

Northwest Education Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP)
Northwest Education Association MAP for Primary Grades (NWEA MPG)

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>Evidence includes: 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"> • Split-half reliability • Coefficient alpha • Test-retest reliability • Classification consistency 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –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>Split-half reliability, coefficient alpha, and test-retest reliability would not be appropriate for this type of assessment.</p> <p>Couldn't do internal consistency, test/re-test due to the computer adaptive nature of the assessment.</p>	<p>Does not meet: I</p> <p>Partially meets: I</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>
	<p>Standard error of measurement or standard estimate of error is reported</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p>	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information</p>	<p>Evidence provided for K-2, but we are not finding 3rd grade. Due to the adaptive nature, you would</p>	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets: II</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores. SEM estimates are reported for score ranges and cut-scores for each assessment (grade-level, form, subtest). 	<p>does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS -- Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>not find multiple forms.</p> <p>SEM is addressed, but not in a way that is easily understood, and the chart is not easily read, due to the lack of color.</p>	<p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>
	<p>Inter-rater reliability studies have been conducted. Study sample used to establish inter-rater reliability represents test administrators.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Inter-rater reliability coefficients exceed .7. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS --most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or</p>	<p>Per the application, inter-rater reliability is NA due to being adaptive.</p> <p>NA-Computer Adapted Assessment</p>	<p>Does not meet: I</p> <p>Partially meets:</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: II</p>

		strong evidence. (2)		
	<p>Studies have been conducted to establish reliability with all subcategories of students who will take the assessment.</p> <p>Evidence Includes: 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>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>States in the proposal MAP & MPG have not been in the position to gather this data.</p> <p>Not evident.</p>	<p>Does not meet: II</p> <p>Partially meets:</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>
Alternative forms available for multiple assessments with demonstrated equivalence or comparability	<p>If alternative forms are provided, all forms have demonstrated evidence of equivalence or comparability such as test-retest, parallel form and internal consistency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical reviews indicate all forms for each grade level have demonstrated evidence of comparability and 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the</p>	<p>Not enough forms available to be able to progress monitor</p> <p>Not enough forms of the assessment to be used as a progress monitoring tool.</p>	<p>Does not meet: I</p> <p>Partially meets: I</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>

	<p>content specifications.</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient forms are provided to allow for progress monitoring between interim assessments. • Split-half reliability. • Coefficient alpha reliability. 	<p>criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –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>		
Content and Construct Validity				
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>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear description is provided that demonstrates the purpose of the assessment is to screen students for reading concerns. • Content specifications for each grade-level, including a complete 	Rating	<p>Assessment is self-identified as a summative assessment, there is sufficient data in regards to identifying significant reading deficiency based on the external evaluation by NCRTI</p> <p>Concern that the foundational skills are not fully addressed for screening purposes for K-1.</p>	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets: II</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>

	<p>description of the test content, purpose(s), and intended use(s), and assessment blueprint as appropriate, is provided.</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>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field testing populations should be clear and should mirror the school/district demographics. • Statistics used to establish the reading levels are reported with both ELL and Non-ELL populations. • Findings from a content review by field experts, including teachers in tested grade levels. 		<p>Lack of description of field tested population and no data given on ELL versus non ELL</p> <p>Data specific to ELL and Non-ELL missing.</p>	<p>Does not meet: I</p> <p>Partially meets: I</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</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>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.</p>	<p>See Appendix C</p>	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets:</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: III</p>

		(1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
	There are studies of construct validity, such as convergent and discriminant analysis, demonstrating correlations of .7 or above.	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	Studies are evident and correlations are .7 or above Not certain it will identify SRD.	Does not meet: Partially meets: I Meets or exceeds: II
Evidence of criterion/predictive validity accurately identifying students with <i>“significant</i>	Evidence reported to demonstrate that the assessment has established criterion and/or predictive validity to correctly identify	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or	The predictive validity is comparing MAP to MPG rather than to	Does not meet: I Partially meets: I

<p><i>reading deficiency</i>”</p>	<p>students with and without a “<i>significant reading deficiency</i>.”</p> <p>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear definition of the criterion or measure that were used to establish concurrent validity. • Studies with similar assessments that demonstrate the assessment measures reading ability, not other irrelevant criteria. Predictive validity correlations above .7. 	<p>information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>outside/similar assessments No validity to correctly identify students with or without a reading deficiency</p> <p>Some evidence, but unclear if this assessment will accurately screen for SRD.</p>	<p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>
<p>Determination of cut-scores based upon well-designed pilot study</p>	<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>Evidence indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes a description of the process used to establish the cut points. • A full description of the norming sample. • The norming sample is a large representative national sample of 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for</p>	<p>Demographic data is not broken down beyond ethnicity. For example no mention of ELL, students with special disabilities, free/reduced lunch subgroups etc (groups/variables are stated, but specific data not presented).</p> <p>Based on their own studies the 20th percentile matches SRD.</p>	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets: II</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>

	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.	the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
	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.	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	A full circle (convincing evidence) was reached, however we are not able to know if it's a .8 or higher. Not provided by vendor.	Does not meet: Partially meets: II Meets or exceeds: I
	Acceptable, recognized procedures are followed for setting cut-scores.	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)		Does not meet: Partially meets: I Meets or exceeds: II

		<p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>		
	<p>SEM estimates are reported for cut-scores with guidance for score interpretation.</p>	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.(1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or</p>	<p>Guidance for score interpretation is not clear</p> <p>Implementation of RIT scores may create confusion</p>	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets: II</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>

		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>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed issues of equity of utility for all populations. • Results of bias reviews and plans that have addressed any concerns. • At least two to three types of classification, reliability, and validity study data have been disaggregated by subgroups and meet the criteria. • Culturally diverse students were included throughout the entire process of test development. For example in the samples of pilot students, in cognitive interviews, etc. • The content of the reading materials does not favor mainstream culture. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	Data presented for the MAP (3-8)	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets: I</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: II</p>
Third party evaluation conducted	Evidence reported to demonstrate that an independent, qualified third	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not		Does not meet:

	party has provided a thorough and unbiased evaluation of the quality of the assessment.	provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		Partially meets: Meets or exceeds: III
Administration & Scoring				
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.	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR		Does not meet: Partially meets: Meets or exceeds: III

		EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
Efficiency of administration	The amount of time needed to administer the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided.	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1)</p> <p>MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>		<p>Does not meet: I</p> <p>Partially meets:</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: II</p>
Efficiency of scoring	The amount of time needed to score the assessment is reasonable and balanced to the information provided;			<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially</p>

	computer-assisted scoring is available; procedures for calculating scores are clear; scores can be stored and reported electronically.			meets: I Meets or exceeds: II
Accommodations clearly stated and described for students with disabilities and students with special needs (504, etc.)	The differing needs of students with disabilities are specifically addressed. Evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any accommodations do not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test. Specific administration guidelines are provided for implementing any accommodations. How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in the training materials or program. Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based. 	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)	Suggested accommodations have not been researched (p.34) Tool has not conducted research regarding special education students. Vendor reports no accommodations are needed.	Does not meet: Partially meets: II Meets or exceeds: I
Accommodations clearly stated and described for Second Language Learners	The accommodations directly address the linguistic needs of the student. Evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any accommodation does not compromise the interpretation or purpose of the test. Specific administration guidelines are provided for implementing any 	DOES NOT MEET -evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the	Accommodations provided, but suggested accommodations are not researched or evidence-based (p.14).	Does not meet: Partially meets: II Meets or exceeds: I

	<p>accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to address accommodations is specifically addressed in the training. • Suggested accommodations are research or evidence-based. 	<p>criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>		
Utility				
<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>Evidence includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score ranges or a scale is provided. • Guides for interpretation of scores are provided. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0)</p> <p>PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence. (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong</p>	<p>There is no reference point for determining significant deficiency.</p> <p>Analysis of RIT scores is cumbersome.</p>	<p>Does not meet: I</p> <p>Partially meets: I</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>

		evidence. (2)		
<p>Cost effective: Materials, administration costs including personnel, scoring, and training</p>	<p>Materials are provided or easily accessible; time away from instruction is minimal; no additional personnel required; all costs inclusive including any additional data platform or storage costs; minimal data entry is required.</p>	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence.(0) PARTIALLY MEETS -partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence (1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)</p>	<p>No pricing information given.</p> <p>No cost information is provided.</p> <p>Could not determine cost effectiveness</p>	<p>Does not meet: II</p> <p>Partially meets: I</p> <p>Meets or exceeds:</p>
<p>Reports provide guidance for interpretation useful to educators, administrators, and parents</p>	<p>Information is displayed in a format and language that is understandable to educators, administrators and parents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data reports are easily read and interpreted. • Clear description of how to interpret results. • Reports provide trajectory for student progress. • District, school, classroom, and student reports provided. 	<p>DOES NOT MEET-evidence was not provided for this criteria or information does not demonstrate evidence. (0) PARTIALLY MEETS-partial evidence was provided related to the criterion and/ or data provided demonstrates weak evidence.</p>	<p>Reports are only available in English, p.42.</p> <p>The process to interpret reports is complicated and time consuming. Show progress over time, but only in 3 reporting periods. No progress monitoring.</p>	<p>Does not meet:</p> <p>Partially meets: II</p> <p>Meets or exceeds: I</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports available in real-time. • Reports can be exported to data-base formats. • Reports available in languages other than English. • Customer service is available provided for users. 	(1) MEETS OR EXCEEDS –most information for the criterion is provided. Information and data provided suggests acceptable or strong evidence. (2)		
--	---	---	--	--

Strengths:

Efficiency of administration and scoring.

The application was very easy to follow. It was presented in the format of the rubric.

Alignment to CAS was evident.

Each item is evaluated against a set of criteria to determine bias.

Aligned to CAS.

Weaknesses:

Clear evidence of reliability within subgroups (ELLs, disabilities, Free & Reduced...)

The test can only be given up to three times a year and cannot be administered as a progress monitoring tool which is required by state board rules.

Too time consuming to administer and reports are not easy to correctly and quickly interpret.

Do not know the cost.

Recommended: x

Not Recommended: x x