

Academic Screening Tools Chart

Rating Rubrics: English tools that include English Learners

Please note that the following rubrics are applied separately for each grade level targeted by the tool.

Technical Standard 1. Classification Accuracy

Note: Classification Accuracy will be rated separately for each time of year for the administration (e.g., Fall, Winter, Spring).

Rating	Definition
Full Bubble	All of Q1 – Q3 rated as YES and The lower bound of the confidence interval around the Area Under the Curve (AUC) estimate ≥ 0.80 and Sensitivity ≥ 0.80 and Specificity ≥ 0.80
Half Bubble	All of Q1 – Q3 rated as YES and (a) The lower bound of the confidence interval around the AUC estimate ≥ 0.70 but < 0.80 or (b) Sensitivity ≥ 0.70 and Specificity ≥ 0.70
Empty Bubble	Does not meet full or half bubble
Dash	Classification accuracy data were not provided

Q1. Was an appropriate external measure of academic performance used as an outcome?

Q2. Was risk adequately defined within an RTI approach to screening (i.e., 10th-20th percentile)?

Q3. Were the classification analyses and cut-points adequately performed?

Area Under the Curve (AUC) Statistic: an overall indication of the diagnostic accuracy of a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve. ROC curves are a generalization of the set of



potential combinations of sensitivity and specificity possible for predictors. AUC values closer to 1 indicate the screening measure reliably distinguishes among students with satisfactory and unsatisfactory reading performance, whereas values at 0.50 indicate the predictor is no better than chance.

Technical Standard 2: Reliability

Rating	Definition
Full Bubble	<p>(a) A model-based approach to reliability was reported</p> <p>or</p> <p>(b) At least two types of reliability were reported that are appropriate for the purpose of the tool (e.g., inter-rater reliability is provided for tools that require human judgment), and evidence is drawn from at least <u>two</u> samples that are representative of students across all performance levels</p> <p>and</p> <p>For each type of reliability reported, the median lower bound of the confidence interval around the estimate met or exceeded <u>0.70</u>.</p>
Half Bubble	<p>(a) A model-based approach to reliability was reported</p> <p>or</p> <p>(b) At least two types of reliability were reported that are appropriate for the purpose of the tool (e.g., inter-rater reliability is provided for tools that require human judgment), and evidence is drawn from at least <u>one</u> sample that is representative of students across all performance levels</p> <p>and</p> <p>For each type of reliability reported, the median lower bound of the confidence interval around the estimate met or exceeded <u>0.60</u>.</p>
Empty Bubble	Does not meet full or half bubble.
Dash	Reliability data were not provided.



Technical Standard 3: Validity

Rating	Definition
Full Bubble	At least <u>two</u> types of <u>appropriately justified</u> * validity analyses are reported, and the analyses are drawn from at least <u>one</u> sample representative of students across all performance levels, and the median lower bound of the confidence interval around the estimate met or exceeded <u>0.60</u> (or was within an acceptable range given the expected relationship with the criterion measure).
Half Bubble	Analyses, measures, and sample were appropriate for at least two types of appropriately justified validity analyses*, but evidence was mixed, with the median lower bound of the confidence interval for one or more, but not all, types of validity either not meeting or exceeding 0.60 or not within an acceptable range given the expected relationship with the criterion measure.
Empty Bubble	Does not meet full or half bubble.
Dash	Validity data were not provided.

*Appropriately justified analyses must include at least one criterion measure that is external to the screening system and theoretically linked to the underlying construct measured by the tool.



Technical Standard 4: Sample Representativeness

Description	Definition
National with Cross-Validation	At least one classification accuracy analysis was conducted using a national sample* and at least one cross-validation study was conducted.
National without Cross-Validation	At least one classification accuracy analysis was conducted using a national sample* without a cross-validation study.
Regional with Cross-Validation	At least one classification accuracy analysis was conducted using one or more state or regional samples and at least one cross-validation study was conducted.
Regional without Cross-Validation	At least one classification accuracy analysis was conducted using one or more state or regional samples without a cross-validation study.
Local with Cross-Validation	At least one classification accuracy analysis was conducted using one or more local district samples and at least one cross-validation study was conducted.
Local without Cross-Validation	At least one classification accuracy analysis was conducted using one or more local district samples without a cross-validation study.

*A national sample consists of at least 150 students across at least three of nine geographical divisions defined by U.S. Census Bureau.

Technical Standard 5: Bias Analysis

Bias Analysis refers to an analysis that examines the degree to which a tool is or is not biased against subgroups (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, students with disabilities, English language learners).

Rating	Definition
Yes	Analyses testing differential classification accuracy across demographic and language proficiency groups were conducted. Other bias analyses that can be reported as an addition to differential classification accuracy include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Multiple-group confirmatory factor models for categorical item responses 2. Explanatory group models such as multiple-indicators, multiple-causes (MIMIC) or explanatory IRT with group predictors 3. Differential Item Functioning from Item Response Theory (DIF in IRT)
No	Does not meet "yes"



This resource was produced under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, Award No. H326Q210001. Celia Rosenquist serves as the project officer. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this document is intended or should be inferred.

