# **ITEM 04 ADDENDUM**

**DATE:** March 5, 2024

**TO:** PANELISTS, Reading Difficulties Risk Screener Selection Panel (RDRSSP)

**FROM:** Young-Suk Kim, Chair, Reading Difficulties Risk Screener Selection Panel and STAFF, California State Board of Education

**SUBJECT:** Draft Review Process and Evaluation Criteria Specified Under California *Education Code* Section 53008, subdivisions (b) & (g)

The document beginning on the following page, titled “Reading Difficulties Risk Screener Selection Panel (RDRSSP) Proposed Review Elements and Evaluation Criteria,” was considered by the State Board of Education (SBE) at its March 6, 2024, meeting (see [Item 14](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr24/agenda202403.asp)). The RDRSSP considered a version of this document at its February 16, 2024, meeting (see [Item 03](https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/rd/rdrsspfeb16agenda.asp)).

For this item, the RDRSSP will hear information about this document, including a summary of the discussion and feedback of the SBE.

## Reading Difficulties Risk Screener Selection Panel (RDRSSP)Proposed Review Elements and Evaluation Criteria

The RDRSSP’s Governing Policy, sections I.D. and I.E., specifies that RDRSSP will advise the State Board of Education (SBE) on a review process with evaluation criteria for the SBE’s adoption pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 53008, subdivisions (b) and (g)(1), for the RDRSSP to use to evaluate and approve a list of screening instruments by December 31, 2024. Section I.E specifies that the RDRSSP will advise the SBE on its recommended review process under *EC* Section 53008, subdivisions (b) and (g)(1), for the SBE’s adoption at the SBE’s meeting scheduled to be held on May 8–9, 2024.

The following review elements are provided for consideration of the aforementioned recommended review process and evaluation criteria.

*EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(A)–(E) specifies that, to support the adoption of high-quality screening instruments that minimize the overidentification or under-identification of pupils' risk of reading difficulties and offer meaningful information for follow up, the extent to which a screening instrument addresses the following factors be considered in the adoption of evaluation criteria:

1. Use of direct measurement, supplemented by other pupil data, to determine if a pupil is at risk of a reading difficulty, including dyslexia.
2. Measurement of domains that may predict dyslexia and other reading disorders, including, but not limited to, measures of oral language, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding skills, letter–sound knowledge, knowledge of letter names, rapid automatized naming, visual attention, reading fluency, vocabulary, and language comprehension.
3. Evidence that the tool is normed and validated using a contemporary multicultural and multilanguage sample of pupils, with outcome data for pupils whose home language is a language other than English as well as those who are native English speakers.
4. Integration of relevant pupil demographic information, such as home language, English language fluency, and access to prekindergarten education, to more fully understand a pupil's performance.
5. Guidance and resources for educators regarding how to administer screening instruments, interpret results, explain results to families, including in pupils' primary languages, and determine further educational strategies, assessments, diagnostics, and interventions that should be considered and that are specific to each type of pupil result. Guidance and resources provided pursuant to this subparagraph shall be informed by the English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools developed pursuant to Section 60207 and the California Dyslexia Guidelines developed pursuant to Section 56335, as well as knowledge of effective interventions for the specific needs of individual pupils, and shall reflect a tiered interventions model aligned with the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Within this context, the following review elements are expected to be used for evaluating screeners. In cases where assessments are offered in languages other than English, the details outlined below should be supplied for each language of assessment. If information pertaining to any of the points below is unavailable, a justification should be provided.

### Description of Assessment Battery

1. Constructs and rationale: In line with *EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(A) and *EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(B), constructs directly measured at each grade level should be listed and described. The Panel must consider the extent to which these constructs include the following: oral language, phonological and phonemic awareness, decoding skills, letter–sound knowledge, knowledge of letter names, rapid automatized naming, visual attention, reading fluency, vocabulary, and language comprehension.

Theoretical frameworks and prior research and evidence for the constructs measured and their developmental appropriateness at each level should be provided. In languages other than English, the rationale and evidence for how constructs have been modified as appropriate to the language should also be provided.

1. In line with *EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(C) and (D), descriptions of tasks should include the following:
	1. Their intended appropriate use
	2. For each task at each grade level, a description of the administration and scoring format and platform, the number of items, assessment time, administration and scoring procedures, and types of scores and their interpretation
	3. In languages other than English, how tasks have been constructed to appropriately reflect language features
2. In line with *EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(C) and (D), information on interpretation and appropriate use of students’ performance across tasks should include the following:
	1. Standard interpretation, including types of decision rules such as benchmark goals and/or risk levels
	2. Other considerations (student and family language background, language of instruction, proficiency in the language of the screening instrument, prior educational experience) and how these are taken into account in decisions about screener use and interpretation

### Psychometrics

In line with *EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(C) and (D), the following information should be provided for each screener, where appropriate by grade level and screener language:

Participants: Information on the participants who participated in collection of the reliability and validity data, including numbers of participants, demographic characteristics (e.g., grade/age, gender, race/ethnicity, exceptionality status, English learner status, socio-economic status), and geographic region (including urbanicity)

Reliability

1. Appropriate reliability estimates for different types of tasks (e.g., internal consistency, test–retest, alternate form, interrater agreement)
2. Reliability by subgroups, such as grade/age, gender, English learner status, exceptionality status, major racial/ethnic categories, and socio-economic status numbers of participants included in each subgroup

Validity

1. Content validity: Information on the content of each task, including information on items (development and selection; developmental appropriateness considering age/grade, linguistic and cultural aspects)
2. Construct validity (e.g., age/grade differentiation, group differentiation [e.g., demographic and exceptionality status])
3. Criterion validity
	* Concurrent and predictive correlations (overall and for subgroups, including by age/grade, prior education experience, English language proficiency level and specific language background, where appropriate)
	* Information about the minimum language proficiency level necessary for the instrument to yield valid information in each assessed language
	* Classification accuracy: Specificity and sensitivity for identifying students’ reading difficulty status, reported by the above-mentioned subgroups and with reference to language background, English proficiency level, and prior education
	* Types of decision rules such as benchmark goals and/or risk levels and associated evidence, reported by the above-mentioned subgroups and with reference to language background, English language proficiency levels, and prior education

### Additional Information

In line with *EC* Section 53008(g)(1)(E), the following information should be provided:

1. How information about performance and relevant context factors is reported and analyzed for potential needs and next steps
2. User interfaces and data management systems for entering and viewing scores, as relevant to various users such as teachers, school and district leaders, and parents/guardians
3. Resources available, including professional development, for teachers, school and district leaders, and parents/guardians
	1. Guidance, resources, and professional development for educators regarding how to administer screening instruments, interpret results, explain results to families, and determine further educational strategies, assessments, diagnostics, and interventions that should be considered specific to each type of pupil result, including the method and mode for delivery of these resources or training
	2. For students with limited English proficiency or English learners, guidance about the minimum English language proficiency level required for valid assessment results in English and additional guidance about English proficiency level used to determine assessment in languages other than English
	3. Resources available in multiple languages, with consideration of the languages of parents/guardians
4. Safeguards to protect student privacy and confidentiality
5. Alignment with *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*  (*ELA/ELD Framework*) and the California Dyslexia Guidelines.
6. Feedback from users on their experience using screening instruments and/or participating in or using training and resources

### Proposed RDRSSP Evaluation Criteria (NEW)

The proposed review elements outlined above will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

* The extent to which the screening instruments measure key constructs in a manner that is theoretically and empirically well-grounded (evaluated for each grade level and language represented)
* The extent to which the screening instruments have been shown to be reliable and valid for populations of students representative of the California student population
* The extent to which the mode of administration for the screening instruments are appropriate for the students being evaluated (by grade level and student need)
* The extent to which the screening instruments offer well-grounded guidance for determining when a student has sufficient language proficiency for them to be appropriately used
* The extent to which the screening instruments offer useful guidance for administration and data interpretation and reporting
* The extent to which the screening instruments offer educators and families useful guidance for next steps based on students’ performances
* The extent to which the screening instruments align with California guidance in the *ELA/ELD Framework* and the California Dyslexia Guidelines

The evaluation process will produce a description, for each approved screener, of its features and valid uses to inform local educational agency decision-making and use.