prekindergarten assessment tool?

No

Yes (what is the name tool?):

Texas Education Agency

Miscellaneous Document

Request for Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instrument Submissions

Filing Date. February 15, 2017

Filing Authority. Texas Education Code, §29.169(c)

Description. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is notifying publishers, school districts, and charter schools that prekindergarten student progress monitoring tools (English and Spanish) may be submitted for review for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments*. The *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments* will be available in spring 2017 so that school districts and open-enrollment charter schools may order instruments for implementation in the 2017-2018 school year. Instruments selected for the commissioner's list will remain on the list for a minimum of two school years. Inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments* will be evaluated in terms of psychometric properties, administrative features, scoring, and efficiency (e.g., cost, time to administer). TEA will give priority to multi-dimensional assessments; unidimensional assessments will also be considered (see criteria as follows).

Prekindergarten. Texas Education Code (TEC), §29.169, authorizes the commissioner of education to develop a recommended list of student progress monitoring tools for school districts and charter schools to measure the progress of students in meeting the recommended prekindergarten learning outcomes. In accordance with the TEC, §29.169, a school district or charter school receiving funding as part of the High Quality Prekindergarten Grant shall select and implement appropriate methods for evaluating the district's program classes by measuring student progress and shall make data from the results of program evaluations available to parents. A school district may administer diagnostic assessments to students in a program class to evaluate student progress but may not administer a state standardized assessment instrument. An assessment instrument administered to a prekindergarten program class must be selected from a list of appropriate prekindergarten assessment instruments identified by the commissioner.

Background: High Quality Prekindergarten Grant Program Requirements. To be eligible to receive grant funding under the High Quality Prekindergarten Grant, a school district or charter school must measure the progress of each student in meeting the recommended end of prekindergarten year outcomes identified in the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines. Each district or charter school that receives grant funding must select a progress monitoring tool or a

combination of tools from the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments* to measure the domains listed in Table One.

Figure-Table One

Criteria Specific to Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments. Publishers, school districts, charter schools, and other organizations will be responsible for submitting prekindergarten progress monitoring tools to be considered for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments*. The TEA is looking for student progress monitoring tools in five domains: emergent literacy - reading, emergent literacy - writing, language and communication, social and emotional development, and mathematics. See the following *Guidelines for the Implementation of TEA Criteria for the Evaluation of English and Spanish Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments* for additional information. Submissions must include a concise summary of the evidence base for each requested component in this request along with a brief discussion of how the instrument aligns with the cited research. Submissions must include supporting documentation.

Guidelines for the Implementation of TEA Criteria for the Evaluation of English and Spanish Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments

1. The instrument must be intended for progress monitoring use in prekindergarten. *Progress monitoring* refers to brief measures that are conducted on a routine basis to provide information on what children are learning and rates of improvement across the prekindergarten year. Results of progress monitoring measures should be predictive of more lengthy (e.g., comprehensive) standardized measures. As progress monitoring measures are brief, teachers can conduct them at least three times across a school year and learn which students are or are not demonstrating adequate progress. With this knowledge, teachers report that they no longer have to "guesstimate" what children are learning and can adapt their curricular activities and instructional approaches to be more responsive to the children's needs.
2. Teachers must use a standardized measure to assess student performance. This means the assessment has a common set of questions, tasks, and materials and the child's score is based on a normative sample of children.
3. Whenever possible, skill levels of children who speak a language other than English should be assessed in both their home language and English. Measurement of home language skill level is essential when children are enrolled in bilingual instructional programs.

4. The length of time needed to administer each domain measurement must not exceed 20 minutes per student. The cumulative assessment time must not exceed 100 minutes per student. Some criteria may be measured through observation, informal assessments, reflection, collection of children's work in portfolios, or checklists. Informal assessments may not be the primary method for monitoring children's progress.

5. A measure must directly assess five domains of health and wellness development, language and communication, emergent literacy - reading, emergent literacy - writing, and mathematics, as they are specified in the Texas Prekindergarten Guidelines respectively.

Criteria for Review: Multidimensional Assessments. In order to be considered for review, multidimensional instruments must measure at least three domains. Assessments that measure all five domains are preferred.

All submitted assessments must measure both of the following two domains and must be able to provide a domain score as well as a score for the measured concepts: (1) emergent literacy-reading: representing at least 2 concepts (see Table One), and (2) mathematics: representing at least 2 concepts (see Table One).

All submitted assessments must also measure at least one of the following: (1) emergency literacy - writing: representing at least 2 concepts (see Table One), (2) language and communication: representing at least 2 concepts (see Table One), and (3) health and wellness development: representing at least 2 concepts (see Table One).

Criteria for Review: Unidimensional Assessments. In order to be considered for review, unidimensional instruments must fully measure all the concepts in the respective domain (see Table One). This means that a score for each concept must be provided as well as a single composite score for the domain. For example, an assessment that measures only expressive vocabulary will not be considered as a full assessment of language and communication.

6. The measure should have a scoring structure that yields a separate score for each domain included for prekindergarten. For this review, an instrument is only considered to "assess" a domain if it provides a score for that domain.

7. The instrument must be individually administered.

8. Administration of the instrument by a classroom teacher must be allowable. Specifically, the qualifications for those who administer and interpret the instrument (as specified in publisher's guidelines) should be within the coursework and/or licenses typically completed by teachers certified to teach in Texas public schools.

Administration procedures requiring timing, the establishment of basals and ceilings, complex judgments, and/or subjective ratings that require the special training of a diagnostician are inappropriate for teacher administration.

9. If the instrument is norm-referenced, it must have a representative norming sample in terms of the sample size and the groups represented. Norm-referenced tests must be representative of the population of students in the grade(s) for which the measure is intended. Criterion-referenced decisions about criterion mastery, non-mastery, risk, and impairment have special requirements for reliability and validity (see Guidelines 10 and 11).

10. At a minimum, a measure must possess adequate reliability as demonstrated by independent research. For tests built using classical test theory, this should include internal consistency and alternate form and/or test-retest reliability data as appropriate for the measure's purpose and intended use. Evidence of alternate-form reliability should be submitted.

For tests developed using item response models, suitable psychometric data from the test development process should be submitted, including, but not limited to, the standard error of measurement, indices of item discrimination and difficulty, and total test information. Classifications resulting from criterion-referenced tests must be shown to be reliable. Instruments that depend on examiner ratings must demonstrate appropriate forms of inter-rater reliability.

11. Decisions based on test results must be supported by validity evidence established by independent research. Evidence of construct, content, criterion validity (concurrent or predictive), and discriminant and convergent validity are appropriate, depending on the purpose and intended uses of the measure. Classifications resulting from criterion-referenced tests must be shown to be valid and must demonstrate both sensitivity and specificity. Submissions should include evidence of internal consistency reliability (e.g., alpha coefficients) and construct/criterion validity (e.g., correlations with measures of similar and/or dissimilar constructs, results of confirmatory factor analyses). Evidence of predictive validity should be submitted for measures that claim to predict future status or the likelihood of subsequent success.

12. Normative and technical data for the instrument must be no more than 15 years old (2001 or later).

13. Instruments that include reliable and valid measures of phonological awareness and single-word decoding will satisfy the commissioner's requirements related to the identification of risk for disability or dyslexia, pending further research and further communication from TEA.

Instructions

1. Please complete the form included in this document. Provide written response to all inquiries, and attach any supporting technical evidence using the prompts provided in each section.

Figure-Prekindergarten Submission Form

2. Email this completed form with all attachments embedded to core@smu.edu no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017.
3. Submit three paper copies of the form, including all attachments, to the SMU Center on Research and Evaluation at the address provided in this notice no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017 (submissions must be received at this time).
4. Submit two jump drives, including electronic versions of the submission form and all supporting documentation, to the SMU Center on Research and Evaluation at the address provided in this notice no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017 (submissions must be received at this time).
5. Clearly mark packages with the following: name of submitting agency, date of submission, contact name, contact phone number, and contact email address. A confirmation of receipt of all required materials will be emailed to the contact email address provided.
6. Submissions that do not include all required materials (email of form and attachments, three paper copies of form and attachments, two jump drives with form and attachments, and supporting materials) or submissions that are not received by the deadline will not be reviewed.

Please note that all submissions will be reviewed using the *Guidelines for the Implementation of TEA Criteria for the Evaluation of English and Spanish Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments* and responses to the questions provided in the prekindergarten submission form. Further, online or electronic tests submitted for evaluation must include online access information (e.g., web address, login, password) and/or an installable copy of the software. At least three (3) paper versions of all submission materials (the submission form) and all supporting attachments must be received by the deadline. Submissions must include the name, direct line phone number, and email address for a primary contact person who can be contacted in the event reviewers need to ask questions or request more information pertaining to the submission. Delays in responding to reviewers' questions may result in an incomplete review; products with incomplete reviews will not be considered for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments*.

All proposals must be submitted to:

SMU Center on Research and Evaluation

Attn: Dylan Farmer

3140 Dyer St #750511

Dallas, TX 75205

A rolling review will be implemented and instruments will be reviewed in the order they are received. To be considered for inclusion on the *2017-2019 Commissioner's List of Approved Prekindergarten Progress Monitoring Instruments*, all materials, including paper versions and jump drives, must be received no later than 3:00 p.m. (Central Time) on Friday, March 17, 2017.

Further Information. For clarifying information, contact the TEA Office of Early Childhood Education at (512) 463-8886.

Issued in Austin, Texas, on February 15, 2017.

Cristina De La Fuente-Valadez

Director, Rulemaking

Texas Education Agency

Texas Education Agency

Request for Information (RFI) Form

Prekindergarten Assessment Tool

* English and Spanish versions of a tool should be submitted separately for review.

In this section you will be asked to describe the general features of your tool.

Title of Instrument:

Brief summary of this tool (200 words max):

Publisher:

Languages:

English

Spanish

Other

Price per student:

Format (choose all that apply):

Paper and Pencil

Observation

Computer Adaptive Test

Survey

Online

Other

Please describe the training required for test administrators including estimated amount of time for training. (200 words max)

What age levels are appropriate for this tool?

How long does it take to administer each test (per student)?

How long does it take to score each test (per student)?

In this section you will be asked to describe the content areas your tool measures.

Are you submitting a unidimensional or multidimensional assessment?

Unidimensional

Multidimensional

Which of the following domains and concepts does your tool measure (check all that apply).

Social and Emotional Development

Self-Concept Skills

Self-Regulation Skills (Behavior Control)

Self-Regulation Skills (Emotional Control)

Self-Regulation Skills (Control of Attention)

Relationships with Others

Social Awareness Skills

Other

Language and Communication

Listening Comprehension Skills

Speaking (Conversation) Skills

Speech Production Skills

Vocabulary Skills

Sentences and Structure Skills

Other

Emergent Literacy – Reading

Motivation to Read Skills
Phonological Awareness Skills
Alphabet Knowledge Skills
Comprehension of Text Read Aloud Skills
Other

Emergent Literacy – Writing

Motivation to Write Skills
Conventions in Writing
Concepts about Print Skills
Other

Mathematics

Counting Skills
Adding To/Taking Away Skills
Geometry and Spatial Sense Skills
Measurement Skills
Classification and Patterns Skills
Other

If other domain(s), explain:

In this section you will be asked to describe how the tool is administered.

What is the test administration format?

- One-on-one (one student at a time)
- Group format (multiple students at one time)

Please provide a brief description of the administration, including who may administer the test (e.g., teachers, teaching assistants, etc.) and what is required of the student. (250 words max)

In this section you will be asked to describe how the tool is scored.

Describe the scoring of the instrument. (Please provide information about the type of scores [e.g., raw score, t score, percentile, performance category, etc.] as well as how each underlying concept, individual domain and the full assessment are scored [e.g., does each domain receive an individual score and is there a score for the entire assessment?]) (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

How is the tool scored (note: this refers to how scores are generated not how the tool is administered):

Manual – paper only.

Computer – for example, web-based entry of scores.

Computer automated – for example, test is administered on the computer and automatically scored.

Option for either of the previous.

In this section you will be asked to describe psychometric features of the tool. For each question below, please attach supporting documentation (such as a technical report, white paper, manuscript, etc). In your 500 word written description please refer to specific documents as well as page numbers to help expedite careful review. Submit any/all supporting documents.

Please provide evidence of the tool's ability to monitor PreK progress (for example, sensitivity to student improvement, end of year benchmarks, number of alternate forms and evidence of comparable difficulty, etc.)
(500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Please provide evidence of classification accuracy (the extent to which a tool is able to accurately classify students into “risk” categories). Specifically, please provide evidence about the external measures used as an outcome, children in the study used to evaluate classification accuracy, alignment with an RTI approach, cut-points, and/or sensitivity/specificity. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe the generalizability of the assessment (the extent to which results from one population can be applied to another population; please describe the size and diversity of the norming/validation sample). (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of test-retest reliability. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of inter-rater reliability. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of internal consistency (coefficient alpha). (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Please submit suitable psychometric data from the test development process (ex; factor analysis; IRT including but not limited to the standard error of measurement, and indices of item discrimination and difficulty). (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

Describe evidence of validity, or the extent to which the tool accurately measures what it is intended to measure. Please include evidence of content validity, construct validity, and predictive validity. (1500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

In this section you will be asked to describe how the tool can be used for formative purposes/data-based individualization.

Does your tool offer the following features?

Decision rules for making changes to instruction.

Yes

No

Decision rules for increasing student performance goals.

Yes

No

Evidence that tool use results in improved student achievement.

Yes

No

Evidence that tool use results in improved teacher planning.

Yes

No

Please describe your responses. (500 words max)

Name of supporting document(s) where this information is best represented and specific page range:

In this section you will be asked to describe how scores and reports may be used by various interested parties (ex, if there are various “views” of results that can be accessed).

Does the tool allow for the following “views” of results? (check all that apply)

Individual student

Whole classroom

Whole school

Parent view

Please describe how scores can be disaggregated and reported separately for sub groups. (500 words max)

Are you also submitting a Kindergarten assessment tool?

No

Yes (what is the name tool?):

Table One. Domains and concepts preferred.

Domain	Preferred concepts to be assessed include, but are not limited to:
Health and Wellness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gross and Fine Motor • Social Competence • Self-Regulation Skills including attention • Relationships with Others • Social Awareness Skills
Language and Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listening Comprehension Skills • Speaking (Conversation) Skills • Speech Production Skills • Vocabulary Skills • Sentences and Structure Skills
Emergent Literacy – Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation to Read Skills • Phonological Awareness Skills • Alphabet Knowledge Skills • Comprehension of Text Read Aloud Skills
Emergent Literacy – Writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation to Write Skills • Conventions in Writing • Concepts about Print Skills
Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counting Skills • Adding To/Taking Away Skills • Geometry and Spatial Sense Skills • Measurement Skills • Classification, Sequencing and Patterns