STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Dyslexia Screening Tool Rubric

Suggested Non-Negotiables				
Skills Required of Law-Phonemic Awareness, Phonological Awareness, and Letter Sound Knowledge				
Description: *What skill (s) can be assessed in this vendor's proposal? Please indicate below.*				
Skill Being Assessed in this Proposal *Indicate Below*	**Skill Being Assessed in this Proposal** *Indicate Below*	**Skill Being Assessed in this Proposal** *Indicate Below*	**Skill Being Assessed in this Proposal** *Indicate Below*	**Score:** /4
(1 Skill=1 Point)	*(2 Skills=2 Points)*	*(3 Skills=3 Points)*	*(4 Skills=4 Points)*	
□ Phonemic Awareness □ Phonological Awareness □ Letter Sound Knowledge □ Rapid Automatized Naming	□ Phonemic Awareness □ Phonological Awareness □ Letter Sound Knowledge □ Rapid Automatized Naming	□ Phonemic Awareness □ Phonological Awareness □ Letter Sound Knowledge □ Rapid Automatized Naming	□ Phonemic Awareness □ Phonological Awareness □ Letter Sound Knowledge □ Rapid Automatized Naming	
Notes About the Rating:				

STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Dyslexia Screening Tool Rubric

Oral Presentations via Zoom Online Platform

Considerations:
- The presentation provided a succinct overview of the vendor's screening tool including details and or examples about the assessment's platform.
- The presentation included details about the vendor's organization and lead team if selected as successful bidder.
- The presenters thoughtfully answered the questions, posed by the Dyslexia Advisory Council.

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20
	□ The presentation provided details and examples about the proposed screening tool. □ The presentation by the proposed vendor enhanced the written proposal.		

Notes About the Rating:

Quality of the Assessment of Proposed Screening Tool[i]

Considerations:
- Is the content on the screener reflective of what should be measured, as indicated in the proposal?
- Is there a research base that supports this assessment as a screener?
- What does the assessment screen for? How does this assessment screen for this? (e.g. word, lists, oral reading, etc.)
- If the screener is computer adaptive, is the content range developmentally appropriate for grades K-2?
- How are student scores categorized for reporting interpretation? (tier based, rubric, skill breakdown)
- Is each skill assessment normed for grades K-2?
- Is the process defined in the proposal, and are examples given?
- Is the cut-score for "at-risk" for reading difficulties clearly defined in the proposal?
- How is data represented at student, classroom, grade, school, and district levels?
- Does the screener use more than one assessment? If yes, does the screener provide decision making protocol to take multiple scores into account to make a recommendation?
- Is professional learning available to ensure consistent implementation of the screener?
- Are there various professional learning formats for educators and districts to select from, if they choose this screener?

<10 Points **Below Baseline**	**15 Points** **Baseline**	**20 Points** **Exceeds Baseline**	**Score:** **/20**
	□ Content is reflective of what should be measured. □ The screeners outcome is clearly defined and includes cut scores and reports. □ If there is more than one assessment, there is guidance how to use multiple scores. □ For each assessment, a decision making protocol is provided. □ Professional learning opportunities for implementation of the screener are included in the proposal.		

Notes About the Rating:

Bias and Sensitivity of Proposed Screening Tool[ii]

Considerations:
- Is Sensitivity reported? Is it at least .80?
  - Is a confidence interval reported, and is the lower bound of the confidence interval at least .80?

- Is Specificity on each skill set reported? Is it at least .80?
- What is the False Positive rate?
- What is the False Negative rate?
- **Has one of the following types of analyses been used to test that the screener is not biased against student groups (e.g., gender, race, poverty, students with disabilities, dual language learners)**
    a. **Item-level bias analysis (e.g., differential item functioning)**
    b. **Test-level bias analysis (e.g., differential classification accuracy)?**
    c. **Are the norming groups:**
        I. **diverse (e.g., gender, race, poverty, students with disabilities, dual language learners);**
        II. **representative of Washington students?**

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20
	□ Sensitivity is at least .80 □ Confidence Interval is at least .80 □ Specificity is at least .80 □ False and negative and positive rates have been conducted. □ One of the two types of bias analysis listed above have been conducted. □ The norming group population is similar to that of Washington students.		

Notes About the Rating:

Validity and Reliability of Proposed Screening Tool[iii]

Considerations

Validity – The extent to which something measures what it purports to measure. What types of validity are reported?
   a) Content validity – clarity and appropriacy of domain measured.
   b) Substantive validity – how the text design matches the construct.
   c) Consequential validity – recognition of the intended or unintended side effects.

Reliability – The consistency of scores. What types of reliability are reported?
   a) If the screener is item-based, is internal consistency reported?
   b) If test-retest is reported, what is the spacing between testing occasions?
   c) If alternate-form or split-form reliability is reported, is another form of reliability reported?
   d) Are at least two types of reliability reported?
   e) What level of reliability is reported?
      • If the screener is computer adaptive, is only marginal reliability reported (i.e., overall)?
      • Is reliability across a range of ability reported?
      • What is the level of reported reliability?
   f) If the screener is not computer adaptive, is the internal consistency at least .90 (important for decision-making purposes)?

<10 Points **Below Baseline**	**15 Points** **Baseline**	**20 Points** **Exceeds Baseline**	**Score: /20**
	□ The publisher has reported efforts to ensure validity. □ At least two types of reliability are reported in the proposal. □ Non-computer adaptive screeners have an internal consistency of at least .90. □ If the screener is computer adaptive, a range of reliability is reported.		

Notes About the Rating:

Correlation and Alignment to WA State Standards and Assessments

Considerations:

- How does the proposal reflect and alignment between the screener and an assessment from a related construct such as WAKiDS?
- How does the proposal demonstrate an alignment with the WA State ELA Standards?
- How does the proposal demonstrate correlation with the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA)?
- *Correlation can be seen when two sets of data are graphed on a scatter plot, which is a graph with an X and Y axis and dots representing the data points.*
- *Correlation is the extent to which two assessments are related, and the direction of that relationship. They reflect the tendency of the variables to "co-vary"; that is, for changes in the value of one variable to be associated with changes in the value of the other. In interpreting correlation coefficients, two properties are important.[iv]*
- *Correlation can be positive, negative, or no correlation. Positive correlation means that as one data set increases, the other data set increases as well. Data sets can also have perfect correlation, strong correlation, or weak correlation. The closer the data points are together, the stronger the correlation.[v]*

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20
	□ Alignment between the screener and an assessment of a related construct is demonstrated. □ Correlations between the skills assessed and the English Language Arts Standards and/or the SBA are demonstrated.		

Notes about the Rating:

Suggested Alignments

Capacity to Support WA School Districts[vi]

Description:
- What is the intended age range for the assessment?

- When the screener was normed:
    a) How similar was the norming sample to the Washington Student population?
    b) Was the sample size for validating the screener sufficient for the analyses?
    c) Were multiple sites, states, and/or regions used to validate the screener?
- Is the cut-score for each grade band, reasonable for WA State Districts and Schools?
- Does the vendor have the ability to meet the diverse needs of Washington Districts and Schools?
- Does the vendor have the ability to partner 1:1 with districts of varying sizes with student populations size ranging from "7 enrolled students to 51,000 enrolled students"?

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20
	□ The normative sample reflects the students in WA schools. □ The screener is intended for students in grades K-2. □ The content and format are developmentally appropriate for WA State District and Schools. □ The vendor has the ability to meet the diverse needs of Washington Districts and Schools.		

Notes About the Rating:

Vendor and Staff Qualifications/ Experiences

Considerations:
- Identify minimum qualifications of staff, including subcontractors, who will be assigned to the potential contract, indicating the responsibilities and qualifications of such personnel, and include the amount of time each will be assigned to the project.
- Provide resumes for the named staff, which include information on the individual's particular skills related to this project, education, experience, significant accomplishments and any other pertinent information.
- The vendor must commit that staff identified in its proposal will actually perform this assigned work. Any staff substitution must have prior approval of OSPI.

- Include other relevant experience that indicates the qualifications of the vendor, and any subcontractors, for the performance of the potential contract.
- Include a list of contracts the vendor has had during the last five years that relate to the Vendor's ability to perform the services needed under this RFQQ.
- List contract reference numbers, contract period of performance, contact persons, telephone numbers, and fax numbers/e-mail addresses
- **When requested the proposed vendor will furnish OSPI and or Washington School District with VPAT to ensure ADA compliance.**

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20
	□ The information provided clearly indicates that the publisher is qualified to supply the screener for the diverse Washington Districts and Schools and support its use.		

Notes About the Rating:

Cost Proposal

Considerations:
- Identify all costs including expenses to be charged for performing the services necessary to accomplish the objectives of the contract. The Vendor is to submit a fully detailed budget including staff costs, administrative cost/s, travel costs, and any other expenses necessary to accomplish the tasks and to produce the deliverables under the contract.
- The proposal provides details about the cost for initial and sustaining services.
- Vendors are required to collect and pay Washington State sales tax, if applicable.
- Costs for subcontractors are to be broken out separately.
- Please note if any subcontractors are certified by the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Dyslexia Screening Tool Rubric

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20
	□ The proposal provided clear information regarding the per-pupil costs of the screener. □ The proposal provided clear information about the professional learning and additional implementation costs of selecting their screener.		

Notes About the Rating:

Project Management Proposal Team Structure/Internal Controls

Considerations:
- Provide a description of the proposed project team structure and internal controls to be used during the course of the project, including any subcontractors.
- Provide an organizational chart of your firm indicating lines of authority for personnel involved in performance of this potential contract and relationships of this staff to other programs or functions of the firm. This chart must also show lines of authority to the next senior level of management.
- Include who within the firm will have prime responsibility and final authority for the work.

<10 Points Below Baseline	15 Points Baseline	20 Points Exceeds Baseline	Score: /20

	□ The proposal provides clear information regarding the project team structure. □ The proposal details who has prime responsibility for the work and the vendor's organizational chart.		

Notes About the Rating:

---

[i] Adapted from the Scope of Assessment on Page 22 from National Center for Improving Literacy "Screening for Dyslexia" ████████████████ Downloads/NCIL%20ScreeningforDyslexia%20(1).pdf

[ii] Adapted from the Classification Accuracy on Page 24 from National Center for Improving Literacy "Screening for Dyslexia" ████████████████ Downloads/NCIL%20ScreeningforDyslexia%20(1).pdf

[iii] Adapted from the Validity on Page 19-20 and 22-23from National Center for Improving Literacy "Screening for Dyslexia" ████████████████ Downloads/NCIL%20ScreeningforDyslexia%20(1).pdf

[iv] Adapted from the University of Washington: http://www.washington.edu/assessment/scanning-scoring/scoring/reports/correlations/

[v] Adapted from the lesson by *Stephanie Matalone* on https://study.com/academy/lesson/correlation-definition-analysis-examples.html

[vi] Adapted from the Scope of Assessment on Page 22 from National Center for Improving Literacy "Screening for Dyslexia" ████████████████ /Downloads/NCIL%20ScreeningforDyslexia%20(1).pdf

Smarter Balanced Assessment : https://portal.smarterbalanced.org/library/en/bias-and-sensitivity-guidelines.pdf