



STUDENT ASSESSMENTS
AND ASSOCIATED GROWTH MODELS FOR
TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

FORM C

PUBLICLY AVAILABLE SERVICES SUMMARY

	<hr/> <hr/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide an overview of the assessment for districts and BOCES. Please include:


- x A description of the assessment;
- x A description of how the assessment is administered;
- x A description of how scores are reported (include links to sample reports as appropriate);
- x A description of how the Assessment Provider supports implementation of the assessment, including any technical assistance. (3 pages max)

CBMreading is an evidence-based assessment for use to screen and monitor student progress in reading competency in primary grades (1-6). CBMreading uses easy, time-efficient assessment procedures to determine a student's general reading ability across short intervals of time. Students read aloud for one minute from grade- or instructional-level passages. The words read correct per minute (WRCM) functions as a robust indicator of reading health and a sensitive indicator of intervention effects. CBMreading includes standardized administration and scoring procedures along with proprietary instrumentation, which was designed and developed to optimize the consistency of data collected across progress monitoring occasions. CBMreading provides teachers with a direct link to instruction and allows them to determine if and when instructional adaptations are needed, set ambitious but attainable goals for students, and monitor progress toward those goals (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2002). CBMreading is an effective tool used to measure rate of reading. Indeed, reading disabilities are most frequently associated with deficits in accurate and efficient word identification. Although reading is not merely rapid word identification or the "barking at words" (Samuels, 2007), the use of rate-based measures provide a general measure of reading that can alert teachers to students who have problems and are behind their peers in general reading ability. Overall, CBMreading provides a global indicator of reading.

Uses and Applications: CBMreading is an evidence-based assessment for use to screen and monitor students' progress in reading achievement in the primary grades. Each assessment is designed to be highly efficient and give a broad indication of reading competence. The automated output of each assessment gives information on the accuracy and fluency of passage reading which can be used to determine instructional level to inform intervention.

Screening: CBMreading as a screening assessment is intended to identify students who are at-risk for reading difficulties, and to guide instructional decisions. This allows for instruction to be more or less resource intensive and more individualized for students requiring the most support. In addition, at the school level, student growth can be tracked and monitored, allowing administrators to look at improvements both across grades and academic years for the purpose of accountability. Teachers and administrators may use this information to help parents better understand their children's reading needs. Screening information can be

monitor stu-ucg of mds.FebrussescreenMayn efScent 2on can be periods st mlr



administration, report guides, Benchmark and Norm information, and tools to support School Managers and District Managers. From the FAST Knowledge Base, users may also submit a request for assistance from our School Support team either via email or using the Knowledge Base’s “Live Chat” feature (available during business hours).

Please provide an overview of the student-level growth model or target setting model for SLOs for districts and BOCES, along with how student-level growth scores are aggregated to create teacher-level scores, and how those teacher-level scores are converted to New York State’s 0-20 metric.

--

	<p>CBMreading item development followed the process and standards presented by Schmeiser and Welch (2006) in the fourth edition of Educational Measurement (Brennan, 2006). In addition to the process and standards of developing item passages presented by Schmeiser and Welch, text difficulty had to be considered. Relevant research in reading comprehension was also taken into consideration. Text type, paragraph and sentence structure, word and language usage, and cohesion were selected as criteria for development of all CBMreading passages. Research assistants, teachers from each grade level (1st through 5th), and content experts in the area of reading served as both item writers and reviewers for those items at the Kindergarten through 5th grade level. After items were written they were reviewed for feasibility, fairness, construct relevance, and content balance. A stratified procedure was used to recruit a diverse set of item writers from urban, suburban and rural areas. The item writers wrote, reviewed, and edited assessment materials. CBMreading passages are divided into Levels A, B and C, which correspond to 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade, and 4th to 6th grade reading levels, respectively. There are 39 Level A passages, 60 Level B, and 60 Level C passages. Those passages are assigned as screening forms for each grade level and a variety of progress monitoring forms, which are designed to administer the same three passages once per month or administer one to three unique passages weekly. Passage levels are also divided into grade level passage sets. Fifteen unique progress monitoring passages are available for each grade. All forms are vertically scaled/linked across grades and levels. They are also horizontally equated within level and progress monitoring passage set. Additional information about CBMreading item development is included in the Technical Manual submitted with Appendix A-2 starting on page 52.</p>
<p>Assessments Woven Tightly Into the Curriculum:</p>	<p>We believe the best assessments are those that are able to be seamlessly administered in conjunction with regular classroom instruction and in support of the day-to-day academic goals of the teacher. Designed for Multiple Systems of Support (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (Rtl), FAST makes program implementation easy and efficient with automated scoring, analysis, norming and reporting; customizable screening, benchmarking, instructional recommendations and progress monitoring.</p> <p>Immediate, on-demand reporting within FAST provides actionable data specifically designed to guide instruction and remediation. Our assessments help teachers collect data that answer their critical questions about student skills, instructional needs, and growth at the student, group, class, grade, school, and district levels. A variety of reports are provided to inform instruction. FAST</p>

	<p>assessments yield reports with scores compared to color-coded norms (class, school, district, national) and benchmarks (high risk, some risk, low risk that predict state test performance). Norms and benchmarks are available for both level of achievement and rate of</p>
<p>Performance Assessment:</p>	

	<p>refers to some risk, whereas two exclamation marks refer to high risk of reading difficulties or not meeting statewide assessments benchmarks, based on the score.</p> <p>Interpreting FastBridge assessment scores involves a basic understanding of the various scores provided in the FastBridge Learning software and helps to guide instructional and intervention development. FastBridge Learning offers individual, class, and grade level reports for screening, and individual reports for progress monitoring. Additionally, online training modules include sections on administering the assessments, interpreting results, screen casts, and videos. Results should always be interpreted carefully considering reliability and validity of the score, which is influenced by the quality of standardized administration and scoring. It important to consider the intended purpose of the assessment, its content, the stability of performance over time, scoring procedures, testing situations, or the examinee. The FastBridge Learning system automates analysis, scoring, calculations, reporting and data aggregation. It also facilitates scaling and equating across screening and progress monitoring occasions.</p>
<p>Efficient Time-Saving Assessments:</p>	<p>Each CBMreading assessment is designed to be highly efficient and give a broad indication of reading competence. CBMreading can be administered one-on-one in approximately 5 minutes for screening and in approximately 1 minute for progress monitoring. The assessment is computer administered (optional paper-and-pencil version available) with automated browser-based scoring. The automated output of each assessment gives information on the accuracy and fluency of passage reading which can be used to determine instructional level to inform intervention.</p>
<p>Technology:</p>	<p>FAST™ is a web-based, hosted SaaS solution. As such, with no hardware or software to install, implementing FAST™ is simple. FAST™ requires no network or computer-based installation. Our cloud-based system is easy to implement and supported with optional automated rostering and SIS integration, nothing to install or maintain, and multi-platform and device support.</p>
<p>Degree to which the growth model must differentiate across New York State’s four levels of teacher effectiveness (only applicable to supplemental assessments):</p>	<p>CBMreading can be used to support teacher and principal evaluations in grades 1 through 6. Student scaled scores are converted to student growth percentiles (SGP) using national norming data, including students from NY schools. Student SGP are aggregated by educator and then converted to APPR scores and HEDI ratings.</p> <p>A CBMreading crosswalk table is provided on page 65 of the Growth Report in Appendix A-1. APPR scores were assigned to educator median growth percentiles (MGP) so that a HEDI rating of “Ineffective” corresponded to APPR scores from 0 to 12, “Developing” corresponds to APPR scores from 13 to 14, “Effective” to APPR scores</p>

	<p>from 15 to 17, and “Highly Effective” to scores from 18 to 20. Based on this crosswalk, MGP for the “Ineffective” category extend to 0.59, and MGP for “Developing” then extend from 0.60 to 0.74. “Effective” MGP range from 0.75 to 0.89, and “Highly Effective” MGP range from 0.90 to 0.99.</p>
--	--



STUDENT ASSESSMENTS FOR TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION


	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>2.2(D)-i: Technical Documentation Related to Assessment and Student Growth Score Properties: RELIABILITY Both “minimum” and “desired” qualifications are listed. For the purposes of this RFQ, applications will only be rated against the “minimum” qualifications; however, NYSED’s aspirational “desired” qualifications are also listed to identify possible future requirements for assessments and associated growth models.</p>	
<p>For supplemental assessments used in conjunction with growth models: This application contains evidence of the minimum criteria for reliability: x Student test scores have adequate levels of reliability (e.g., coefficient alpha > 0.75).</p> <p>This application contains evidence of the desired criteria for reliability: x Standard errors provided for students growth scores. x Student growth classifications have adequate decision consistency. x Teacher effectiveness classifications demonstrate adequate consistency. Examples include agreement statistics (e.g., kappa coefficients) based on simulation studies.</p>	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>2.2(D)-ii: Technical Documentation Related to Assessment and Student Growth Score Properties: VALIDITY – ALIGNMENT Both “minimum” and “desired” qualifications are listed. For the purposes of this RFQ, applications will only be rated against the “minimum” qualifications; however, NYSED’s aspirational “desired” qualifications are also listed to identify possible future requirements for assessments and associated growth models.</p>	
<p>For supplemental assessments used in conjunction with growth models: This application contains evidence of the minimum criteria for alignment validity: x Evidence that test content is sufficiently aligned with New York State Learning Standards and covers a range of measurable standards. Documentation that demonstrates that: (a) at least 80% of the test measures content aligned with NYS learning standards, (b) no more than 20% of test content is aligned with other learning standards or objectives, and (c) a range of content from the NYS learning standards is measured</p> <p>Note: Other relevant standards can be proposed if NYS Learning Standards do not apply to subject area.</p> <p>This application contains evidence of the desired criteria for alignment validity: x 100% alignment between NYS Learning Standards and assessment.</p>	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>2.2(D)-iii: Technical Documentation Related to Assessment and Student Growth Score Properties: VALIDITY – RELATIONS TO OTHER VARIABLES Both “minimum” and “desired” qualifications are listed. For the purposes of this RFQ, applications will only be rated against the “minimum” qualifications; however, NYSED’s aspirational “desired” qualifications are also listed to identify possible future requirements for assessments and associated growth models.</p>	
<p>For supplemental assessments used in conjunction with growth models: This application contains evidence of the minimum criteria for validity in relation to other variables: x Evidence students’ growth scores are correlated with other measures of student progress (e.g., $r > .5$ with measures such as the number of objectives mastered by a student over the course of the year, teachers’ ratings of</p>	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>





To be completed by the Copyright Owner/Assessment Representative of the assessment being proposed and, where necessary, the co-applicant LEA:

<p>FastBridge Learning, LLC 1. Name of Organization (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p>	 4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE BLUE INK)
<p>Terri Lynn Soutor 2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p>	<p>March 7, 2016 5. Date Signed</p>
<p>Chief Executive Officer 3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p>	
<p>N/A 1. Name of LEA (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p>	<p>4. Signature of School Representative (PLEASE USE BLUE INK)</p>
<p>2. School Representative's Name (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p>	<p>5. Date Signed</p>
<p>3. Title of School Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p>	