

**Imagination Station (Istation):
Istation's Indicators of Progress (ISIP) Español
Validity Study Kindergarten through Grade 5**

Deni Basaraba • Anthony Sparks • Leanne R. Ketterlin-Geller •

Southern Methodist University

Fall 2018_Revised

Published by

Southern Methodist University
Department of Education Policy & Leadership
Simmons School of Education & Human Development
PO Box 750114
Dallas, TX 75275-0114
Contact information: lkgeller@smu.edu

This research was supported by Project Imagination Station, Inc.
RME is affiliated with the Simmons School of Education and Human Development, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those Southern Methodist University or individuals within it.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank the following individuals for their assistance in completing this research and preparing the report: Neil Martin, Elisa Gallegos, and Marta Lozano. We would like to thank the RME staff for reviewing and editing the documents.

Copyright © 2018. Southern Methodist University. All rights reserved. This publication, or parts thereof, may not be used or reproduced in any manner without written permission.

SMU will not discriminate in any employment practice, education program or educational activity on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability or veteran status. This document is available in alternative formats upon request.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Method	6
Participants	6
Measures	7
Universal Screening Assessments	9
FAST Assessments	10
Criterion Assessments	15
Hiring and Training of Data Collectors	21
Recruiting and Hiring Data Collectors	21
Data Collector Training	22
Analyses	23
Generalizability of the Sample	23
Classification Accuracy	23
Validity Evidence	26
Results and Discussion	28
Generalizability	28
Classification Accuracy	30
Grade 1: Classification Accuracy	36
Grade 2: Classification Accuracy	42
Grade 3: Classification Accuracy	48
Grade 4: Classification Accuracy	63
Grade 5: Classification Accuracy	78
Criterion-Related Evidence for Validity	92
Concurrent-Related Validity Evidence	92

Predictive-Related Evidence for Validity	93
Validity Evidence Disaggregated by Subgroup	96
Concurrent-Related Validity Evidence Disaggregated by Subgroup	96
Predictive-Related Evidence for Validity Disaggregated by Subgroup	100
Conclusions	108
References	110
Appendix A:	111
Concurrent Correlation Coefficients for Overall/Composite Scale Scores and All Subtest Scores	111
Appendix B:	130
Concurrent Correlation Coefficients for Subgroups	130
Appendix C:	199
Predictive Correlation Coefficients for Overall/Composite Scales Scores and All Subtest Scores	199
Appendix D:	240
Predictive Correlation Coefficients for Subgroups	240
Beginning of Year to End of Year	241
Middle of Year to End of Year	293

Imagination Station (Istation): Istation's Indicators of Progress (ISIP) Español Validity Study

Introduction

As of 2017, Hispanic English Learners (ELs) constituted 77.1% of the entire EL population (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2017). Although not all ELs are at-risk for not demonstrating grade-level proficiency in English Language Arts and Literacy, examination of multi-year trend data for the English *Reading* subtest of the National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP] comparing the performance of ELs and non-ELs of students in Grades 4 and 8 reveals that ELs persistently earn scores that are significantly lower than their non-EL peers (USDOE, 2017). One viable option for supporting the literacy development of ELs is to capitalize on their native-language skills by building on theories of cross-linguistic transfer (Cummins, 1979; Lado, 1964) that serve as the foundation for the increasing number of bilingual education programs offered in schools across the United States to support the development of ELs' language and literacy skills in their native language (L1) and their second language (L2; English). As of 2015, for example, most states provided additional funding to schools to support ELs while six states offered funding specifically for bilingual (dual language) programs (USDOE, OELA, 2015).

Similar to establishing prevention-oriented systems to monitor the acquisition of early literacy skills for students learning to read in English, those working in dual language programs supporting the development of foundational early literacy skills in Spanish will benefit from the availability of evidence-based, technically adequate (e.g., reliable and valid) universal screening assessments in Spanish. However, a review of the available research indicates few studies have been conducted describing the development and/or exploring the technically adequacy of the few Spanish universal screening reading assessments available to help educators monitor students' acquisition of Spanish literacy skills (Keller-Marguilis & Mercer, 2014; Keller-Marguilis, Payan, & Booth, 2012). The current study aims to contribute to this nascent body of literature by examining the technical adequacy (e.g., reliability, validity, and classification accuracy) of the IStation *Lectura Temprana* (ISIP Español LT) and *Lectura Avanzada* (ISIP Español LA) assessments for students in Grades Kindergarten – Grade 5.

Results from universal screening assessments, such as the *ISIP Español LT* and the *ISIP Español LA*, can help educators identify students who are on-track and not on-track for reaching Spanish learning goals. These same assessments can also be used to determine the intensity of instructional support that students may need to achieve these learning goals and demonstrate proficiency with grade-level content and skills by the end of the school year (Glover & Albers, 2007). Supporting educators in their decision-making processes related to this instructional support, however, requires that they have access to appropriate student assessment data that is substantiated by multiple sources of relevant evidence (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

Reliability and validity are two sources of evidence commonly used to evaluate tests. Reliability generally refers to the consistency of measurement, while validity refers to the degree that interpretations made using test scores are appropriate, meaningful, and useful (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). Classification accuracy analyses, which provides a specific source of predictive validity evidence by providing evidence of the extent to which a universal screening assessment can accurately differentiate between those who will be on-track or not on-track for not meeting grade-level expectations, is an increasingly popular method for evaluating universal screening assessments (Glovers & Albers, 2007). The purpose of this study was to determine the appropriateness or technical adequacy of *ISIP Español LT* (Kindergarten – Grade 2) and *ISIP Español LA* (Grades 3-5) for making screening decisions for students in Grades Kindergarten – 5 and to summarize the results from this study.

Method

In this section, we describe the methods used to conduct the validity study to gather evidence for the Istation Indicators of Progress Español (*ISIP Español*), including: (a) participants, (b) measures, (c) hiring and training of data collectors, and (d) analyses.

Participants

Data for this study were collected from four geographically distinct school districts in Texas and one school district in New Mexico during the 2017-2018 school year. Students in Grades K-5 were enrolled in one of 12 elementary schools receiving instruction from 100 teachers who agreed to participate in our study. Our total sample included 1,403 students, although not all students completed all assessments. We present the distribution of students by state, district, school, and grade level in Table 1. Our sample size was insufficient across all grades to conduct cross-validation analyses. The names of the participating school districts have been removed from this report.

Table 1

Distribution of Participating Students by District and Grade Level

State	District	Schools	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
TX	A	1	12	12	42	18	26	33	143
TX	B	1	12	22	21	25	23	16	119
TX	C	5	148	104	140	180	181	141	980
TX	D	3	43	37	46	18	43	14	212
NM	E	1	-	-	-	18	15	17	50
Total		12	215	175	249	259	288	221	1403

Table 2 presents the demographic distribution of students by grade level.

Table 2.

Demographic Distribution of Participating Students by Grade Level

Demographic Subgroup*	K	1	2	3	4	5
Gender						

Male	41.86%	50.86%	51.81%	43.63%	50.00%	55.20%
Female	49.76%	47.43%	46.59%	55.21%	49.31%	44.34%
Hispanic/Latino						
Yes	83.81%	99.42%	98.38%	95.70%	98.54%	98.14%
No	8.57%	0%	0.40%	0%	0.73%	1.40%
Race/Ethnicity						
American Indian/Alaskan Native	39.53%	49.14%	34.13%	0.40%	0.70%	0.50%
African American	0.50%	0.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Hispanic/Latino	26.97%	39.43%	43.37%	91.51%	98.61%	90.04%
White	26.97%	20.00%	20.88%	6.94%	0.00%	8.60%
Economically Disadvantaged						
Yes	86.05%	89.71%	87.95%	89.58%	92.01%	90.95%
No	5.58%	8.57%	10.44%	9.27%	7.29%	8.60%
Limited English Proficient						
Yes	90.02%	96.00%	98.39%	94.98%	93.75%	92.76%
No	8.37%	2.29%	1.63%	1.93%	2.43%	2.26%
Special Education						
Yes	1.86%	7.43%	7.23%	9.27%	4.17%	7.24%
No	89.76%	90.86%	90.85%	89.58%	95.14%	92.31%

* Note: Rates of missing data varied by demographic subgroup but were no more than 8.5% for any given variable

Measures

In the sections that follow, we describe the three types of measures administered in this study: (1) reading assessments administered to students in Grades K – 5 (universal screening and criterion assessments), (2) fidelity of assessment administration measures, and (3) a teacher survey designed to collect information about the instructional context within which participating students were receiving reading instruction and the assessments were administered.

The FastBridge and Aprenda assessments were used to obtain criterion-related evidence for the ISIP *Lectura Temprana* (ISIP Español LT) and ISIP *Lectura Avanzada* (ISIP Español LA) assessments. In Table 3 below, we categorize the assessments by grade level and critical domain of Spanish early reading skill(s) assessed. Specifically, to demonstrate the alignment in skills assessed by each of the assessments, we categorize them by one of the five critical domains of Spanish literacy they were designed to assess (e.g., phonological awareness, alphabetic understanding, fluency, vocabulary, or comprehension), plus language. For those assessments that included more subtests than we administered as part of this study, we use an asterisk (*) to denote those subtests that were administered. For example, the following item types (ISIP Español LT) and subtests were used to assess students' phonological awareness skills: Initial Sounds and Blending (ISIP Español LT), Onset Sounds and Phoneme Segmenting (FastBridge Early Reading Spanish), and Sounds & Letters (Aprenda).

Table 3

Reading Domain	ISIP Español (K-5)	FastBridge (K-5)	Aprenda (K-5)	STAAR (3-5)	PARCC (3-5)
Phonemic & Phonological Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Sounds* • Blending* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onset Sounds* (PreK-K) • Word Rhyming • Word Blending • Word Segmenting* (K-1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sounds & Letters (K) 		
Alphabetic Understanding (Phonics)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phoneme-grapheme conversion* • Phoneme & syllable awareness* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter Names • Letter Sounds* (K) • Decodable Words • Syllable Reading* (K-1) • Sight Words* (K-1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word Reading (K-2) 		
Fluency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maze* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence Reading • Curriculum-Based Reading* (1-5) 			
Vocabulary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral Vocabulary • Reading* Vocabulary* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral Repetition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary (1-5) 	Vocabulary	Vocabulary
Comprehension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listening Comprehension (K-3)* • Reading Comprehension* 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence Reading (K-2) • Reading Comprehension (1-5) 	<p>Understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literary Text • Informational Text <p>Across Genres</p>	<p>Understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literary Text • Informational Text
Language					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Conventions Written Expression

Note: Subtests/item types administered as part of this study are marked with an asterisk.

Universal Screening Assessments

The universal screening assessments included: ISIP Español *Lectura Temprana* (ISIP Español LT), ISIP Español *Lectura Avanzada* (ISIP Español LA), *FastBridge earlyReading Spanish* (FB ER), and *FastBridge CBM Reading Spanish* (FB CBMR).

[*ISIP Español Lectura Temprana \(ISIP Español LT\)*](#)

ISIP Español LT is a computerized adaptive test designed to provide teachers with tools for continuous progress monitoring of K-3 students' development in five critical domains of Spanish early reading: (1) phonemic and phonological awareness, (2) alphabetic understanding, (3) fluency with connected text, (4) vocabulary, and (5) comprehension. Standardized scale scores, the corresponding standard error, and recommended instructional tier are reported for each of these five domains, as well as an overall composite score that represents student performance across the domain. Each domain is assessed by one or more subtests, which we describe in brief detail below (for additional details, including screenshots of the item types, see Istation, 2016).

- *Destreza fonológica y fonética [Phonemic and Phonological Awareness]*: Phonemic awareness refers to the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate individual sounds (or phonemes) in spoken words (National Reading Panel, 2000). Four types of items comprise the *Destreza fonológica y fonética* subtest: (1) *conversión grafema-fonema* [phoneme-grapheme conversion], (2) *conciencia fonética y silábica* [phoneme and syllable awareness], (3) *sonidos iniciales* [initial sounds], and (4) *unión de sílabas* [blending]. Phoneme-grapheme conversion items measure students' ability to identify the symbols that correspond to specific sounds of the Spanish language, including letters, syllables, vowel combinations, consonant clusters, and words. Phoneme and syllable awareness items measure students' ability to identify single sounds (letters or syllables) in grade-level appropriate words. Initial sound items require students to identify the beginning sound of words presented on the computer screen following the narrators instruction while blending items measure students' ability to identify blended phonemes or syllables presented orally.
- *Lectura con fluidez [Text Fluency]*: In this subtest, students are presented a passage of connected text with every seventh word omitted. Three options for each omitted word (blank) are provided and students are tasked with choosing the word that makes the most sense to complete the sentence. Students have two and a half minutes (2:30 min) to complete this maze task. Prior research indicates this task is highly correlated with measures of fluency and accuracy.
- *Vocabulario [Vocabulary]*: The Vocabulary subtest within the ISIP Español is comprised of two developmentally appropriate item types. *Vocabulario de lenguaje oral [Oral Vocabulary]* items are presented for students in the younger grades who likely have insufficient decoding skills to be able to read words presented on the computer screen. Instead, during the oral vocabulary subtest, four pictures are presented on the screen and orally identified by the narrator. The narrator then asks the student to identify the word that best illustrates the spoken word orally. The item structure for the *Vocabulario para lectura y escrita [Reading Vocabulary]* is similar, except a combination of word strategies (e.g., roots, prefixes, suffixes) are presented to the student using both pictures and words that appear in sets of four on the screen. Students are asked to respond to

questions that assess their understanding of different parts of word knowledge, such as word families (derivatives), word classifications, and synonyms.

- *Comprensión [Comprehension]*: Similarly, the Comprehension subtest is comprised of two developmentally appropriate tasks. The *Comprensión auditiva [Listening Comprehension]* subtest is designed to assess students' ability to listen, understand, and answer questions related to a story that is presented orally. Although a picture related to the short story is presented on the screen, no text appears as the narrator reads the story aloud. Once the narrator has finished reading the story, he/she then asks the student a question related to the story, and the student is presented with four pictures and is asked to choose the one that best answers the question. In contrast, the *Comprensión de lectura [Reading Comprehension]* subtest requires students to read a passage of connected narrative or expository text. Once the student has finished reading, he/she clicks a green button to indicate he/she has finished reading the passage and is then presented with a number of questions designed to elicit students' inferential and evidential thinking. Each question is accompanied by four response options and students are asked to identify the most appropriate response; kindergarten students select from pictures that represent each answer choice.

[ISIP Español Lectura Avanzada \(ISIP Español LA\)](#)

ISIP Español LA is a computerized adaptive test designed to provide teachers with tools for continuous progress monitoring of the early literacy skills in Grades 4-5. Similar to the *ISIP Español LT*, the *ISIP Español LA* is designed to assess five critical domains in Spanish reading: (1) phonemic and phonological awareness, (2) alphabetic understanding, (3) fluency with connected text, (4) vocabulary, and (5) comprehension. The same subtests described for the ISIP ER comprise the *ISIP Español LA*, although the tasks are more complex and require the application of more sophisticated literacy skills (e.g., multisyllabic words, prefixes and suffixes that students are likely to encounter in narrative and expository passages in Grade 4 and Grade 5 texts, etc.). Because reading comprehension is a more accurate representation of older students' comprehension skills, the *ISIP Español LA* includes the *Comprensión de Lectura* task but not the *Comprensión Auditiva* task.

FAST Assessments

For the purposes of this study, the FastBridge Early Reading Spanish (FB ER Spanish) and FastBridge CBMReading Spanish (FB CBM-R Spanish) served as the competitor's universal screening assessment that we used to collect additional criterion-related validity evidence for the *ISIP Español LT* and *ISIP Español LA* universal screening assessments. We describe these assessments (and their corresponding subtests) in the sections that follow.

In Table 4, we present the FastBridge subtests administered in this study, by season and grade level.

Table 4

FastBridge Administration Timeline (by Grade and Season)

FastBridge Assessment	Kindergarten		Grade 1		Grades 2-5	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Onset Sounds	X					
Letter Sounds	X	X				
Syllable	X	X	X	X		
Reading						
Word	X	X	X	X		
Segmenting						
Sight Words		X	X	X		
CBM-R					X	X
Spanish						

FastBridge Early Reading Spanish (FB ER Spanish)

Similar to the *ISIP Español LT*, the multiple subtests of FB ER Spanish are designed to assess students' development of critical foundational skills for learning to read in Spanish: (1) phonemic and phonological awareness, (2) alphabetic understanding, and (3) fluency with connected text. Three alternate forms are available for individual administration using either a paper-pencil or computer delivery format. In Figure 1 below we present a list of the 13 subtests that are available as part of the FB ER Spanish assessment system; however, in the sections that follow we describe and present technical adequacy information for only those subtests that were administered as part of our study:

Figure 1

FastBridge Early Reading Subtests

Subtest Name	Subtest Description
• Concepts of Print	• Demonstrate print awareness (e.g., proper page orientation, accurate print tracking, locate beginning/end of sentences)
• Onset Sounds	• Identify which picture begins with a particular sound
• Word Rhyming	• Identify picture that corresponds with a word that rhymes with a given word OR independently generate a word that rhymes with a given word
• Word Blending	• Blend phonemes (sounds) provided by test administrator to create word
• Word Segmenting	• Segment orally provided word into its individual phonemes
• Letter Names	• Identify correct names for uppercase and lowercase Spanish letters
• Letter Sounds	• Identify correct sounds for uppercase and lowercase Spanish letters
• Oral Repetition	• Repeat word-for-word sentence read aloud by test administrator

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllable Reading • Decodable Words • Sight Words • Curriculum-Based Reading | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read phonetically regular Spanish nonsense words of varying syllable lengths • Decode phonetically regular Spanish words • Identify 50 most high-frequency Spanish words • Read passages of connected text |
|--|---|

Spanish Concepts of Print: The goal of this untimed subtest is to assess the print awareness of students in grades PreKindergarten and Kindergarten by asking them to complete a series of print-awareness tasks. These tasks include: (a) page orientation, (b) identifying specified shapes/objects on a page (e.g., circle, letter, word, sentence, etc.), and (c) identifying a given word from two possible word options (e.g., *Mira estas dos palabras. Una es la palabra TORO y la otra es la palabra TORONJA. ¿Cuál de las dos es la palabra TORO? [Look at these two words. One is the word BULL and the other is the word GRAPEFRUIT. Which of the two is the word BULL?]*). The subtest ends when the student has responded to all 12 items or if the test administrator has had to discontinue the task; the task is discontinued if the student responds to the first 4 consecutive items incorrectly. One point is awarded for each correct response and zero points are awarded if the student points to another part of the page (other than that specified), provides an incorrect response, or provides no response. The following scores are reported for the Spanish Concepts of Print task: total items correct, percentage of items correct (accuracy), and number of items correct per minute. According to information reported on the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI) screening tools chart, median α for Kindergarten was 0.82 while split-half reliability was 0.86. This subtest was administered in our study as it is required to generate a FB ER Spanish Composite Score for PreKindergarten in Fall, Winter, and Spring, as well as Fall of Kindergarten.

Spanish Onset Sounds: During this task, which was designed to assess students' phonemic awareness skills, the test administrator presents the student with pages that contain four pictures, provides the word for each of the pictures, and asks the student to identify which picture begins with a particular sound (e.g., *This is baby, backpack, bear, and elephant. Which of these pictures begins with the sound /e/?*). The subtest is untimed but test administrators are expected to time the student during the administration of the subtest and record the amount of time it took the student to complete the task so that the students' rate of performance (items correct per minute) can be calculated. The subtest ends when the student has responded to all 16 items or if the administrator has had to discontinue the task; the task is discontinued if a student responds to the first four consecutive items incorrectly. One point is awarded for each correct onset sound provided and zero points are awarded if the student provides an incorrect sound or does not respond; if the student pauses for 5 seconds without responding the test administrator is directed to score the item as incorrect and proceed with the next item. The following scores are reported for the Spanish Onset Sounds task: total items, total items correct, accuracy, and items correct per minute. According to the technical adequacy information reported on the NCRTI tools chart, delayed test-retest reliability was $r = .48$ for Fall-Winter and Fall-Spring administrations, $\alpha = .87$ split-half reliability equaled .87. This subtest was administered as part of our study as it is required to generate a FB ER Spanish Composite Score in Winter and Spring for Winter for Kindergarten.

Word Segmenting Spanish: This subtest also assesses students' phonemic awareness skills in Spanish by asking them to complete the antithesis of the Word Blending subtest; in this task, the test administrator provides a spoken word and the student is asked to segment that word into its individual sounds (phonemes) (e.g., *¿Cuáles son los sonidos de la palabra 'mal'?*; /m/ /a/ /l/). This task is not timed but test administrators are expected to use a stopwatch or the timer embedded in the computer-delivery option to record the amount of time it took the student to respond to all 10 items. The task is discontinued if a student responds to the first four consecutive items incorrectly. One point is awarded for each correctly identified phoneme and zero points are awarded if the student makes any of the following errors: (a) provides incorrect words or sounds, (b) provides an incorrect vowel sound, (c) omits a sound, or (d) provides no response; if the student pauses for 5 seconds without responding the test administrator is directed to score the item as incorrect and provide the next item. On this subtest, it is possible for the student to earn partial credit by segmenting *some* but not all of the sounds in the spoken word into individual phonemes (e.g., If the student is given the word *gato* and segments in the following way: /ga/ /t/ /o/; in this word there are four phonemes, /g/ /a/ /t/ /o/ but the student only provided 3 segments). The following scores are reported for the Word Segmenting task: total items, total items correct, accuracy, and number of correct phoneme segments per minute. According to the technical adequacy information reported on the NCRTI tools chart, delayed test-retest reliability ranged from $r = .36 - .50$ for Grade 1, median $\alpha = .95$, and median split-half reliability = .98. Validity coefficients between the Word Segmenting subtest and the *Aprenda PrePrimario 2* ranged from $r = .54 - .60$ for Kindergarten and from $r = .11 - .18$ for Grade 1 (*Aprenda Primario 1*). This subtest was administered as part of our study as it is required to generate a FB ER Spanish Composite Score for the Winter and Spring of Kindergarten and for the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 1.

Letter Sounds Spanish: This subtest was designed to assess students' accuracy and automaticity identifying the sounds for Spanish letters (presented in lower case only). This subtest is timed and students have 1 minute to identify as many letter sounds as they can from a page with three sections of sounds; the first section includes unique letter sounds, the second section includes repeated letter sounds, and the third section includes letters with dual sounds. Test administrators are directed to have students complete the first two sections as needed until the 1 minute time is completed; completion of the third section is an optional way to receive an inventory of all known and unknown dual sounds. The task ends either when the 1 minute duration is complete or when he/she has identified sounds for all letters presented. If the student finishes before the 1 minute timing has ended, the system automatically adjusts the sounds per minute score accordingly. The task is discontinued if the student is unable to correctly identify any sounds within the first 10 letters. One point is awarded for each correctly identified letter sound and zero points are awarded if the student provides an incorrect response or provides no response. If the student hesitates for 3 seconds without responding the test administrator is directed to score the item as incorrect, to provide the letter sound, and have the student continue with the next letter. The following scores are reported for the Letter Sounds task: number of items attempted, number of correct letter sounds identified in one minute, accuracy, and a ratio of the total correct letter sounds/total sounds in one minute. According to the technical adequacy information reported on the NCRTI tools chart, delayed test-retest reliability ranged from $r = .43 - .44$, coefficient alpha ranged from $\alpha = .80 - .98$, and split-half reliability ranged from $\kappa = .84 - .99$. This subtest was

administered in our study as it is required to generate a FB ER Spanish Composite Score for Winter, and Spring test administrations in Kindergarten.

Syllable Reading Spanish: This subtest was designed to assess students' alphabetic understanding skills by measuring their ability to read phonetically regular pseudo-words, or words that are phonetically regular (i.e., follow the phoneme-grapheme correspondence rules of Spanish) but may not be real words. This task begins with two sample activities during which the test administrator models for the student how to read syllables. Once it is clear the student understand the task, the test administrator presents the student with a page of phonetically regular syllables and asks the student to do his/her best to read the syllables on the page from left to right. If the student starts with a different task (e.g., reading letter names, letter sounds, or telling a story), the test administrator is advised to pause the timer, redirect the student, and continue with the subtest administration. Timing for this one minute subtest begins when the student says the first syllable and ends either at the end of one minute or if the student reads all of the syllables before the minute has ended, in which case the test administrator stops the timer and selects the "Mark Last Response" button. This subtest is discontinued if the student is unable to identify any syllables correct in the first 10 syllables. One point is awarded for each syllable read correctly and zero points are awarded if the student reads a syllable incorrectly, substitutes the given syllable with another syllable, reverses or misreads the syllable, or pauses for 3 or more seconds between responses. The following scores are reported for the Syllable Reading Spanish subtest: total items attempted, number of correct syllables read, number of correct syllables read in 1 minute, and accuracy. This subtest was administered in our study because it is required to generate a FB ER Spanish Composite Score for the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grades Kindergarten, and 1.

Sight Words Spanish: This timed subtest is comprised of 50 of the most high-frequency words in Spanish. It is important to note that not all 50 words are decodable, as many high frequency words are not decodable; consequently, students are required to identify them with automaticity rather than using decoding strategies to read them. For this task, the test administrator places the page of sight words in front of the student and asks him/her to read the words from left to right; if the student does not know a word, the test administrator provides it for him/her. The one minute timing begins once the student reads the first word and ends either when the one minute has ended or if the student reads all of the words before the one minute has ended, in which case the test administrator stops the timer, and selects the "Mark Last Response" button. This subtest is discontinued if the student cannot identify any of the first 10 consecutive sight words correctly. One point is awarded for each sight word read correctly and zero points are awarded if the student omits, substitutes, reverses, or misreads the word or pauses for more than 3 seconds. The following scores are reported for the Sight Words Spanish subtest: total number of sight words read, total number of sight words read correctly, and accuracy. According to the technical adequacy information reported on the NCRTI tools chart, coefficient alpha for Kindergarten ranged from $\alpha = .83 - .98$, split-half reliability for Kindergarten ranged from $\kappa = .83 - .99$, and median concurrent validity with the Aprenda-3 equaled .61. This subtest was administered in our study because it is required to generate a FB ER Spanish Composite Score for the Spring of Kindergarten and Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 1.

Curriculum-Based Reading: This subtest is designed to assess students' fluency and accuracy with passages of connected text. Due to the complexity of the task and passages, this is one subtest for which the administration guidelines specify the test administrator should be fluent in Spanish. During the subtest, the test administrator presents a passage of connected text to the student, briefly introduces the passage, tells the student that his/her task is to read the passage from left to right, doing his/her best reading. For benchmark testing, the student is asked to read three passages. The timing for the one-minute subtest begins when the student reads the first word and the student is expected to read until the one-minute timing has ended; if the student finishes the passage before the one-minute has ended, the test administrator is directed to select the "Mark Last Response" button, which prompts the FAST system to adjust the calculation for words read per minute. The task is discontinued if the student is unable to read any words correctly in the first 10 consecutive words of the first passage; if the student is unable to identify any words correctly in the first passage, the remaining two passages are not administered. One point is awarded for each word read correctly while 0 points are awarded for the following types of errors: mispronunciations, added endings, word substitutions, omissions, word reversals, and hesitations of 3 seconds or longer; repeated words, insertions, and self-corrections are not counted as errors. The following scores are reported for the FB-CBMR Spanish subtest: Total Words Read, Words Read Correctly (WRC), WRC per minute, and accuracy. This subtest was administered to students in Grades 1-5 in this study as it is required to generate a FB Spanish Composite Score from Winter of Grade 1 onward.

Criterion Assessments

The criterion assessments administered included the *Aprenda*, which we administered to participating students in Grades K-5. In addition, we requested that schools participating in the study share with us the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading scores for students in Grades 3-5.

[*Aprenda-3*](#)

The *Aprenda-3* (*La pureba de logros en español*, Tercera edición), is a standardized academic achievement test of K-12 Spanish-speaking students in their native language. Modeled after the Stanford Achievement Test 10th edition (SAT-10), the *Aprenda-3* is a comprehensive academic achievement test is comprised of nine subtests designed to assess Spanish-speaking students' skills in the following areas:

Figure 3
Aprenda-3 Subtests

Content Area	Content Description
Reading*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Emphasize a balanced approach to reading development that includes phonemic awareness, decoding, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension (at appropriate grade levels)• Uses authentic reading selections from Spanish children's literature

Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses student proficiency in fundamental concepts and processes of problem-solving and aligned with the <i>NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics</i> (2000)
Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses student achievement in applying effective writing skills, including proficiency in language mechanics (e.g., capitalization, punctuation, usage) and language expression (e.g., sentence structure, prewriting and editing skills)
Spelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses objectives based on phonetic and structural principles taught at each grade level
Listening Comprehension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses vocabulary and listening comprehension skills by including items that assess students' knowledge of word meanings (vocabulary) and listening comprehension with dictated selections and questions
Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses student understanding of life, physical, and earth science concepts using questions that elicit problem-solving and inquiry
Social Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses student understanding in the areas of history, geography, civics and government, and economics using items that are aligned with the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) <i>Curriculum Standards for Social Studies</i> and state content standards

Because the *Aprenda-3* was used as a criterion-referenced assessment of reading in this study, we administered the reading subtests identified by the publisher to be the most appropriate for each grade level (K-5), using publisher recommendations to help us determine which levels of the Aprenda 3 to administer at each grade level. In Figure 4 we summarize each reading subtest administered, by grade level and test level, and follow this with a more detailed description of each reading subtest.

Figure 4
Aprenda-3 Test Levels, Grade Levels, and Subtests

Aprenda 3 Test Level	Grade Level(s)	Reading Subtests
PrePrimario 2	KG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sonidas y Letras (Sounds & Letters) Lectura de Palabras (Word Reading) Lectura de Oraciones (Sentence Reading)
Primario 1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lectura de Oraciones (Sentence Reading) Vocabulario (Reading Vocabulary) Comprensión de Lectura (Reading Comprehension)
Primario 2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulario (Reading Vocabulary) Comprensión de Lectura (Reading Comprehension)
Primario 3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulario (Reading Vocabulary) Comprensión de Lectura (Reading Comprehension)

Intermedio 1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulario (Reading Vocabulary) • Comprensión de Lectura (Reading Comprehension)
Intermedio 2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulario (Reading Vocabulary) • Comprensión de Lectura (Reading Comprehension)

Although each subtest and set of items within a subtest is untimed, guidelines for the minimum time students should be allowed to complete each set of items are provided within the administration manual. The majority of item sets are untimed (unless indicated otherwise). Each set of items within a subtest is prefaced by one or two examples in which the test administrator describes the task for students, students complete the task, the test administrator provides corrective feedback (as needed), and students have an opportunity to ask any questions needed to clarify their understanding of the task.

Sonidas y Letras [Sounds and Letters]: This subtest assesses student's phonological awareness skills by presenting them with orally dictated words, pictures that correspond to those words, and asking students to identify:(a) similarities or differences in spoken words, (b) the initial sound (onset) in a given word, (c) the rime, or vowel and remaining consonants in a given word, (d) words, and (e) words that begin with a given sound (or sounds).

- In the first set of items (1-6), the test administrator dictates two words orally and directs students to listen to determine whether the words sound similar or different. If the two words sound similar, students are told to fill in the circle under the square; if the two words sound different, students are directed to fill in the circle under the circle and the triangle, because the words sound different.
- In the second set of items (7-12), students are directed to look at a given picture, to look at three pictures next to the target picture, and identify which of the three pictures (distractors) begins with the same sound as the object pictured in the target image. As illustrated in *Ejemplo C* (Example C), *Primero ven el dibujo de la bicicleta. Al lado de la bicicleta ven dibujos de una guitarra, una biblioteca, y un pingüino. Alguno de estos dibujos comienza con el mismo sonido que bicicleta. ¿Cuál es la respuesta?* (First look at the picture of the bicycle. Next to the bicycle see pictures of a *guitarra* (guitar), a *biblioteca* (library), and a *pingüino* (penguin). One of these pictures starts with the same sound as bicycle. What is the answer?). These items assess students' ability to correctly identify the initial consonant/consonant blend, or onset, in a given word.
- In the third set of items (13-18), students are directed to look at a given picture, to look at three pictures next to the target picture, and identify which of the three pictures (distractors) ends with the same sound as the object pictured in the target image. As illustrated in *Ejemplo E* (Example E), *Pongan su marcador debajo de la primera fila, la que tiene la hornilla. Asegúranse de que puedan ver los círculos debajo de los dibujos. Aquí ven los dibujos de una estampilla, una trompeta, y un rodillo. ¿Cuál termina con el mismo sonido que hornilla?* (Put your marker under the first row, the one that has the *hornilla* (burner). Make sure that you can see the circles under the pictures. Now look at the pictures of a *estampilla* (stamp), *trompeta* (trumpet), and a *rodillo* (knee). Which one ends with the same sound as *hornilla*? These items assess students' ability to correctly identify the rime, or the vowel and final consonants following the onset.

- In the fourth set of items (19-21), the test administrator dictates a word orally for students and asks them to identify which of the following is a word. As illustrated in *Ejemplo G* (Example G), *Pongan su marcador debajo de la primera fila, la que tiene el reloj. ¿Cuál de las siguientes es una palabra? Llenen el círculo debajo de su respuesta. ¿Cuál círculo llenaron? Sí. Así es. Pinta es una palabra. Deben haber llenado el primer círculo debajo de p-i-n-t-a, porque ésa es la respuesta correcta.* (Put your marker under the first row, the one that has a clock. Which of the following is a word? Fill in the circle under your response. Which circle did you fill in? Yes. That's correct. You should have filled in the first circle under *p-i-n-t-a* because this is the correct response.)
- In the fifth set of items (22-24), the test administrator dictates a word orally for students and asks students to identify which word contains a given sound. As illustrated in *Ejemplo H* (Example H), *Pongan su marcador debajo de la primera fila, la que tiene un sol. Llenen el círculo debajo de la palabra que tiene la letra b en ella. ¿Cuál círculo llenaron? Si. Así es. Deben haber llenado el círculo debajo de la segunda palabra, sabe, porque esta palabra tiene la letra b en ella.* (Put your marker under the first row, the one that has a sun. Fill in the circle under the word that has a *b* in it. Which circle did you fill in? Yes. That's correct. You should have filled in the circle under the second word, *sabe*, because this word has a *b* in it. These items assess student's ability to correctly identify a spoken sound in a given word.)
- In the sixth set of items (25-28), students are asked to identify the picture whose object begins with the group of letters that appear in the box. As illustrated in *Ejemplo I* (Example I), *Pongan su marcador debajo de la primera fila, la que tiene el forro, un corral, y un cuadro. Asegúranse de que puedan ver los círculos debajo de los dibujos. Miren las letras en el cuadro. Llenen el círculo debajo del dibujo que comienza con el grup de letras que están en cuadro. ¿Forro, corral, o cuadro?* (Put your marker under the first row, the one that has a *forro*, a *corral*, and a *cuadro*. Make sure that you can see the circles under the pictures. Look at the letters in the box. Fill in the circle under the picture that begins with the letters that are in the box. *Forro, corral, or cuadro?*)
- In the seventh set of items (29-31), students are asked to identify the picture whose object begins with a set of given letters. As illustrated in *Ejemplo J* (Example J), *Pongan su marcadro debajo de la primera file, donde ven el plátano, una Paloma, y una piñata. Asegúránse de que puedan ver los círculos debajo de los dibujos. Miren las letras en el cuadro. ¿Qué dibujo comienza con el grup de letras que ven? ¿Plátano, paloma, o piñata? Llenen el círculo debajo del dibujo que comienza con las letras que ven.* (Put your marker under the first row, where you see a *plátano* (banana), a *paloma* (dove), and a *piñata*. Look at the letters in the box. Which picture begins with the group of letters that you see? *Plátano, paloma, or piñata?* Fill in the circle under the picture that begins with the letters you see. These items assess students' ability to identify the sounds at the beginning of a word.)
- In the eighth set of items (32-40), students are asked to identify the group of letters that correspond to the beginning sounds in a word that corresponds to a pictured object. As illustrated in *Ejemplo K* (Example K), *Luego van a llenar el círculo debajo del grupo de letras que es el primer sonido en la palabra. Pongan su marcador debajo de la primera fila, la que tiene el ratón. Asegúránse de que puedan ver los círculos debajo de los grupos de letras. Miren el grupo de letras que está junto al dibujo del ratón. Llenen el círculo debajo del grupo de letras que es el primer sonido en ratón.* (Now you are going

to fill in the circle under the group of letters that are the first sound in a word. Put your marker under the first row, the one with the *ratón* (mouse). Make sure that you can see the circles under the groups of letters. Look at the group of letters that are with the picture of the *ratón* (mouse). Fill in the circle under the group of letters that is the first sound in *ratón* (mouse). These items assess students' ability to isolate and identify the beginning sounds in a given word.

Lectura de Palabras [Word Reading]: This subtest assesses students' alphabetic understanding, or phonics, skills, by asking them to read words.

- In the first set of items (1-14), students are directed to look at three pictures and the test administrator says the name of one of the pictures. Students are asked to find the picture they think says (or corresponds to) the word that was said.
- In the second set of items (15-22), students are asked to look at a picture and two rows of word. Each row contains word that say something about the picture and students are directed to find the word that says something about the picture. As illustrated in *Ejemplo B* (Example B), *Al lado del dibujo hay dos filas con palabras. En cada fila hay una palabra que dice algo acerca del dibujo. Miren las palabras en la primer fila al lado del dibujo; luego encuentren la palabra que dice algo acerca del dibujo. ¿Cuál palabra encontraron? Sí. Así es. El círculo debajo de la segunda palabra, salta, ha sido llenado para mostrar que ésa es la respuesta correcta. Ahora miren las palabras en la segunda fila al lado del dibujo. Encuentren la otra palabra que dice algo acerca del dibujo. Llenen el círculo debajo de su respuesta.* (Next to the picture are two rows of words. In each row there is one word that says something about the picture. Look at the words in the first row next to the picture; then, find the word that says something about the picture. Which word did you find? Yes. That's correct. The circle under the second word, *salta* (jumps) has been filled to show that this is the correct response. Now, look at the words in the second row next to the picture. Find the other word that says something about the picture. Fill in the circle under your response.) These items assess student's ability to read words by requiring them to read words to identify the one that corresponds to a pictured object.
- In the third set of items (23-30) the test administrator dictates a word orally and students are directed to identify the corresponding printed word from a set of three words (one correct word and two distractors). These items assess students' phoneme-grapheme correspondence knowledge and ability to read words by requiring them to identify a written word that corresponds with a spoken word.

Lectura de Oraciones [Sentence Reading]: This subtest assesses students' comprehension skills by having them identify pictures that correspond to parts of a story that has been read aloud orally by the test administrator.

- In the first set of items (1-8), the test administrator tells students that he/she is going to read part of a story, the sentence that appears in their test booklet. Students are directed to fill in the circle under the picture that depicts the part of the story that was read aloud.
- In the second set of items (9-30), the test administrator reads a sentence aloud for students and students are directed to fill in the circle under the picture that corresponds with the sentence. Depending on the test level, this subtest may be timed.

Vocabulario [Vocabulary]: This subtest assesses students' knowledge of word meanings, including synonyms and polysemous (multiple meaning) words.

- In the first set of items (1-18), students are presented with words and asked to identify words that say the same thing, or mean almost the same thing, as the given word. As illustrated in *Ejemplo A* (Example A), students are directed to *escogerán la palabra que es lo mismo, o casi lo mismo, que la palabra subrayada. Brincar es lo mismo que – saltar...decir...buscar...o perder. Llenan el círculo al lado de la palabra que decir lo mismo, o casi lo mismo, que la palabra subrayada, brincar* (You will find the word that is the same, or almost the same, as the underlined word. Jump is the same as – jump...say...look...or lose. Fill in the circle next to the word that means the same thing as, or almost the same as, the underlined word, jump).
- In the second set of items (19-24), the test administrator provides a vocabulary word in the context of a student. Students are then directed to read the question next to the box and identify in which sentence does the given word have the same meaning it did in the previous sentence.
- In the third set of items (25-30), the test administrator presents a sentence orally with a vocabulary word in context and students are asked to identify what the specific words means within the given context

Comprensión de Lectura [Reading Comprehension]: This subtest assesses students' reading comprehension by having students read short passages and respond to questions related to the passage.

[State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness – Reading \(STAAR-Reading\)](#)

Students in Grades 3-5 attending one of our participating Texas schools participated in the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness in Spring 2018. According to the test content blueprint, three domains (or reporting categories) comprise the STAAR-Reading assessment: (1) understanding across genres, (2) understanding/analysis of literary text, and (3) understanding/analysis of informational texts. The content standards assessed are categorized as readiness standards and supporting standards and include skills such as reading/vocabulary development, reading/comprehension of literary text, and reading/comprehension skills (e.g., readiness standards for Grade 3) and reading strategies and reading/comprehension of theme and genre, poetry, literary nonfiction, and sensory languages (e.g., supporting standards for Grade 3). Although the exact number of items by reporting categories, across grade levels 60% - 70% of the items assess readiness standards and 30% - 40% of the items assess supporting standards; all items were multiple-choice items with one correct response and three distractors. Because students in the study took the STAAR-Reading in either English or Spanish (depending on determinations made by school- or district-level Language Proficiency Assessment Committees) we have conducted our analyses separately for each language (i.e., English or Spanish).

[Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers \(PARCC\)](#)

Three units comprise the PARCC English Language Arts/Literacy assessments for Grades 3-5, each of which has a different focus. According to the most recent PARCC test content specification blueprint, as part of Unit 1 students are asked to complete a literary analysis task, as

part of Unit 2 students are asked to complete a research simulation task, and as part of Unit 3 students are asked to complete a Narrative Writing task (PARCC, 2017). Depending on the grade level, students may also be asked to respond to a short passage set, long passage set, or paired passage set that aligns with the overall task for the unit. Across the units and tasks the following reading and writing skills and subskills are assessed: reading literary text, informational text, and vocabulary; written expression, knowledge of language and conventions. 40 items comprise the Grade 3 test and 56 items comprise the test for Grades 4 and 5; the number of Evidence-Based Selected Response (ESBR), Technology-Enhanced Constructed Response (TECR), and Prose Constructed Response (PCR) item types also varies by grade level. Average total score reliability estimates for Grades 3-5 ranged from 0.85-0.90 for both administration formats (paper-pencil and computer-based), while the average reliabilities of the claim and sub-claim scores range from 0.59 – 0.85 (Pearson, 2018). Average intercorrelations and reliabilities ranged from 0.62-0.99 for Grade 3, 0.54-0.99 for Grade 4, and 0.54-0.99 for Grade 5, providing moderate-strong validity evidence for the internal structure of the PARCC ELA/L test for each grade level.

Hiring and Training of Data Collectors

To support standardized administration of the measures, we hired data collectors who were proficient (if not native) Spanish speakers and systematically trained them to administer each of the assessments that were not collected by school personnel (i.e., FB ER Spanish, FB CBMR Spanish, and Aprenda-3). In the sections that follow, we briefly describe our process for recruiting and hiring qualified data collectors, summarize data collector qualifications, and describe our efforts to ensure that data collectors were trained to administer the assessments with fidelity.

Recruiting and Hiring Data Collectors

Candidate recruitment efforts began with the development of a list of qualifications for the position. In particular, we wanted to make sure that prospective data collectors were fluent (if not native) Spanish speakers, had experience working with children, had experience using Microsoft Excel, and were available to administer the assessments during the school day. We drafted a flyer that included a description of the project, general duties, and list of qualifications that we distributed to (a) students pursuing graduate degrees in Education and/or Spanish majors at a local university (b) several faculty in the World Languages department at that same university.

Data Collector Summary. Based on the recruitment and hiring processes described previously, we hired 8 data collectors (external to our organization) during the Winter test administration. Of these 8, all reported they were fluent in Spanish, 1 reported she had an Associate's degree, 3 (37.50%) reported they had a Bachelor's degree, and 1 reported she had a Ph.D.; of those with advanced degrees, 3 (37.50%) reported they had completed a Spanish major as part of their post-secondary education. Data collection efforts were supplemented by members of our project team and the Research in Mathematics Education (RME) unit as needed to administer the FastBridge assessments in the Winter to all participating students.

Because we knew data collection efforts would be more intense in the Spring (as we were tripling the number of assessments that needed to be given), we made a concerted effort to

recruit and hire more data collectors to support this study. As a result of these efforts we hired 21 data collectors to help with the Spring data collection; of these 21, 6 were retained from the pool of Winter data collectors and 15 were new hires. Based on the qualifications and experience data reported by these data collectors, 15 (71.43%) reported on their resumes that they were fluent in Spanish. With respect to their prior educational experiences, 1 (4.76%) indicated her highest degree earned was a high school diploma, 2 of our data collectors (9.52%) had earned Associate's degrees, 8 (38.09%) had earned Bachelor's degrees, and 5 (23.81%) had earned Master's degree (these data were not reported for 4 data collectors). Six data collectors (28.57%) indicated they had completed an education major (e.g., Elementary Education, Child Learning & Development) or education-related teacher licensure endorsements (e.g., Elementary Bilingual/ESL certification) and 7 data collectors (33.33%) reported having prior experience working with children and/or conducting observations in classroom settings.

Data Collector Training

Prior to being scheduled to administer assessments with students in the schools, all data collectors had to complete administration and scoring trainings, demonstrate their proficiency with the standardized administration directions, and demonstrate interrater reliability for the assessments that were not administered in schools (i.e., FastBridge and Aprenda). In the sections that follow we briefly describe the training and certification processes for each assessment.

FastBridge ER and CBM-R Spanish: As part of their online system, FAST includes video demonstrations of administration and scoring, practice activities that allow users to practice administering and scoring, quizzes, and certification activities for each subtest. Although the quizzes and certification activities are currently not available online for the FB ER subtests, we were able to conduct certification check-outs with each data collector using the Observing and Rating Administrator Accuracy (ORAA) checklists available as part of the FAST system. These checklists require the observer to indicate whether the test administrator followed the specified administration procedures, provided the standardized administration directions, and (for timed subtests) operates the stopwatch as directed.

To simulate the required certification activities, the Project Coordinators conducted individual check-outs with each data collector in which they acted as the student and performed the tasks associated with each subtest while the data collector scored each subtest using the responses provided. Project Coordinators used scripted performance with pre-specified errors, hesitations, self-corrects, etc. for each subtest as a key against which data collector scoring could be evaluated. To "pass" the check-outs and be approved to help with data collection, each data collector had to have demonstrated at least 90% agreement with the scripted performance exhibited by the Project Coordinators; if data collectors did not demonstrate at least 90% agreement they were asked to review the training materials again and schedule another check-out with a Project Coordinator. All data collectors met the certification requirements to administer the FB ER-Spanish and CBMR-Spanish assessments prior to administering these assessments with students in the schools. The eight data collectors who supported data collection efforts in the Winter and the Spring were required to complete a refresher training and a second set of check-outs with the Project Coordinators in the Spring.

Aprenda-3. The Aprenda-3 was the only test we administered that was not accompanied by publisher-developed training materials. Consequently, we developed our own training materials that focused on the three over-arching areas: (1) a broad overview of the structure and subtests that comprise the different levels of the Aprenda-3 tests, (2) general administration guidelines, and (3) specific subtest administration procedures. As part of the broad overview, we provided data collectors with an orientation to the different reading domains and skills assessed by the Aprenda-3, the subtest designed to assess these skills, and the corresponding grade levels. For example, skills such as alphabetic understanding and decoding are measured by the Word Reading subtest of the Aprenda-3 in Grades K-2. The general administration guidelines section of the training focused on what data collectors would need to do in classrooms to help prepare students to take the test, including making sure students had all of the required materials for testing (e.g., test booklets, pencils, etc.) and that their testing environment was free of distractions, and guidelines for which text in the Administration Manual to read aloud to students to administer each subtest.

Because each Aprenda-3 subtest includes multiple practice activity and all language used to introduce and describe tasks, and to provide affirmative and corrective feedback is included in the Administration Manual, this section of the training was designed to walk data collectors through the Administration Manual and provide an orientation to the structure of each subtest, including an explicit emphasis on the number of modeled examples data collectors would be expected to provide. Following this overview, data collectors were directed to work in pairs/small groups to practice reading through the administration directions, providing affirmative and corrective feedback as necessary, and to answer questions. This training lasted approximately 1 hour. Following the training, data collectors worked with Project Coordinators to complete their Aprenda-3 administration check-out to ensure they were comfortable with the structure of the subtests, with reading the script provided for each of the modeled examples, and providing affirmative or corrective feedback as needed; these check-outs lasted approximately 20 minutes.

Analyses

Generalizability of the Sample

To determine the generalizability of the sample, the sample characteristics were compared to the overall demographic characteristics for each participating state. In addition, we report the base rates of risk for students in our sample by grade level, criterion assessment, and threshold for proficiency (i.e., proficiency defined as performing above the 15th percentile or above the 40th percentile).

Classification Accuracy

With respect to the classification accuracy analyses, we present the required indices: (a) base rate of risk of children requiring intervention, (b) sensitivity, (c) specificity, (d) positive predictive power, (e) negative predictive power, (f) accuracy, and (g) Area Under the Curve, as well as (h) specificity when sensitivity is held constant at levels of .70, .80, and .90). We describe each of these analyses conducted for this study in more detail below. All analyses were performed in R (R Core Team, 2016).

As previously noted, reliability estimates were not calculated for this study. These are generated as part of the Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT) scoring procedures.

Classification accuracy (also known as conditional probability analyses or diagnostic efficiency) refers to the extent to which a universal screening assessment accurately discriminates between categories of students based on their performance on some outcome (or criterion) assessment (Glover & Albers, 2007). Student performance on the *ISIP Español LT* and *ISIP Español LA* was categorized as “at-risk” and “not at-risk” based on percentile ranks, as determined by Istation. Students who were identified as needing Tier 2 or Tier 3 instructional supports were considered “at-risk” while those identified as needing Tier 1 instructional supports were considered “not at-risk”. For this study, classification accuracy of the *ISIP Español LT* (PreK-2) and *ISIP Español LA* (3-5) administered in Fall, Winter, and Spring was calculated using four criterion assessments:

Table 5
Classification accuracy analyses of ISIP Español assessments with criterion assessments, by grade level

Grade	Aprenda	STAAR (ENG or SP)	PARCC
K	X		
1	X		
2	X		
3	X	TX	NM
4	X	TX	NM
5	X	TX	NM

NOTE: Texas students in Grades 3-5 took the STAAR Reading assessment in either English or Spanish

Although we anticipate that the classification accuracy of the *ISIP Español* assessments will vary by season (Fall, Winter, Spring) because students were receiving instruction and should, theoretically, improve, we opted to calculate classification accuracy using *ISIP Español* data from each season because we believe there is value in understanding the extent to which the assessments can accurately discriminate between students who will or will not pass a criterion assessment administered later in the school year. For the two criterion assessments available for commercial use –*Aprenda-3* (Grades K-5) – we conducted two sets of classification accuracy analyses using the following percentiles:

- **15th percentile:** Students who performed at or below the 15th percentile were classified as “did not meet proficiency” while students who performed above the 15th percentile were classified as “met proficiency”. These percentiles were derived from normative information provided by the test developer using scale scores.
- **40th percentile:** Students who performed at or below the 40th percentile were classified as “did not meet proficiency” while students who performed above the 40th percentile were classified as “met proficiency”. These percentiles were derived from normative information provided by the test developers using scale scores.

For the two state-level standardized summative assessments of reading – STAAR (TX; Grades 3-5) and PARCC (NM; Grades 3-5) – we consulted the standards for achievement published by the respective state departments of education to identify the proficiency levels associated with passing or not passing each state assessment. Students were classified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” using the following criteria:

- STAAR: Students who performed at Level 1 (*Does Not Meet*) were classified as “did not meet proficiency” while students who performed at Levels 2, 3, or 4 (*Approaches, Meets, or Exceeds*, respectfully) were classified as “met proficiency”.
- PARCC: Students who performed at Level 1 (*Did Not Yet Meet Expectations*) and Level 2 (*Partially Met Expectations*) were classified as “did not meet proficiency” while students who performed at Levels 3, 4, or 5 (*Approached Expectations, Met Expectations, or Exceeded Expectations*, respectively) were classified as “met proficiency”.

For each of these assessments, we calculated the following statistics (described in no particular order of precedence or importance):

- False Positive (FP) rate: The proportion of “met proficiency” students incorrectly identified as students who “did not meet proficiency” (also known as Type I error). For example, the proportion of students identified by ISIP Español as students who “did not meet proficiency” who were identified as “met proficiency” on the Aprenda-3 (or any of the other criterion measures). In other words, an incorrect classification of “did not meet proficiency” with respect to the criterion measure.
- False Negative (FN) rate: The proportion of “did not meet proficiency” students incorrectly identified as students who “met proficiency” (also known as Type II error). For example, the proportion of students identified by ISIP Español as students who “met proficiency” who were identified as students who “did not meet proficiency” on the Aprenda-3 (or any of the other criterion measures). In other words, an incorrect classification of “met proficiency” with respect to the criterion measure.
- Sensitivity (Sn): The proportion of “did not met proficiency” students correctly identified as students who “did not meet proficiency”, also known as the True Positive (TP) rate. For example, the proportion of students identified by *ISIP Español* as students who “did not meet proficiency” who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* (or any of the other criterion measures). In other words, a correct classification of students who “did not meet proficiency” with respect to the criterion measure.
- Specificity (Sp): The proportion of “met proficiency” students correctly identified as students who “met proficiency”, also known as the True Negative (TN) rate. For example, the proportion of students identified by *ISIP Español* as “met proficiency” who were identified as students who “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* (or any of the other criterion measures). In other words, a correct classification of students who “met proficiency” with respect to the criterion measure. In addition to reporting the specificity at the calculated sensitivity rate, we also report specificity when sensitivity is held constant at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90 for each criterion assessment.
- Positive Predictive Value (PPV): The proportion of students who truly “did not meet proficiency” of all students identified as students who “did not meet proficiency”, also known as precision. For example, all of the students identified as students who “did not meet proficiency” on both *ISIP Español* and the *Aprenda-3* (or any of the other criterion

measures), the PPV is the proportion of students who are identified as students who “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* (or any of the other criterion measures).

- Negative Predictive Value (NPV): The proportion of students who truly “met proficiency” of all students identified as students who “met proficiency”. For example, all of the students identified as students who “met proficiency” on both *ISIP Español* and the *Aprenda-3* (or any of the other criterion measures), the NPV is the proportion of students who are identified as those who “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* (or any of the other criterion measures).
- Accuracy: The proportion of correctly identified students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency”. For example, the accuracy of *ISIP Español* reflects the proportion of students who were correctly identified as students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” with respect to their performance on the criterion measure.
- Area Under the Curve (AUC): The probability that performance on a screening assessment correctly classifies a student as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the criterion assessment. There is variability in the acceptable criteria for convincing evidence for AUC. Kettler et al. (2014) notes that AUC values between .60 and .80 are moderate and values equal to or exceeding .80 are considered high and indicative of strong universal screening assessments. For each AUC value, we also report the upper and lower bounds of the 95% confidence interval (CI).

Validity Evidence

Criterion-related evidence for validity should also be considered when evaluating universal screening assessments because this type of evidence provides an indicator of the extent to which a student’s performance on the universal screening assessment is associated with his/her performance on a criterion-referenced assessment, such as a norm-referenced test or state accountability test (Johnson, Jenkins, Petscher, & Catts, 2009). Predictive-related evidence for validity examines the relation between performance on the universal screening assessment and the criterion-referenced assessment when administered at some point in the future (e.g., Fall performance on the universal screening assessment with Spring performance on the criterion-referenced assessment). Concurrent-related evidence for validity examines the relation between performance on the universal screening assessment and the criterion-referenced assessment(s) when administered at the same point in time (e.g., Spring). Kline (2000) proposes that coefficients of approximately $r = .75$ or greater provide strong evidence for concurrent-related validity evidence, correlations of $r = .40 - .50$ serve as moderate evidence for concurrent-related validity evidence, and correlations of $r = .30 - .40$ serve as moderate indicators of evidence for predictive validity.

As part of this study, we collected concurrent- and predictive-related validity evidence for the *ISIP Español* assessments. Concurrent-related validity evidence for *ISIP Español* was collected in the Winter with FB ER Spanish and FB CBM-R Spanish and with each of the assessments administered at the Spring – FB ER Spanish, FB CBMR Spanish, *Aprenda-3* (Grades K-5), STAAR (Grades 3-5), and PARCC (Grades 3-5). Coefficients were calculated for the overall scale scores (or composite scores) for each assessment, as well as for the subtests. Predictive-related validity evidence for the Fall and Winter administrations of *ISIP Español* were also collected relative to the five criterion assessments.

Fidelity of Administration and Scoring

In addition to ensuring that data collectors received the training needed to successfully follow the standardized administration procedures required for each test (e.g., FB-ER Spanish, FB-CBMR Spanish, and Aprenda-3), we also collected fidelity of assessment administration and scoring data for a set of students in each classroom, grade level, and school. For most assessments, these fidelity checks consisted of (a) using the publisher-provided fidelity checklist to observe administration of the assessment and (b) shadow-scoring. For shadow-scoring, the “primary” data collector working with a student served as the primary assessor responsible for providing the directions for how to complete the task, modeling tasks for students (as appropriate), and answering any student questions, administering the test, recording student responses, and tracking the administration time (when applicable); at the same time, a veteran data collector or member of the project team served as the “expert” who also tracked the administration time and also scored student responses. Having two assessors score student responses allowed us to calculate inter-rater reliability coefficients as an index of the magnitude of the agreement in scoring between the two assessors.

We present the results of our fidelity of administration and scoring procedures for the FastBridge assessments in Table 6. Specifically, we report the number of students who were assessed at each time point, the number (and percentage) of fidelity checks conducted, the number of instances in which two assessors co-scored a student, and the level of inter-rater reliability for that FastBridge assessment and grade level.

Table 6
Fidelity Results for FastBridge

	Grade	N	Checks Conducted	Checks Co-Scored	r
FastBridge ER (Winter)	K	204	22 (10.8%)	9	0.99
	1	167	17 (10.2%)	6	0.83
(Winter)	1	168	17 (10.1%)	7	0.99
	2	247	21 (8.5%)	12	0.99
	3	255	33 (12.9%)	13	0.99
	4	274	21 (7.7%)	13	0.98
	5	215	20 (9.3%)	15	0.98
FastBridge ER (Spring)	K	198	12 (6.1%)	12	0.92
	1	160	9 (5.6%)	9	-0.40
(Spring)	1	160	9 (5.6%)	9	0.99
	2	241	20 (8.3%)	20	0.99
	3	248	14 (5.6%)	14	0.99
	4	270	24 (8.9%)	24	0.99
	5	214	14 (6.5%)	14	0.99

It is also worth noting that administration of the *ISIP Español* assessments, *STAAR Reading* (English and Spanish), and *PARCC* was conducted by classroom teachers or other support staff in schools. Consequently, it was not possible to collect fidelity regarding the standardized administration and scoring procedures for these assessments.

Results and Discussion

Generalizability

For the purposes of this report, generalizability refers to the extent to which the analytic sample for the study was comparable to the population of the participating states and the national population. In Table 7 we present data for our analytic sample compared to the demographic data for Texas (2016-2017), New Mexico (2016-2017), and the nation (2015-2016).

Table 7

Comparison of demographic data for participating sample, states, and United States

Demographic Group	Sample	Texas ^a	New Mexico ^b	United States ^c
Ethnicity				
Hispanic/Latino	96.30%	52.42%	61.30%	24.90%
Not Hispanic/Latino	1.80%	47.58%	38.70%	75.10%
Race				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	20.95%	0.40%	10.70%	1.01%
Asian	-	4.20%	1.30%	4.99%
Black/African American	0.13%	12.60%	2.30%	15.46%
Hispanic/Latino	63.53%	52.40%	61.40%	25.89%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	-	0.10%	-	0.35%
Two or More Races	-	2.20%	-	3.42%
White	13.79%	28.10%	24.20%	48.49%
Gender				
Male	49.60%		51.20%	51.39%
Female	48.50%		48.80%	48.61%
Special Services				
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	88.79%	59.00%	74.10%	49.75%
Special Education	6.03%	8.80%	15.70%	11.61%
Bilingual Program				
English as a Second Language	3.45%	18.90%	13.60%	
Program				
Limited English Proficient	94.23%			7.32%

a: Texas Education Agency (2017); b: New Mexico Public Education Department (2017); c: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (2015-2016)

Note: The TEA reports % of students in bilingual/ESL programs (18.80%), but not LEP

Examination of the demographic data reported in Table 7 indicates what while the sample is comparable to the national and state population with respect to gender, the percentage of students in different racial/ethnic groups and receiving special services varies considerably from the state

and national data. With respect to race/ethnicity, the percentage of students who were Hispanic/Latino in our sample were more comparable to the percentages of Hispanic/Latino students in the participating states; the difference from the national percentage is not surprising given our purposeful recruiting of Hispanic/Latino students who spoke Spanish as their native language for participation in this study. Consequently, the significant overrepresentation of students identified as Limited English Proficient in our sample (compared to the state and national percentages) is also not surprising; our sample had approximately 12.8 times as many LEP students (94.23%) as the percentage of students identified as LEP in the United States (7.32%). Although slight differences in the data may be created, in part, by the fact that some entities use the term *English Learner* while others use the term *Limited English Proficient*, data reported by the Texas Education Agency differentiates between students who are identified as LEP versus those who participated in an English as a Second Language (ESL) or Bilingual program.

Additional differences between the sample and the state and national populations include (1) a lower percentage of students in our sample were identified as receiving Special Education services (approximately 1.5 to 2.5 times fewer students), and (b) a greater percentage of students in our sample were identified as receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch (88.79%) than students in the national sample (49.75%). The overrepresentation of students in our sample receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch (compared to the state and national samples) is not surprising, given that, on average, more Hispanic/Latino children under the 18 live in poverty compared to students from other demographics subgroups (Krogstad, 2014). Thus, the sample is comparable with the state and national populations for most demographic variables, with the exception of the percentage of Limited English Proficient students or students receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch.

We present the base rates of risk for participating students by grade level, assessment, and threshold for proficiency in Figure 5.

Figure 5

Base Rates of Risk by Grade Level, Criterion Assessment, and Proficiency Threshold

Grade	Assessment	15 th Percentile	40 th Percentile
K	Aprenda-3	0.02	0.20
1	Aprenda-3	0.04	0.11
2	Aprenda-3	0.04	0.17
3	Aprenda-3	0.03	0.15
4	Aprenda-3	0.07	0.29
5	Aprenda-3	0.11	0.41

Classification Accuracy

Classification accuracy analyses were performed with the *ISIP Español* assessments to explore the extent to which each *ISIP Español* subtest (and season of administration) was able to accurately differentiate between students who were categorized as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” using the *Aprenda-3*, *STAAR*, and *PARCC* as the criterion assessments. When reporting the results of these analyses with the *Aprenda-3* as the criterion assessments we present the results of all analyses (using Fall, Winter, and Spring data) with scores above the 15th percentile as our criterion first, followed by presentation of the same results when categorization of “meets proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” is based on scores above the 40th percentile.

Kindergarten Proficiency Above the 15th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LT* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Kindergarten for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 15th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 8 below and interpret them in the sections that follow.

Table 8
Classification accuracy of Kindergarten Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 15th percentile

<i>ISIP Español</i> LT subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	200	0.75	0.49	0.51	0.25	0.03	0.99	0.50	0.62 (0.37, 0.62)
Destreza fonológica y foneética	200	0.25	0.56	0.44	0.75	0.02	0.97	0.55	0.40 (0.16, 0.40)
Vocabulario	200	0.25	0.68	0.32	0.75	0.02	0.98	0.67	0.47 (0.22, 0.47)
Comprensión Auditiva	200	0.50	0.54	0.46	0.50	0.02	0.98	0.55	0.52 (0.24, 0.52)
Comprensión de Lectura	200	1.00	0.55	0.45	0.00	0.04	1.00	0.56	0.78 (0.74, 0.78)
Winter									
Overall	203	0.75	0.68	0.32	0.25	0.05	0.99	0.68	0.72 (0.47, 0.72)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	203	0.75	0.65	0.35	0.25	0.04	0.99	0.65	0.58 (0.30, 0.58)
Vocabulario	203	0.50	0.66	0.34	0.50	0.03	0.98	0.66	0.58 (0.30, 0.59)
Comprensión Auditiva	203	0.50	0.73	0.27	0.50	0.04	0.99	0.73	0.62 (0.33, 0.62)
Comprensión de Lectura	203	0.50	0.67	0.33	0.50	0.03	0.98	0.67	0.59 (0.30, 0.59)

Spring									
Overall	203	1.00	0.78	0.22	0.00	0.09	1.00	0.78	0.89 (0.67, 0.89)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	203	1.00	0.75	0.24	0.00	0.08	1.00	0.76	0.88 (0.85, 0.88)
Vocabulario	203	0.50	0.76	0.24	0.50	0.05	0.99	0.75	0.63 (0.34, 0.63)
Comprensión Auditiva	203	0.25	0.67	0.33	0.75	0.02	0.98	0.66	0.46 (0.21, 0.46)
Comprensión de Lectura	203	0.75	0.76	0.23	0.25	0.07	0.99	0.77	0.76 (0.51, 0.76)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. Examination of the results presented in the top panel of Table 8 for **Fall ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* indicates that level of risk based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 75% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten ($Sn = .75$). The specificity of level of risk for the Fall *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was slightly lower, as only 49% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was low at .03, indicating that only 3% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LT* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that only 50% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were correctly identified. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 62% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LT scores. Examination of the results presented in the middle panel of Table 8 for **Winter ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* indicates that (similarly to the Fall) level of risk based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 75% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten ($Sn = .75$). The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was only marginally lower, as only 68% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was low at .05, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3* only 5% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting

proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that 68% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 72% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results for **Spring ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 8. The sensitivity value of 1.00 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 100% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten. The specificity value of .78 indicates that 78% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LT* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was largest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 9% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at 1.00; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 100% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 78% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 89% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Kindergarten when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile indicates the estimates, on average, are the most robust for the Spring. Of particular note, data from the Spring come the closest to the recommended guidelines of sensitivity and specificity values of 1.00; although the sensitivity values for Fall and Winter are comparable ($Sn = .75$), the specificity values vary in magnitude and are particularly low for the Fall. Similarly, the data indicate that the accuracy and AUC values were the lowest for the Fall and largest for the Spring. Collectively, these data indicate that performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring of Kindergarten had the greatest ability to classify students as “meeting proficiency” and “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*.

Kindergarten Proficiency Above the 40th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LT* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Kindergarten for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 40th percentile. We present

the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 9 below and interpret them in the sections that follow.

Table 9

Classification accuracy of Kindergarten Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 40th percentile

ISIP Español LT subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	200	0.72	0.54	0.46	0.28	0.28	0.89	0.58	0.63 (0.55, 0.63)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	200	0.46	0.57	0.43	0.54	0.21	0.81	0.55	0.51 (0.43, 0.51)
Vocabulario	200	0.36	0.69	0.31	0.64	0.23	0.81	0.63	0.53 (0.44, 0.53)
Comprensión Auditiva	200	0.64	0.59	0.41	0.36	0.28	0.87	0.60	0.61 (0.53, 0.61)
Comprensión de Lectura	200	0.56	0.57	0.43	0.44	0.2	0.84	0.57	0.57 (0.44, 0.53)
Winter									
Overall	203	0.68	0.76	0.24	0.33	0.42	0.90	0.74	0.72 (0.64, 0.72)
Destreza fonológica y foneética	203	0.68	0.72	0.28	0.33	0.38	0.90	0.71	0.70 (0.62, 0.70)
Vocabulario	203	0.48	0.69	0.31	0.53	0.28	0.84	0.65	0.58 (0.50, 0.58)
Comprensión Auditiva	203	0.45	0.77	0.23	0.55	0.33	0.85	0.71	0.61 (0.52, 0.61)
Comprensión de Lectura	203	0.50	0.71	0.29	0.50	0.30	0.85	0.67	0.61 (0.52, 0.61)
Spring									
Overall	203	0.73	0.89	0.11	0.28	0.62	0.93	0.85	0.81 (0.73, 0.81)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	203	0.46	0.57	0.43	0.54	0.21	0.81	0.55	0.51 (0.43, 0.60)
Vocabulario	203	0.55	0.83	0.17	0.45	0.45	0.88	0.77	0.69 (0.61, 0.69)
Comprensión Auditiva	203	0.53	0.72	0.28	0.48	0.32	0.86	0.6	0.62 (0.54, 0.62)
Comprensión de Lectura	203	0.55	0.84	0.16	0.45	0.46	0.88	0.78	0.69 (0.61, 0.69)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. Examination of results for Fall ISIP Español LT level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the Aprenda-3 indicates that level of risk based on the Fall ISIP Español LT overall score accurately identified 72% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Aprenda-3 (Sn = .72). The specificity of level of risk for the Fall ISIP Español LT for correctly identifying students who

were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was slightly lower, as only 54% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .28, indicating that 28% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LT* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .89; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 89% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that only 58% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* were correctly identified by their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 63% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results of classification accuracy analyses using the level of risk based on the **Winter ISIP Español LT** when the proficiency threshold is above the 40th percentile in the middle panel of Table 9. Results indicate that the sensitivity for Winter was slightly lower at $Sn = .68$; in other words, the level of risk based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 68% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. Interestingly, the specificity value was greater than the sensitivity value at $Sp = .76$, suggesting that the Winter *ISIP Español LT* correctly identified 76% of students who met proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, for Winter was relatively high at .42, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 42% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, was also high at .99. The accuracy of the Winter *ISIP Español LT* identifying students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring was also relatively high at 74%. In addition, the AUC value of .72 indicates that for 72% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results for **Spring ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 9. The sensitivity value of .73 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 73% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten. The specificity value of .89 indicates that 89% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LT* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was largest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 62% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. In

addition, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .93; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 93% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 85% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 81% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Kindergarten when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile across the three seasons indicates the estimates, on average, are the most robust for the Spring. Of particular note, data from the Spring come the closest to the recommended guidelines of sensitivity and specificity values of 1.00; although the range of sensitivity values across the three seasons is relatively small ($Sn = .68 - .73$), the variability observed in specificity is greater ($Sp = .54 - .89$) and is the lowest for Fall. In addition, the accuracy of performance on the *ISIP Español LT* increased across the season, ranging from .58 to .85 from Fall to Spring. Similar trends were observed in the AUC, with the best predictive model obtained using data from the Spring (AUC = .83). Collectively, these data indicate that performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring of Kindergarten had the greatest ability to classify students as “meeting proficiency” and “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*.

In Table 10, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 10
Specificity Values for Predicting Proficiency on the Aprenda-3 when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LT Subtest	Above 15 th Percentile			Above 40 th Percentile		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.53	0.40	0.20	0.55	0.38	0.19
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.23	0.15	0.07	0.32	0.21	0.11
Vocabulario	0.27	0.18	0.09	0.32	0.22	0.11
Comprensión Auditiva	0.33	0.22	0.11	0.49	0.33	0.16
Comprensión de Lectura	0.69	0.64	0.60	0.39	0.26	0.13
Winter						
Overall	0.70	0.55	0.27	0.42	0.28	0.14
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.67	0.52	0.26	0.67	0.45	0.22
Vocabulario	0.40	0.26	0.13	0.43	0.28	0.14
Comprensión Auditiva	0.44	0.29	0.15	0.42	0.28	0.14
Comprensión de Lectura	0.40	0.27	0.13	0.43	0.28	0.14
Spring						
Overall	0.85	0.82	0.80	0.89	0.64	0.32
Destreza fonológica y fonética						
Vocabulario	0.46	0.30	0.15	0.55	0.37	0.18

Comprensión Auditiva	0.27	0.18	0.09	0.45	0.30	0.15
Comprensión de Lectura	0.78	0.62	0.31	0.58	0.37	0.19

Grade 1: Classification Accuracy

We present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LT* (overall and subtest scores) administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring with respect to performance on the *Aprenda-3* overall scale score in Tables 41-43, respectively. We present the results of these classification analyses for each available *ISIP Español LT* score (overall scale score and individual subtest scores) with the *Aprenda-3* using the two cut points for defining risk-status described previously (i.e., performance above the 15th percentile and performance above the 40th percentile). In our interpretation of the results, we focus primarily on the accuracy and diagnostic efficiency of the *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score.

Grade 1 Proficiency Above the 15th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LT* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 1 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 15th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 11 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 11

Classification accuracy of Grade 1 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 15th percentile

ISIP Español LT subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	154	1.00	0.66	0.34	0.00	0.11	1.00	0.67	0.83 (0.79, 0.83)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	154	0.83	0.79	0.21	0.17	0.14	0.99	0.79	0.81 (0.64, 0.81)
Vocabulario	154	0.83	0.78	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.99	0.78	0.81 (0.64, 0.81)
Comprensión de Lectura	154	0.67	0.76	0.24	0.25	0.08	0.99	0.76	0.75 (0.51, 0.75)
Winter									
Overall	157	1.00	0.68	0.32	0.00	0.11	1.00	0.69	0.84 (0.80, 0.84)
Destreza fonológica y foneética	157	1.00	0.68	0.32	0.00	0.11	1.00	0.69	0.84 (0.80, 0.84)
Vocabulario	157	0.83	0.64	0.36	0.17	0.09	0.99	0.65	0.74 (0.57, 0.74)
Comprensión de Lectura	157	0.67	0.64	0.36	0.33	0.07	0.98	0.64	0.65 (0.44, 0.65)

Spring									
Overall	158	1.00	0.77	0.23	0.00	0.15	1.00	0.78	0.89 (0.85, 0.89)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	158	1.00	0.76	0.24	0.00	0.14	1.00	0.77	0.88 (0.85, 0.88)
Vocabulario	158	1.00	0.73	0.27	0.00	0.13	1.00	0.75	0.87 (0.83, 0.87)
Comprensión de Lectura	158	1.00	0.80	0.20	0.00	0.17	1.00	0.81	0.90 (0.87, 0.90)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results of classification accuracy for the Grade 1 **Fall ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 11. The specificity for Fall indicates that level of risk based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 100% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten ($Sn = 100\%$). The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was lower, as 66% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .11, indicating that only 11% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LT* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at 1.00; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 100% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that only 67% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were correctly identified. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 83% of Grade 1 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LT scores. Results are presented in the middle panel of Table 11 for Grade 1 **Winter ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3*. These data indicate that, similarly to the Fall, level of risk based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 100% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten ($Sn = 1.00$). The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was only marginally lower, as only 68% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .11, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3* 11% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at 1.00; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 100% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy,

results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that 69% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately.

Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 84% of Grade 1 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results for **Spring ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 11. Similar to the results for Fall and Winter, the sensitivity value of 1.00 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 100% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 1. The specificity value of .77 indicates that 77% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LT* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was largest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 9% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at 1.00; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 100% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 78% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 89% of Kindergarten students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 1 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile indicates the estimates, on average, are the most robust for the Spring. Data from the Spring, for example, come the closest to the recommended guidelines of sensitivity and specificity values of 1.00 (CITE). Although the sensitivity values for *ISIP Español LT* are 1.00 for Fall, Winter, and Spring (indicating that in Grade 1 *ISIP Español LT* is able to accurately identify 100% of students who later did not meet proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*), the specificity value for Spring of Grade 1 is also the highest ($Sp = .77$). In addition, the accuracy for Spring of Grade 1 is the greatest, indicating that 78% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* were correctly identified (compared to only 67% of students using Fall scores and 69% of students using Winter scores). The AUC values across all three seasons were relatively high ($AUC = 0.83 - 0.89$) and, consequently, indicative of the *ISIP Español LT* as a strong universal screening assessment; however, the AUC value was also the greatest in the Spring. Collectively, these data indicate that performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring of Grade 1 had the greatest ability to classify students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*.

Grade 1 Proficiency Above the 40th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LT* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 1 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 40th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 12 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 12

Classification accuracy of Grade 1 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 40th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LT</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	154	0.88	0.69	0.31	0.13	0.25	0.98	0.71	0.78 (0.69, 0.78)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	154	0.75	0.82	0.18	0.25	0.33	0.97	0.82	0.79 (0.67, 0.79)
Vocabulario	154	0.50	0.79	0.21	0.50	0.22	0.93	0.78	0.64 (0.51, 0.64)
Comprensión de Lectura	154	0.69	0.79	0.21	0.32	0.28	0.96	0.78	0.74 (0.62, 0.74)
Winter									
Overall	157	0.88	0.72	0.28	0.12	0.28	0.98	0.74	0.80 (0.71, 0.80)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	157	0.82	0.71	0.29	0.18	0.26	0.97	0.73	0.77 (0.67, 0.77)
Vocabulario	157	0.76	0.67	0.33	0.24	0.22	0.96	0.68	0.72 (0.61, 0.72)
Comprensión de Lectura	157	0.82	0.68	0.32	0.18	0.24	0.97	0.70	0.75 (0.65, 0.75)
Spring									
Overall	158	0.82	0.81	0.19	0.18	0.35	0.97	0.81	0.82 (0.72, 0.82)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	158	0.88	0.81	0.19	0.12	0.36	0.98	0.81	0.84 (0.76, 0.84)
Vocabulario	158	0.71	0.76	0.24	0.30	0.26	0.95	0.75	0.73 (0.61, 0.73)
Comprensión de Lectura	158	0.71	0.83	0.17	0.29	0.33	0.96	0.81	0.77 (0.65, 0.77)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results of classification accuracy for the Grade 1 **Fall** *ISIP Español LT* level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 12. The specificity for Fall indicates that level of risk based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 88% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in

the Spring of Grade 1 ($Sn = .88$). The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was lower, as 69% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .25, indicating that 25% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LT* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. This represents the proportion of students who truly did not demonstrate proficiency. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .98; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 98% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score indicate that only 71% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 78% of Grade 1 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LT scores. Results for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* using the Grade 1 **Winter ISIP Español LT** level of risk are presented in the middle panel of Table 12. These data indicate that, similarly to the Fall, level of risk based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 88% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 1 ($Sn = .88$). The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was only marginally lower, as 72% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .28, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3* 28% of those students truly “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .98; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 98% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that 74% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 80% of Grade 1 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results for **Spring ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 12. The sensitivity of the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring of Grade 1 was slightly lower than the sensitivity in the Fall and Winter, with accurate identification of only 82% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 1. The specificity value of .81 indicates that 81% of students who were

identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LT* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was largest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT* at .35, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 35% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .98; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 98% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 81% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 82% of Grade 1 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 1 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile indicates the estimates, on average, are the most robust for the Spring. Data from the Spring, for example, demonstrate the greatest balance between sensitivity and specificity, or, in other words, a balance in the trade-off between the identification of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the criterion measure. Also of note is that the precision, or PPV, is the greatest for the Spring administration of the *ISIP Español LT* (PPV = .35, compared to .25 and .28 for Fall and Winter, respectively). This outcome indicates that this administration at this point in time did the best at identifying students who truly “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* of all students identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LT* and *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accurate identification of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency”, accuracy was also greatest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT*, whereby the performance of 81% of Grade 1 students was accurately identified. The AUC values across all three seasons were moderate to high (AUC = 0.78 – 0.83), but the AUC value was the greatest in the Spring. Collectively, these data indicate that performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring of Grade 1 had the greatest ability to classify students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*.

In Table 13, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 13
Specificity Values for Predicting Proficiency on the Aprenda-3 when Sensitivity is Fixed (Grade 1)

ISIP Español LT Subtest	Above 15 th Percentile			Above 40 th Percentile		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.76	0.73	0.69	0.75	0.72	0.55
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.82	0.80	0.47	0.84	0.66	0.33
Vocabulario	0.82	0.80	0.47	0.47	0.31	0.16
Comprensión de Lectura	0.68	0.46	0.23	0.76	0.51	0.25
Winter						

Overall	0.75	0.74	0.71	0.76	0.74	0.61
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.77	0.74	0.71	0.75	0.72	0.40
Vocabulario	0.70	0.66	0.39	0.71	0.57	0.29
Comprensión de Lectura	0.57	0.38	0.19	0.73	0.69	0.39
Spring						
Overall	0.84	0.82	0.80	0.84	0.82	0.46
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.83	0.81	0.78	0.85	0.82	0.68
Vocabulario	0.81	0.79	0.76	0.76	0.51	0.26
Comprensión de Lectura	0.86	0.84	0.82	0.83	0.56	0.28

Grade 2: Classification Accuracy

We present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for Grade 2 *ISIP Español LT* (overall and subtest scores) administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring with respect to performance on the *Aprenda-3* overall scale score in Tables 32-34, respectively. We present the results of these classification analyses for each available *ISIP Español LT* score (overall scale score and individual subtest scores) with the *Aprenda-3* using the two cut points for defining risk-status described previously (i.e., performance above the 15th percentile and performance above the 40th percentile). In our interpretation of the results, we focus primarily on the accuracy and diagnostic efficiency of the *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score.

Grade 2 Proficiency Above the 15th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LT* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 2 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 15th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 14 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 14
Classification accuracy of Grade 2 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 15th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LT</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	241	0.89	0.80	0.20	0.11	0.15	0.99	0.80	0.85 (0.73, 0.85)
Destreza fonológica y foneética	241	0.89	0.72	0.28	0.11	0.11	0.99	0.73	0.80 (0.69, 0.80)
Vocabulario	241	1.00	0.19	0.81	0.00	0.05	1.00	0.22	0.60 (0.57, 0.60)
Comprensión de Lectura	241	0.56	0.78	0.22	0.44	0.09	0.98	0.76	0.67 (0.50, 0.67)
Winter									
Overall	242	0.78	0.76	0.24	0.22	0.11	0.99	0.76	0.77 (0.62, 0.77)

Destreza fonológica y fonética	242	0.67	0.73	0.27	0.33	0.09	0.98	0.73	0.70 (0.53, 0.70)
Vocabulario	242	1.00	0.42	0.58	0.00	0.07	1.00	0.44	0.71 (0.68, 0.71)
Comprensión de Lectura	242	0.89	0.81	0.19	0.11	0.15	0.99	0.81	0.85 (0.74, 0.85)
Spring									
Overall	244	1.00	0.74	0.26	0.00	0.13	1.00	0.75	0.87 (0.84, 0.87)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	244	0.89	0.77	0.23	0.11	0.13	0.99	0.77	0.83 (0.72, 0.83)
Vocabulario	244	1.00	0.49	0.51	0.00	0.07	1.00	0.50	0.74 (0.71, 0.74)
Comprensión de Lectura	244	0.67	0.80	0.20	0.33	0.12	0.98	0.80	0.74 (0.57, 0.74)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. Results for the classification accuracy for the Grade 2 Fall ISIP Español LT level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are presented in the top panel of Table 14. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 2 students' level of risk based on their Fall ISIP Español LT overall score accurately identified 89% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Kindergarten ($Sn = .89$). The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LT for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* was marginally lower, as 89% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LT level of risk was .15, indicating that only 15% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LT and *Aprenda-3* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LT and the *Aprenda-3*, ii% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall ISIP Español LT overall score indicate that only 80% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 85% of Grade 2 students their performance on the ISIP Español LT in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results Grade 2 Winter ISIP Español LT level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the middle panel of Table 14. These data indicate lower sensitivity for the ISIP Español LT in the Winter of Grade 2 (compared to Fall), whereby the level of risk on ISIP Español LT accurately identified 78% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 15th percentile in the Spring of Grade 2 ($Sn = .78$). The specificity of level of risk for the Winter ISIP Español LT was comparable with the sensitivity, however, at .76, indicating that 76% of students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the ISIP Español LT in the Winter also "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The

precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .11, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3* 11% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 100% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that 76% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 77% of Grade 2 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results for **Spring ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 14. The sensitivity value of 1.00 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 100% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 2. The specificity value of .74 indicates that 74% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LT* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was largest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 13% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at 1.00; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 100% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 75% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 87% of Grade 2 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 2 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile indicates potentially mixed results. The sensitivity of the level of risk associated with the Grade 2 *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score, for example, was the greatest in the Fall ($Sn = .89$), as was the specificity ($Sp = .80$). These results indicate that performance on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* was able to identify the largest proportion of students who (a) did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* later in the school year, and (b) did demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* later in the school year. In addition, the PPV was largest for the Fall, indicating that of all students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 15% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Accuracy was also the greatest for the Fall, indicating that 80% of students were correctly classified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” based on

the level of risk associated with their *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score. The AUC was greatest for the Spring, however, but only marginally greater than the AUC for the Fall (AUC = .87 and .85, respectively). Although not as conclusive as the data for other grades, in general these data appear to indicate that performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall of Grade 2 had the greatest ability to classify students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*.

Grade 2 Proficiency Above the 40th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LT* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 2 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 40th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 15 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 15
Classification accuracy of Grade 2 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 40th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LT</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	241	0.76	0.89	0.12	0.24	0.57	0.95	0.86	0.82 (0.75, 0.82)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	241	0.73	0.79	0.22	0.27	0.41	0.93	0.78	0.76 (0.68, 0.76)
Vocabulario	241	0.95	0.22	0.79	0.05	0.20	0.96	0.34	0.58 (0.54, 0.58)
Comprensión de Lectura	241	0.63	0.86	0.15	0.37	0.47	0.92	0.81	0.74 (0.67, 0.74)
Winter									
Overall	242	0.71	.83	0.17	0.29	0.45	0.93	0.81	0.77 (0.69, 0.77)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	242	0.63	0.79	0.21	0.37	0.38	0.91	0.76	0.71 (0.63, 0.71)
Vocabulario	242	0.95	0.48	0.52	0.05	0.27	0.98	0.82	0.71 (0.67, 0.71)
Comprensión de Lectura	242	0.61	0.87	0.13	0.39	0.48	0.92	0.82	0.74 (0.66, 0.74)
Spring									
Overall	244	0.81	0.82	0.18	0.20	0.48	0.95	0.82	0.81 (0.75, 0.81)
Destreza fonológica y fonética	244	0.76	0.84	0.16	0.24	0.49	0.94	0.83	0.80 (0.73, 0.80)
Vocabulario	244	0.93	0.55	0.45	0.07	0.29	0.97	0.84	0.74 (0.68, 0.74)

Comprensión de Lectura	244	0.66	0.88	0.12	0.34	0.52	0.93	0.84	0.77 (0.69, 0.77)
---------------------------	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	----------------------

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. The results of classification accuracy for the Grade 2 **Fall ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are reported in the top panel of Table 15. The specificity for Fall indicates that level of risk based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 76% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 2 ($Sn = .76$). The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was higher, as 89% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was quite high, indicating that 57% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LT* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. This represents the proportion of students who truly did not demonstrate proficiency. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .95; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 95% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score indicate that only 86% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 82% of Grade 2 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is high.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results of the Grade 2 **Winter ISIP Español LT** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the middle panel of Table 15. These data indicate that, similarly to the Fall, level of risk based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall score accurately identified 71% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 2 ($Sn = .71$). The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LT* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* was only marginally lower, as 83% of students were correctly identified as “did not meet proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .45, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3* 45% of those students truly “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .93; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 93% of those students were identified as “meets proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LT* overall indicate that 81% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 77% of Grade 2 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LT scores. We present the results for Grade 2 Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 15. The sensitivity of the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring of Grade 2 was relatively high, with accurate identification of 81% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 2. The specificity value of .82 indicates that 82% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LT* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was largest for the Spring *ISIP Español LT* at .48, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 48% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .95; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 95% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 82% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 81% of Grade 2 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 2 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile again indicates variability as to which season may be the best predictor. Sensitivity was greatest, for example, for the Spring at .81, indicating that the greatest proportion of students who “did not meet proficiency” were accurately identified by the *ISIP Español LT* when administered in the Spring of Grade 2. Conversely, specificity was the greatest in the Fall ($Sp = .89$), indicating that the Fall *ISIP Español* was the season for which the greatest proportion of students who “met proficiency” were identified. Accuracy was also greatest for the Fall administration, whereby 86% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” (compared to 81% of students in the Winter and 82% of students in the Spring). Similarly, the AUC was the greatest for the Fall at .82, although this is only marginally greater than the AUC for Spring (AUC = .81) and slightly greater than the AUC for Winter (AUC = .77). Altogether these data suggest that performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall of Grade 2 may have the greatest ability to accurately classify students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*, although additional data collection is likely warranted.

In Table 16, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 16
Specificity Values for Grade 2 ISIP Español LT Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the Aprenda-3 when Sensitivity is Fixed (Grade 2)

ISIP Español LT Subtest	Above 15 th Percentile			Above 40 th Percentile		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.84	0.82	0.82	0.89	0.75	0.36
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.78	0.75	0.65	0.79	0.59	0.29
Vocabulario	0.44	0.36	0.27	0.42	0.34	0.26
Comprensión de Lectura	0.53	0.35	0.18	0.70	0.47	0.23
Winter						
Overall	0.78	0.68	0.68	0.83	0.56	0.28
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.66	0.44	0.22	0.65	0.43	0.22
Vocabulario	0.59	0.54	0.48	0.62	0.56	0.51
Comprensión de Lectura	0.85	0.83	0.73	0.67	0.44	0.22
Spring						
Overall	0.82	0.80	0.77	0.85	0.82	0.42
Destreza fonológica y fonética	0.82	0.79	0.69	0.85	0.69	0.35
Vocabulario	0.64	0.59	0.54	0.66	0.61	0.56
Comprensión de Lectura	0.72	0.48	0.24	0.77	0.51	0.26

Grade 3: Classification Accuracy

We first present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for Grade 3 *ISIP Español LA* (overall and subtest scores) administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring with respect to performance on the *Aprenda-3* overall scale score in Tables 17-19, respectively. We present the results of these classification analyses for each available *ISIP Español LA* score (overall scale score and individual subtest scores) with the *Aprenda-3* using the two cut points for defining risk-status described previously (i.e., performance above the 15th percentile and performance above the 40th percentile). In our interpretation of the results, we focus primarily on the accuracy and diagnostic efficiency of the *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score.

We then present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for the two state standardized assessments, STAAR and PARCC. As noted earlier in the Method section, proficiency on these two assessments was defined using the state-specified criteria. Specifically, students who performed at Level 1 on STAAR were categorized as “did not meet proficiency” while those who performed at Levels 2, 3, or 4 were categorized as “met proficiency”. Similarly, students who performed at Levels 1 or 2 on PARCC were categorized as “did not meet proficiency” while those who performed at Levels 3 or 4 were categorized as “met proficiency”.

Grade 3 Proficiency Above the 15th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 3 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 15th percentile. We present the

results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 17 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 17

Classification accuracy of Grade 3 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LT level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 15th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LA subtest</i>	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	235	0.88	0.76	0.24	0.13	0.11	0.99	0.82	0.82 (0.69, 0.82)
Lectura con fluidez	235	0.75	0.78	0.22	0.25	0.11	0.99	0.78	0.76 (0.60, 0.76)
Vocabulario	235	0.88	0.48	0.52	0.13	0.06	0.99	0.50	0.68 (0.55, 0.68)
Comprensión de Lectura	235	0.88	0.79	0.21	0.13	0.13	0.99	0.80	0.83 (0.71, 0.83)
Winter									
Overall	246	0.71	0.73	0.27	0.29	0.07	0.99	0.73	0.73 (0.54, 0.73)
Lectura con fluidez	246	0.71	0.66	0.34	0.29	0.06	0.99	0.66	0.69 (0.50, 0.69)
Vocabulario	246	0.75	0.63	0.37	0.25	0.06	0.99	0.63	0.69 (0.53, 0.69)
Comprensión de Lectura	246	0.71	0.80	0.20	0.29	0.10	0.99	0.80	0.76 (0.57, 0.76)
Spring									
Overall	244	0.71	0.69	0.31	0.29	0.06	0.99	0.69	0.70 (0.52, 0.70)
Lectura con fluidez	244	1.00	0.72	0.28	0.00	0.09	1.00	0.73	0.86 (0.83, 0.86)
Vocabulario	244	1.00	0.66	0.34	0.00	0.09	1.00	0.67	0.83 (0.80, 0.83)
Comprensión de Lectura	244	0.71	0.78	0.22	0.29	0.09	0.99	0.78	0.75 (0.57, 0.75)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 3 Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 17. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 3 students' level of risk based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified 88% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 3 (Sn = .88). The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* was somewhat lower, as 76% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .11, indicating that only 11% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and *Aprenda-3* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .99; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students

were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score indicate that only 82% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 82% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is high.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 3 **Winter** *ISIP Español LA* level of risk predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are displayed in the middle panel of Table 17. These data indicate significantly lower sensitivity for the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter of Grade 3 (compared to Fall), whereby the level of risk on *ISIP Español LA* accurately identified 71% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 15th percentile in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was comparable with the sensitivity, however, at .73, indicating that 73% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* level of risk was .07, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3* 7% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall indicate that 73% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 73% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 3 **Spring** *ISIP Español LA* level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 17. The sensitivity value of .71 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 71% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity value of .69 indicates that 69% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was lowest for the Spring *ISIP Español LA*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 6% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 69% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly.

Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 70% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 3 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile indicates that performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall may be the most accurate for predicting and classifying student performance on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. Several sources of evidence support this conclusion. One, the sensitivity for the Grade 3 *ISIP Español LA* is significantly greater in the Fall ($Sn = .88$) than it was for the Winter and Spring ($Sn = .71$), indicating accurate identification of a greater proportion of students who later “did not meet” proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. Two, the specificity was also the greatest for the Fall, whereby the data indicate that the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall was able to accurately identify 76% of the students who later “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* (compared to only 69% of students accurately identified in the Spring and 73% accurately identified in the Winter). Moreover, the accuracy and AUC values are by far the greatest using the Fall *ISIP Español LA* instructional tier, indicating not only accurate identification of a greater proportion of students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring (82%) but also that the predictive model was most robust and able to accurately differentiate between students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” when using Fall *ISIP Español LA* data.

[Grade 3 Proficiency Above the 40th Percentile](#)

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 3 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 40th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 18 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 18

Classification accuracy of Grade 3 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 40th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	235	0.75	0.82	0.18	0.25	0.44	0.95	0.81	0.79 (0.71, 0.79)
Lectura con fluidez	235	0.58	0.82	0.18	0.42	0.38	0.92	0.79	0.70 (0.62, 0.70)
Vocabulario	235	0.86	0.53	0.47	0.14	0.25	0.95	0.58	0.70 (0.63, 0.70)
Comprensión de Lectura	235	0.69	0.85	0.15	0.31	0.46	0.94	0.83	0.77 (0.69, 0.77)
Winter									
Overall	246	0.76	0.80	0.20	0.24	0.41	0.95	0.80	0.78 (0.71, 0.78)

Lectura con fluidez	246	0.86	0.74	0.26	0.14	0.37	0.97	0.76	0.80 (0.74, 0.80)
Vocabulario	246	0.76	0.68	0.32	0.24	0.31	0.94	0.70	0.72 (0.65, 0.72)
Comprensión de Lectura	246	0.68	0.87	0.13	0.32	0.47	0.94	0.84	0.77 (0.69, 0.77)
Spring									
Overall	244	0.89	0.77	0.23	0.11	0.41	0.96	0.79	0.83 (0.77, 0.83)
Lectura con fluidez	244	0.83	0.79	0.21	0.17	0.41	0.96	0.80	0.81 (0.74, 0.81)
Vocabulario	244	0.81	0.71	0.29	0.19	0.33	0.96	0.73	0.76 (0.69, 0.76)
Comprensión de Lectura	244	0.72	0.85	0.15	0.28	0.46	0.95	0.83	0.79 (0.71, 0.79)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 3 Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 18. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 3 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified 75% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* was higher, as 82% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .44, indicating that almost half of the students (44%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and *Aprenda-3* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .95; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and the *Aprenda-3*, 95% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 81% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 79% of Grade 3 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 3 Winter ISIP Español LA level of risk predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are displayed in the middle panel of Table 18. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 3 Winter ISIP Español LA was able to identify accurately 76% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 40th percentile in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter ISIP Español LA was slightly greater than .80, indicating that 80% of students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the ISIP Español LA in the Winter also "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier was .41, indicating that of all the students who were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Winter ISIP Español LA and the *Aprenda-3* 41%

of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .95; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 95% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 80% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 78% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is high.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 3 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 18. The sensitivity value of .89 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 89% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity value of .77 indicates that 79% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 41% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .96; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 96% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 79% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 83% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 3 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for determining which administration season may be the most accurate for predicting and classifying student performance on the *Aprenda-3*. The sensitivity for the Grade 3 *ISIP Español LA* is significantly greater in the Spring ($Sn = .89$) than it was for the Fall and Winter ($Sn = .75$ and $.76$, respectively), for example, indicating accurate identification of a greater proportion of students who later “did not meet” proficiency on the *Aprenda-3*. However, the specificity was the greatest for the Fall administration ($Sp = .82$), whereby the data indicate that the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall was able to accurately identify 82% of the students who later “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* (compared to only 80% of students accurately identified in the Winter and 77% accurately identified in the Spring). Moreover, the accuracy value is the largest for the Fall, indicating that recommended instructional tier based on Fall *ISIP Español LA* performance was able to

accurately classify 81% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not proficiency”. However, the largest AUC value obtained when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile was observed in the Spring (AUC = .83).

In Table 19, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 19
Specificity Values for Grade 3 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the Aprenda-3 when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	Above 15 th Percentile			Above 40 th Percentile		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.81	0.78	0.61	0.84	0.66	0.33
Lectura con fluidez	0.79	0.62	0.31	0.59	0.40	0.20
Vocabulario	0.59	0.53	0.39	0.62	0.57	0.38
Comprensión de Lectura	0.83	0.81	0.63	0.84	0.56	0.28
Winter						
Overall	0.74	0.51	0.26	0.82	0.66	0.33
Lectura con fluidez	0.66	0.46	0.23	0.79	0.76	0.55
Vocabulario	0.65	0.50	0.25	0.71	0.58	0.29
Comprensión de Lectura	0.80	0.56	0.28	0.80	0.53	0.27
Spring						
Overall	0.69	0.48	0.24	0.82	0.80	0.70
Lectura con fluidez	0.80	0.77	0.75	0.82	0.80	0.47
Vocabulario	0.76	0.73	0.69	0.75	0.72	0.38
Comprensión de Lectura	0.79	0.55	0.27	0.86	0.61	0.31

Grade 3 Predicting Proficiency on the English-language STAAR

In this section, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 3 for predicting proficiency on the *State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness* (STAAR) using proficiency thresholds set by the state department of education. Because some students took the STAAR reading assessment in English while others took it in Spanish, we present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for both languages. We present the results for *ISIP Español LA* with STAAR English in Table 20, followed by the results for *ISIP Español LA* with STAAR Spanish in Table 21.

Table 20
Classification accuracy of Grade 3 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the STAAR Reading (English)

ISIP Español LA subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	87	0.53	0.89	0.11	0.47	0.50	0.90	0.83	0.71 (0.58, 0.71)

Lectura con fluidez	87	0.33	0.85	0.15	0.67	0.31	0.86	0.76	0.59 (0.46, 0.59)
Vocabulario	87	0.67	0.53	0.47	0.33	0.23	0.88	0.55	0.60 (0.46, 0.60)
Comprensión de Lectura	87	0.47	0.92	0.08	0.53	0.54	0.89	0.84	0.69 (0.56, 0.69)
Winter									
Overall	101	0.53	0.83	0.17	0.47	0.42	0.88	0.77	0.68 (0.56, 0.68)
Lectura con fluidez	101	0.58	0.87	0.13	0.42	0.50	0.90	0.81	0.72 (0.60, 0.72)
Vocabulario	101	0.53	0.70	0.30	0.47	0.29	0.87	0.67	0.61 (0.48, 0.61)
Comprensión de Lectura	101	0.53	0.93	0.07	0.48	0.63	0.90	0.85	0.73 (0.61, 0.73)
Spring									
Overall	98	0.63	0.82	0.18	0.37	0.46	0.90	0.79	0.73 (0.61, 0.73)
Lectura con fluidez	98	0.58	0.77	0.23	0.42	0.38	0.88	0.73	0.68 (0.55, 0.68)
Vocabulario	98	0.58	0.69	90.31	0.42	0.31	0.87	0.67	0.63 (0.51, 0.63)
Comprensión de Lectura	98	0.53	0.90	0.10	0.47	0.56	0.89	0.83	0.71 (0.59, 0.71)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 3 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on the English STAAR reading assessment are displayed in the top panel of Table 20. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 3 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified only 53% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English STAAR Reading assessment in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading was significantly higher, as 89% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .50, indicating that half of the students (50%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and English STAAR Reading were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .90; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and the English STAAR Reading, 90% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 83% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 71% of Grade 3 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 3 Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment in the middle panel of Table 20. These data indicate that, similar to Fall, the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 3 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify accurately only 53% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was greater at .83, indicating that 83% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier was .42, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 42% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .88, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 88% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 77% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 68% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 3.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 3 Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk for predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment in the lower panel of Table 20. The sensitivity value of .63 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 63% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity value of .82 indicates that 82% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 46% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .90; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 90% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 79% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 73% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate.

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 3 when predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for determining which administration

season may be the most accurate for predicting and classifying student performance on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment. The sensitivity for the Grade 3 *ISIP Español LA* is greater in the Spring ($Sn = .63$) than it was for the Fall and Winter ($Sn = .53$), for example, indicating accurate identification of a greater proportion of students who later “did not meet” proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading*. However, the specificity was the greatest for the Fall administration ($Sp = .89$), whereby the data indicate that the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall was able to accurately identify 89% of the students who later “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* (compared to only 83% of students accurately identified in the Spring and 82% accurately identified in the Fall). Moreover, the accuracy value is the largest for the Fall, indicating that recommended instructional tier based on Fall *ISIP Español LA* performance was able to accurately classify 83% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not proficiency”. However, the largest AUC value obtained when predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* was observed in the Spring ($AUC = .83$). Altogether these results indicate that collecting more data may be necessary to determine which season of administration may be most able to accurately classify students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment in the Spring of Grade 3.

Grade 3 Predicting Proficiency on the Spanish-language STAAR

Next, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses with proficiency on the Grade 3 Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment as the outcome (Table 21).

Table 21
Classification accuracy of Grade 3 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the STAAR Reading (Spanish)

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	128	0.57	0.83	0.17	0.43	0.50	0.86	0.76	0.70 (0.60, 0.70)
Lectura con fluidez	128	0.43	0.79	0.21	0.57	0.38	0.82	0.70	0.61 (0.51, 0.61)
Vocabulario	128	0.90	0.59	0.41	0.10	0.40	0.95	0.66	0.75 (0.67, 0.75)
Comprensión de Lectura	128	0.53	0.84	0.16	0.47	0.50	0.85	0.77	0.69 (0.59, 0.69)
Winter									
Overall	128	0.57	0.81	0.19	0.43	0.47	0.86	0.75	0.69 (0.59, 0.69)
Lectura con fluidez	128	0.70	0.63	0.37	0.30	0.37	0.87	0.65	0.67 (0.57, 0.67)
Vocabulario	128	0.63	0.71	0.29	0.37	0.40	0.86	0.70	0.67 (0.58, 0.67)
Comprensión de Lectura	128	0.57	0.85	0.15	0.43	0.53	0.87	0.78	0.71 (0.61, 0.71)
Spring									
Overall	126	0.71	0.79	0.21	0.29	0.49	0.91	0.77	0.75 (0.66, 0.75)

Lectura con fluidez	126	0.68	0.84	0.16	0.32	0.54	0.90	0.80	0.76 (0.66, 0.76)
Vocabulario	126	0.66	0.80	0.20	0.34	0.49	0.89	0.77	0.73 (0.63, 0.73)
Comprensión de Lectura	126	0.59	0.85	0.15	0.41	0.53	0.88	0.79	0.72 (0.62, 0.72)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LT scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 3 **Fall ISIP Español LT** recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on the Spanish STAAR reading assessment are displayed in the top panel of Table 21. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 3 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score accurately identified only 57% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LA* for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* was significantly higher, as 83% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LT* level of risk was .50, indicating that half of the students (50%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LA* and Spanish *STAAR Reading* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .86; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 86% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score indicate that 76% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 70% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014), this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 3 **Winter ISIP Español LA** recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in the middle panel of Table 21. These data indicate that, similar to Fall, the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 3 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify accurately only 57% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was greater at .81, indicating that 81% of students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also "met proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* recommended instructional tier was .47, indicating that of all the students who were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 42% of those students were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .86, indicating that of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 86% of those students were identified as "met proficiency" on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español*

LA overall scale score indicate that 75% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Winter correctly classified 69% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 3.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 3 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in the lower panel of Table 21. The sensitivity value of .71 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 63% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity value of .79 indicates that 79% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 49% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .91; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 91% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 77% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 75% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 3 when predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for determining which administration season may be the most accurate for predicting and classifying student performance on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment. The sensitivity for the Grade 3 *ISIP Español LA* is greater in the Spring ($Sn = .71$) than it was for the Fall and Winter ($Sn = .57$), for example, indicating accurate identification of a greater proportion of students who later “did not meet” proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. However, the specificity was the greatest for the Fall administration ($Sp = .83$), whereby the data indicate that the *ISIP Español LT* in the Fall accurately identified 83% of the students who later “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* (compared to only 81% of students accurately identified in the Winter and 79% accurately identified in the Spring). Moreover, the accuracy value is the largest for the Spring, indicating that recommended instructional tier based on Spring *ISIP Español LA* performance was able to accurately classify 79% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not proficiency”. It could be argued, however, that the differences across the three seasons is negligible, as the accuracy ranged from .75 - .77. Additionally, the largest AUC value obtained when predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* was observed in the Spring ($AUC = .75$). Altogether these results suggest that the Spring *ISIP Español LA* may be the most accurate for classifying and predicting performance on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in Grade 3, but additional data collection is recommended.

Results from comparative analyses of the classification accuracy and predictive utility of the recommended instructional tier associated with the *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score for the English and Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessments in Grade 3 are also inconclusive. Comparison of the sensitivity values across seasons and languages, for example, reveals that the range of sensitivity values for the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment is higher ($Sn = .57 - .71$) compared to the English *STAAR Reading* ($Sn = .53 - .61$), suggesting that recommended instructional tier on the *ISIP Español LA* may do a marginally better job of accurately identifying students who later “did not meet proficiency” when the *STAAR Reading* assessment was taken in Spanish. The range of specificity values representing the accurate identification of students who “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency”, however, is greater for the English *STAAR Reading* ($Sp = .82 - .89$) compared to the Spanish *STAAR Reading* ($Sp = .79 - .83$). Similar trends are observed when comparing the ranges of the accuracy values for English and Spanish *STAAR Reading*. Specifically, the accuracy for the Spanish *STAAR* ranged from $.75 - .77$ while the accuracy for the English *STAAR* ranged from $.77 - .83$, suggesting that proficiency as defined by the *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tiers for Grade 3 may identify accurately a greater proportion of students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment. Lastly, comparison of the AUC values for each version of the *STAAR Reading* assessment reveal some overlap between the English *STAAR Reading* ($AUC = .68 - .73$) and the Spanish *STAAR Reading* ($AUC = .69 - .75$) but that the range is higher when attempting to classify student performance on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. Altogether, these results suggest that additional data collection with students completing the English and Spanish versions of the *STAAR Reading* assessment may be warranted.

In Table 22, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *STAAR* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 22
Specificity Values for Grade 3 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the STAAR when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	English STAAR			Spanish STAAR		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.57	0.38	0.19	0.57	0.38	0.19
Lectura con fluidez	0.38	0.25	0.13	0.41	0.28	0.14
Vocabulario	0.48	0.32	0.16	0.68	0.63	0.59
Comprensión de Lectura	0.52	0.34	0.17	0.54	0.36	0.18
Winter						
Overall	0.53	0.35	0.18	0.56	0.37	0.19
Lectura con fluidez	0.62	0.41	0.21	0.63	0.42	0.21
Vocabulario	0.44	0.29	0.15	0.58	0.39	0.19
Comprensión de Lectura	0.59	0.39	0.20	0.59	0.39	0.20
Spring						
Overall	0.67	0.45	0.22	0.79	0.55	0.28
Lectura con fluidez	0.55	0.37	0.18	0.78	0.52	0.26
Vocabulario	0.49	0.33	0.16	0.69	0.46	0.23

Comprensión de Lectura	0.57	0.38	0.19	0.61	0.41	0.20
------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Grade 3 Predicting Proficiency on PARCC

In this section, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 3 for predicting proficiency on the *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers English Language Arts/Literacy* assessment (PARCC) using proficiency thresholds set by the New Mexico state department of education. We present the classification accuracy results for *ISIP Español LA* classifying and predicting proficiency with PARCC in Table 23 and interpret the results in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 23

Classification accuracy of Grade 3 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the PARCC (English)

ISIP Español LA subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall		0.90	0.67	0.33	0.10	0.82	0.80	0.81	0.78 (0.55, 0.78)
Lectura con fluidez		0.40	1.00	0.00	0.60	1.00	0.50	0.63	0.70 (0.54, 0.70)
Vocabulario		0.70	0.33	0.67	0.30	0.64	0.40	0.56	0.52 (0.26, 0.52)
Comprensión de Lectura		0.80	1.00	0.00	0.20	1.00	0.75	0.88	0.90 (0.77, 0.90)
Winter									
Overall		0.75	0.60	0.40	0.25	0.75	0.60	0.69	0.68 (0.39, 0.68)
Lectura con fluidez		0.63	0.80	0.20	0.38	0.83	0.57	0.69	0.71 (0.45, 0.71)
Vocabulario		0.78	0.20	0.80	0.22	0.64	0.33	0.57	0.49 (0.25, 0.49)
Comprensión de Lectura		0.50	1.00	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.56	0.69	0.75 (0.56, 0.75)
Spring									
Overall		0.80	0.50	0.50	0.20	0.73	0.60	0.69	0.65 (0.39, 0.65)
Lectura con fluidez		0.70	1.00	0.00	0.30	1.00	0.67	0.81	0.85 (0.70, 0.85)
Vocabulario		0.91	0.33	0.67	0.09	0.71	0.67	0.71	0.62 (0.40, 0.62)
Comprensión de Lectura		0.60	1.00	0.00	0.40	1.00	0.60	0.75	0.80 (0.64, 0.80)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 3 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on PARCC are displayed in the top panel of Table 23. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 3 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately

identified 90% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on PARCC in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LA* for correctly identifying students who were identified as “met proficiency” on PARCC was lower, as only 67% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* level of risk was .82, indicating that the majority of students (82%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LT* and PARCC were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on PARCC. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .80; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* and PARCC, 80% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on PARCC. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score indicate that 81% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 78% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on PARCC in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 3 **Winter ISIP Español LA** recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on PARCC in the middle panel of Table 23. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 3 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify accurately a significantly smaller proportion of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on PARCC in the Spring of Grade 3 (75%). The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was .60, indicating that 60% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on PARCC in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* recommended instructional tier was .75, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and PARCC, 75% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on PARCC. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .60, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and PARCC, 60% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on PARCC. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 69% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 68% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on PARCC in the Spring of Grade 3.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 3 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency on the English STAAR Reading assessment in the lower panel of Table 23. The sensitivity value of .80 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 80% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on PARCC in the Spring of Grade 3. The specificity value of .50 indicates that 50% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on PARCC. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the

students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 73% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .60, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 60% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 69% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 65% of Grade 3 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring.

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 3 when predicting proficiency on *PARCC* using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates the estimates obtained from the Fall administration of the *ISIP Español LA* may be the most robust. This conclusion is based on the fact that the greatest sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, and AUC values were obtained using the Fall data.

Grade 4: Classification Accuracy

We first present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for Grade 4 *ISIP Español LA* (overall and subtest scores) administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring with respect to performance on the *Aprenda-3* overall scale score in Tables 24-25, respectively. We present the results of these classification analyses for each available *ISIP Español LA* score (overall scale score and individual subtest scores) with the *Aprenda-3* using the two cut points for defining risk-status described previously (i.e., performance above the 15th percentile and performance above the 40th percentile). In our interpretation of the results, we focus primarily on the accuracy and diagnostic efficiency of the *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score.

We then present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for the two state standardized assessments, STAAR and PARCC. As noted earlier in the Method section, proficiency on these two assessments was defined using the state-specified criteria. Specifically, students who performed at Level 1 on STAAR were categorized as “did not meet proficiency” while those who performed at Levels 2, 3, or 4 were categorized as “met proficiency”. Similarly, students who performed at Levels 1 or 2 on PARCC were categorized as “did not meet proficiency” while those who performed at Levels 3 or 4 were categorized as “met proficiency”.

Grade 4 Proficiency Above the 15th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 4 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 15th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 24 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 24

Classification accuracy of Grade 4 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 15th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LA subtest</i>	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	163	0.93	0.72	0.28	0.07	0.24	0.99	0.74	0.82 (0.74, .82)
Lectura con fluidez	163	0.57	0.77	0.23	0.43	0.19	0.95	0.75	0.67 (0.53, 0.67)
Vocabulario	163	0.73	0.70	0.30	0.27	0.18	0.97	0.70	0.72 (0.60, 0.72)
Comprensión de Lectura	163	0.79	0.77	0.23	0.21	0.23	0.98	0.77	0.78 (0.66, 0.78)
Winter									
Overall	224	0.90	0.77	0.23	0.10	0.28	0.99	0.78	0.84 (0.76, 0.84)
Lectura con fluidez	224	0.65	0.76	0.24	0.35	0.21	0.96	0.75	0.71 (0.60, 0.71)
Vocabulario	224	0.75	0.74	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.97	0.74	0.75 (0.64, 0.74)
Comprensión de Lectura	224	0.70	0.84	0.16	0.30	0.30	0.97	0.82	0.77 (0.66, 0.77)
Spring									
Overall	219	0.85	0.80	0.20	0.15	0.30	0.98	0.81	0.83 (0.74, 0.83)
Lectura con fluidez	219	0.70	0.79	0.21	0.30	0.25	0.96	0.78	0.75 (0.64, 0.75)
Vocabulario	219	0.75	0.74	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.97	0.74	0.74 (0.64, 0.75)
Comprensión de Lectura	219	0.50	0.81	0.19	0.50	0.21	0.95	0.79	0.66 (0.54, 0.66)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 4 Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 24. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 4 students' level of risk based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified 93% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* was somewhat lower, as 72% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .24, indicating that only 24% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and *Aprenda-3* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .99; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that only 74% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 82% of Grade 4 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the

Aprenda-3 in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is high.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 4 **Winter ISIP Español LA** level of risk predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are displayed in the middle panel of Table 24. These data indicate slightly lower sensitivity for the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter of Grade 4 (compared to Fall), whereby the level of risk on *ISIP Español LA* accurately identified 90% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 15th percentile in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was higher than that observed in the Fall, however, at .77, indicating that 72% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* level of risk was .28, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3* 28% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .99; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 99% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 78% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 84% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 4 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 24. The sensitivity value of .85 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 85% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity value of .80 indicates that 80% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was highest for the Spring *ISIP Español LA*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 30% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high .98, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 98% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 81% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 83% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 4 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile indicates that results using this sample may be inconclusive for determining the level of risk associated with which season of *ISIP Español LA* administration may be the most accurate for classifying and predicting performance on the *Aprenda-3*. For example, although sensitivity was the greatest for the Fall administration, correctly identifying 93% of Grade 4 students' who later "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*, specificity was greatest for the Spring administration, whereby 80% of students who "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* were correctly identified by the *ISIP Español LA*. Comparison of the accuracy values indicates that the level of risk associated with *ISIP Español LA* overall scale scores was able to correctly classify the greatest proportion of students (81%) as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*, but inspection of the AUC values across the three seasons reveals the highest AUC for Winter of Grade 4 (AUC = .84). Collectively these data indicate that the collection of additional data may be needed to be able to discern which season of *ISIP Español LT* may provide the most robust classification accuracy estimates.

Grade 4 Proficiency Above the 40th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 4 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 40th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 25 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 25

Classification accuracy of Grade 4 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 40th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	163	0.62	0.80	0.20	0.38	0.60	0.81	0.74	0.71 (0.64, 0.71)
Lectura con fluidez	163	0.51	0.85	0.15	0.49	0.63	0.78	0.74	0.68 (0.60, 0.68)
Vocabulario	163	0.62	0.79	0.21	0.38	0.57	0.82	0.74	0.70 (0.63, 0.70)
Comprensión de Lectura	163	0.49	0.82	0.18	0.51	0.55	0.78	0.72	0.66 (0.58, 0.66)
Winter									
Overall	224	0.67	0.89	0.11	0.33	0.75	0.85	0.82	0.78 (0.72, 0.78)
Lectura con fluidez	224	0.53	0.85	0.15	0.47	0.62	0.79	0.74	0.69 (0.62, 0.69)
Vocabulario	224	0.61	0.84	0.16	0.39	0.64	0.82	0.77	0.72 (0.66, 0.72)
Comprensión de Lectura	224	0.49	0.92	0.08	0.51	0.74	0.79	0.78	0.70 (0.64, 0.70)
Spring									
Overall	219	0.56	0.89	0.11	0.44	0.70	0.81	0.78	0.72

Lectura con fluidez	219	0.53	0.88	0.12	0.47	0.67	0.80	0.77	0.70 (0.63, 0.70)
Vocabulario	219	0.63	0.85	0.15	0.37	0.67	0.83	0.78	0.74 (0.68, 0.74)
Comprensión de Lectura	219	0.43	0.89	0.11	0.57	0.64	0.77	0.74	0.66 (0.59, 0.66)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 4 **Fall ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 25. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 4 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score accurately identified 62% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LA* for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* was higher, as 80% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* level of risk was .60, indicating that almost half of the students (60%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LA* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .95; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 95% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score indicate that 74% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 71% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 4 **Winter ISIP Español LA** level of risk predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are displayed in the middle panel of Table 25. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 4 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify accurately 67% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 40th percentile in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was greater at .89, indicating that 89% of students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier was .75, indicating that of all the students who were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3* 75% of those students were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .85; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 35% of those students were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 82% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC

value indicates that for 78% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 4 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 25. The sensitivity value of .56 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 56% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity value of .89 indicates that 89% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 70% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .81; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 81% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 78% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 72% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 4 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates estimates were the most robust using the Winter of Grade 4 *ISIP Español LA* data. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, and AUC estimates were the highest using the level of risk derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score to predict proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile.

In Table 26, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 26
Specificity Values for Grade 4 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the Aprenda-3 when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	Above 15 th Percentile			Above 40 th Percentile		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.79	0.76	0.73	0.64	0.42	0.21
Lectura con fluidez	0.54	0.36	0.18	0.52	0.32	0.17
Vocabulario	0.71	0.52	0.26	0.62	0.41	0.21
Comprensión de Lectura	0.79	0.72	0.36	0.48	0.32	0.16

Winter								
Overall		0.82	0.80	0.77	0.80	0.54	0.27	
Lectura con fluidez		0.65	0.44	0.22	0.54	0.36	0.18	
Vocabulario		0.76	0.59	0.30	0.65	0.43	0.22	
Comprensión de Lectura		0.84	0.56	0.28	0.54	0.36	0.18	
Spring								
Overall		0.84	0.81	0.54	0.60	0.340	0.20	
Lectura con fluidez		0.79	0.53	0.26	0.56	0.38	0.19	
Vocabulario		0.76	0.59	0.30	0.70	0.47	0.23	
Comprensión de Lectura		0.49	0.33	0.16	0.47	0.31	0.16	

Grade 4 Predicting Proficiency on the English-language STAAR

In this section, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 4 for predicting proficiency on the *State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness* (STAAR) using proficiency thresholds set by the state department of education. Because some students took the STAAR reading assessment in English while others took it in Spanish, we present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for both languages. We present the results for *ISIP Español LA* with STAAR English in Table 27, followed by the results for *ISIP Español LA* with STAAR Spanish in Table 28.

Table 27
Classification accuracy of Grade 4 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the STAAR Reading (English)

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	75	0.60	0.80	0.20	0.40	0.52	0.85	0.75	0.70 (0.58, 0.70)
Lectura con fluidez	75	0.55	0.85	0.15	0.45	0.58	0.84	0.77	0.70 (0.58, 0.70)
Vocabulario	75	0.62	0.78	0.22	0.38	0.48	0.86	0.74	0.70 (0.58, 0.70)
Comprensión de Lectura	75	0.60	0.88	0.12	0.40	0.63	0.87	0.81	0.74 (0.62, 0.74)
Winter									
Overall	128	0.57	0.79	0.21	0.43	0.45	0.86	0.73	0.68 (0.58, 0.68)
Lectura con fluidez	128	0.47	0.82	0.18	0.53	0.44	0.83	0.73	0.64 (0.54, 0.64)
Vocabulario	128	0.57	0.80	0.20	0.43	0.46	0.86	0.75	0.68 (0.58, 0.68)
Comprensión de Lectura	128	0.37	0.87	0.13	0.63	0.46	0.81	0.75	0.62 (0.52, 0.62)
Spring									
Overall	127	0.55	0.85	0.16	0.45	0.53	0.85	0.77	0.70 (0.60, 0.70)

Lectura con fluidez	127	0.45	0.86	0.14	0.55	0.52	0.83	0.76	0.67 (0.56, 0.67)
Vocabulario	127	0.61	0.85	0.15	0.39	0.56	0.88	0.79	0.73 (0.64, 0.73)
Comprensión de Lectura	127	0.26	0.89	0.11	0.74	0.42	0.79	0.73	0.57 (0.49, 0.57)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 4 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on the English STAAR reading assessment are displayed in the top panel of Table 27. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 4 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified only 60% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English STAAR Reading assessment in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading was significantly higher, as 80% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .52, indicating that half of the students (52%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and English STAAR Reading were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .85; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LT and the English STAAR Reading, 85% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 75% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 70% of Grade 4 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 4 Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on the English STAAR Reading assessment in the middle panel of Table 27. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 4 Winter ISIP Español LA was accurately identified only 57% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter ISIP Español LA was greater at .79, indicating that 79% of students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the ISIP Español LA in the Winter also "met proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter ISIP Español LT recommended instructional tier was .45, indicating that of all the students who were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Winter ISIP Español LA and the English STAAR Reading, 45% of those students were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .86, indicating that of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Winter ISIP Español LA and the English STAAR Reading, 86% of those students were identified as "met proficiency" on the English STAAR Reading. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter ISIP Español LA overall scale score

indicate that 73% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 68% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 4.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 4 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment in the lower panel of Table 27. The sensitivity value of .55 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 55% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity value of .85 indicates that 82% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 53% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .85; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 85% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 77% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 70% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate.

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 4 when predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for determining which administration season may be the most accurate for predicting and classifying student performance on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment. The sensitivity for the Grade 4 *ISIP Español LA* is greater in the Fall ($Sn = .60$) than it was for the Winter and Spring ($Sn = .57$ and $.55$, respectively), for example, indicating accurate identification of a greater proportion of students who later “did not meet” proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading*. However, the specificity was the greatest for the Spring administration ($Sp = .85$), whereby the data indicate that the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall was able to accurately identify 85% of the students who later “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* (compared to only 79% of students accurately identified in the Winter and 80% accurately identified in the Fall). Moreover, the accuracy value is the largest for the Spring, indicating that recommended instructional tier based on Fall *ISIP Español LA* performance was able to accurately classify 77% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not proficiency”. However, the AUC values obtained when predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* were equal for Fall and Spring ($AUC = .70$). Altogether these results indicate that collecting more data may be necessary to determine which season of administration may be most able to accurately classify students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment in the Spring of Grade 4.

Grade 4 Predicting Proficiency on the Spanish-language STAAR

Next, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses with proficiency on the Grade 4 Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment as the outcome (Table 28).

Table 28

Classification accuracy of Grade 4 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the STAAR Reading (Spanish)

ISIP Español LA subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	74	0.65	0.83	0.17	0.34	0.68	0.82	0.77	0.74 (0.64, 0.74)
Lectura con fluidez	74	0.27	0.79	0.21	0.73	0.41	0.67	0.61	0.53 (0.43, 0.53)
Vocabulario	74	0.57	0.81	0.19	0.43	0.62	0.78	0.73	0.69 (0.58, 0.69)
Comprensión de Lectura	74	0.63	0.86	0.14	0.37	0.71	0.81	0.78	0.74 (0.64, 0.74)
Winter									
Overall	81	0.50	0.86	0.14	0.50	0.70	0.72	0.72	0.68 (0.58, 0.68)
Lectura con fluidez	81	0.44	0.71	0.29	0.56	0.50	0.66	0.60	0.58 (0.47, 0.58)
Vocabulario	81	0.53	0.79	0.21	0.47	0.61	0.73	0.69	0.66 (0.56, 0.66)
Comprensión de Lectura	81	0.41	0.84	0.16	0.59	0.62	0.68	0.67	0.62 (0.52, 0.62)
Spring									
Overall	77	0.44	0.91	0.09	0.56	0.79	0.67	0.70	0.67 (0.58, 0.67)
Lectura con fluidez	77	0.50	0.81	0.19	0.50	0.68	0.67	0.68	0.66 (0.55, 0.66)
Vocabulario	77	0.65	0.82	0.18	0.35	0.73	0.75	0.74	0.73 (0.63, 0.73)
Comprensión de Lectura	77	0.50	0.82	0.18	0.50	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.66 (0.56, 0.66)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 4 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on the Spanish STAAR reading assessment are displayed in the top panel of Table 28. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 4 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LT overall score accurately identified only 65% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish STAAR Reading assessment in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the Spanish STAAR Reading was significantly higher, as 83% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .68, indicating that over half of the students (68%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and Spanish STAAR Reading were

identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .82; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 82% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score indicate that 77% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 74% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014), this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 4 **Winter ISIP Español LA** recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in the middle panel of Table 28. These data indicate that level of risk based on the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 4 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify accurately only 50% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was greater at .86, indicating that 86% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier was .70, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 70% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .72, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 72% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 72% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 68% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 4.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 4 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in the lower panel of Table 58. The sensitivity value of .44 indicates that the level of risk based on the recommended instructional tier for the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified only 44% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity value of .91 indicates that 91% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 79% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met

proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .67, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 67% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 70% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 67% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 4 when predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for determining which administration season may be the most accurate for predicting and classifying student performance on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment. The sensitivity for the Grade 4 *ISIP Español LA* is greater in the Fall ($Sn = .65$) than it was for the Winter and Spring ($Sn = .50$ and $.44$, respectively), for example, indicating accurate identification of a greater proportion of students who later “did not meet” proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. However, the specificity was the greatest for the Spring administration ($Sp = .91$), whereby the data indicate that the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring accurately identified 91% of the students who later “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* (compared to only 83% of students accurately identified in the Fall and 86% accurately identified in the Winter). However, the accuracy value was also the largest for the Fall, indicating that level of risk associated with recommended instructional tier based on Fall *ISIP Español LA* performance was able to accurately classify 77% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not proficiency”. Additionally, the largest AUC value obtained when predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* was also observed in the Fall ($AUC = .74$). Altogether, these results suggest that additional data collection may be needed to obtain consistent classification and predictive information for *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in Grade 4.

Results from comparative analyses of the classification accuracy and predictive utility of the risk status based on the recommended instructional tier associated for the *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score for the English and Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessments in Grade 4 are also inconclusive. Comparison of the sensitivity values across seasons and languages, for example, reveals that the range of sensitivity values for the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment is higher ($Sn = .45 - .65$) compared to the English *STAAR Reading* ($Sn = .55 - .60$), suggesting that risk status based on recommended instructional tier on the *ISIP Español LA* may do a marginally better job of accurately identifying students who later “did not meet proficiency” when the *STAAR Reading* assessment was taken in Spanish. The range of specificity values representing the accurate identification of students who “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency”, was also greater for the Spanish *STAAR Reading* ($Sp = .83 - .91$) compared to the English *STAAR Reading* ($Sp = .79 - .85$). However, the range of accuracy values obtained for classifying students as “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” was higher for the English *STAAR Reading* (.73 - .77) than for the Spanish *STAAR Reading* (.70 - .77). With respect to the overall predictive utility of the *ISIP Español LA* for predicting which students “met proficiency” or “did not meet” proficiency, results for Grade 4 indicate the greatest range of AUC values for Spanish *STAAR*

Reading (AUC = .67 - .74) compared to English *STAAR Reading* (AUC = .68 - .70). Altogether, these results suggest that additional data collection with students completing the English and Spanish versions of the *STAAR Reading* assessment may be warranted.

In Table 29, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *STAAR* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 29
Specificity Values for Grade 4 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the STAAR when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	English STAAR			Spanish STAAR		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.60	0.40	0.20	0.72	0.48	0.24
Lectura con fluidez	0.57	0.38	0.19	0.33	0.22	0.11
Vocabulario	0.61	0.41	0.20	0.57	0.38	0.19
Comprensión de Lectura	0.66	0.44	0.22	0.70	0.46	0.23
Winter						
Overall	0.54	0.36	0.18	0.51	0.34	0.17
Lectura con fluidez	0.46	0.31	0.15	0.38	0.25	0.13
Vocabulario	0.55	0.37	0.18	0.50	0.34	0.17
Comprensión de Lectura	0.41	0.27	0.14	0.42	0.28	0.14
Spring						
Overall	0.56	0.37	0.19	0.49	0.32	0.16
Lectura con fluidez	0.47	0.32	0.16	0.49	0.33	0.16
Vocabulario	0.66	0.44	0.22	0.70	0.46	0.23
Comprensión de Lectura	0.36	0.24	0.12	0.49	0.33	0.16

Grade 4 Predicting Proficiency on PARCC

In this section, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 4 for predicting proficiency on the *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers English Language Arts/Literacy* assessment (PARCC) using proficiency thresholds set by the New Mexico state department of education. We present the classification accuracy results for *ISIP Español LA* classifying and predicting proficiency with PARCC in Table 30 and interpret the results in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 30
Classification accuracy of Grade 4 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the PARCC (English)

<i>ISIP Español LA subtest</i>	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	0.60	0.67	0.33	0.40	0.86	0.33	0.62		0.63 (0.27, 0.63)

Lectura con fluidez	0.60	0.67	0.33	0.40	0.86	0.33	0.62	0.63 (0.27, 0.63)
Vocabulario	0.60	1.00	0.00	0.40	1.00	0.43	0.69	0.80 (0.64, 0.80)
Comprensión de Lectura	0.36	1.00	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.30	0.50	0.68 (0.53, 0.68)
Winter								
Overall	0.36	1.00	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.30	0.50	0.68 (0.53, 0.68)
Lectura con fluidez	0.18	1.00	0.00	0.81	1.00	0.25	0.36	0.59 (0.47, 0.59)
Vocabulario	0.36	0.67	0.33	0.64	0.80	0.22	0.43	0.52 (0.16, 0.52)
Comprensión de Lectura	0.18	1.00	0.00	0.81	1.00	0.25	0.36	0.59 (0.47, 0.59)
Spring								
Overall	0.55	1.00	0.00	0.45	1.00	0.38	0.64	0.77 (0.62, 0.77)
Lectura con fluidez	0.36	1.00	0.00	0.64	1.00	0.35	0.50	0.68 (0.53, 0.68)
Vocabulario	0.27	0.67	0.33	0.73	0.75	0.20	0.36	0.47 (0.12, 0.47)
Comprensión de Lectura	0.30	1.00	0.00	0.70	1.00	0.30	0.46	0.65 (0.50, 0.65)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 4 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on PARCC are displayed in the top panel of Table 30. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 4 students' level of risk associated with their recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified 60% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on PARCC in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on PARCC was marginally greater, with the correct identification of 67% of students as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .86, indicating that the majority of students (86%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and PARCC were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on PARCC. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .33; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and PARCC, 33% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on PARCC. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 62% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 63% of Grade 4 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on PARCC in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 4 Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on PARCC in

the middle panel of Table 30. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 4 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify accurately a significantly smaller proportion of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on *PARCC* in the Spring of Grade 4 (36%). The specificity of the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was 1.00, indicating that 100% of Grade 4 students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier was .1.00, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 100% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .30, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 30% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. With respect to accuracy, results based on level of risk associated with the recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 50% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 68% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring of Grade 4. Interpretations of this value using the guidelines proposed by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest the model is moderately predictive of performance on *PARCC*.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 4 *Spring ISIP Español LA* level of risk for predicting proficiency on *PARCC* in the lower panel of Table 30. The sensitivity value of 0.55 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 55% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on *PARCC* in the Spring of Grade 4. The specificity value of .1.00 indicates that 100% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 100% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .38, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 38% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 64% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 77% of Grade 4 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate (Kettler et al., 2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 4 when predicting proficiency on *PARCC* using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for classifying students and predicting performance on *PARCC* in Grade 4. Although the sensitivity was greatest for the Fall ($Sn = .60$), specificity was equally high ($Sp = 1.00$) for Winter and Spring. In addition, accuracy was the greatest for Spring (.64), as was the AUC ($AUC = .77$). Given the particularly low sample size and limited generalizability

for this criterion assessment, however, these results should be interpreted with caution and additional data should be collected.

In Table 31, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on *PARCC* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 31
Specificity Values for Grade 4 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the PARCC when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall			
Overall	0.50	0.33	0.17
Lectura con fluidez	0.50	0.33	0.17
Vocabulario	0.75	0.50	0.25
Comprensión de Lectura	0.47	0.31	0.16
Winter			
Overall	0.47	0.31	0.16
Lectura con fluidez	0.37	0.24	0.12
Vocabulario	0.31	0.21	0.10
Comprensión de Lectura	0.37	0.24	0.12
Spring			
Overall	0.66	0.44	0.22
Lectura con fluidez	0.47	0.31	0.16
Vocabulario	0.28	0.18	0.10
Comprensión de Lectura	0.43	0.29	0.14

Grade 5: Classification Accuracy

We first present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for Grade 5 *ISIP Español LA* (overall and subtest scores) administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring with respect to performance on the *Aprenda-3* overall scale score in Tables 32-33, respectively. We present the results of these classification analyses for each available *ISIP Español LA* score (overall scale score and individual subtest scores) with the *Aprenda-3* using the two cut points for defining risk-status described previously (i.e., performance above the 15th percentile and performance above the 40th percentile). In our interpretation of the results, we focus primarily on the accuracy and diagnostic efficiency of the *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score.

We then present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for the two state standardized assessments, STAAR and PARCC. As noted earlier in the Method section, proficiency on these two assessments was defined using the state-specified criteria. Specifically, students who performed at Level 1 on STAAR were categorized as “did not meet proficiency” while those who performed at Levels 2, 3, or 4 were categorized as “met proficiency”. Similarly, students who performed at Levels 1 or 2 on PARCC were categorized as “did not meet proficiency” while those who performed at Levels 3 or 4 were categorized as “met proficiency”.

Grade 5 Proficiency Above the 15th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 5 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 15th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 32 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 32

Classification accuracy of Grade 5 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 15th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	215	0.33	0.81	0.19	0.67	0.15	0.92	0.77	0.57 (0.36, 0.57)
Lectura con fluidez	215	0.57	0.72	0.28	0.43	0.20	0.93	0.71	0.65 (0.44, 0.65)
Vocabulario	215	0.57	00.69	0.31	0.43	0.17	0.93	0.69	0.63 (0.43, 0.63)
Comprensión de Lectura	215	0.57	0.73	0.27	0.43	0.20	0.93	0.71	0.65 (0.44, 0.65)
Winter									
Overall	215	0.73	0.78	0.22	0.27	0.28	0.96	0.77	0.75 (0.63, 0.75)
Lectura con fluidez	215	0.60	0.86	0.14	0.40	0.33	0.95	0.83	0.73 (0.60, 0.73)
Vocabulario	215	0.87	0.68	0.32	0.13	0.24	0.98	0.70	0.77 (0.68, 0.77)
Comprensión de Lectura	215	0.60	0.82	0.18	0.4	0.28	0.94	0.80	0.71 (0.58, 0.71)
Spring									
Overall	215	0.75	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.27	0.96	0.75	0.75 (0.61, 0.75)
Lectura con fluidez	215	0.73	00.74	0.26	0.27	0.24	0.96	0.74	0.73 (0.59, 0.73)
Vocabulario	215	1.00	0.70	0.30	0.00	0.28	1.00	0.73	0.85 (0.80, 0.85)
Comprensión de Lectura	215	0.73	0.80	0.20	0.27	0.30	0.96	0.79	0.76 (0.62, 0.76)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 5 Fall *ISIP Español LA* level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 32. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 5 students' level of risk associated with their recommended instructional tier that is based on their Fall *ISIP Español LA* overall score accurately identified only 33% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity for the Fall *ISIP Español LA* for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*

was significantly greater, as 81% of students were correctly identified as “met proficiency”. The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* level of risk was .15, indicating that only 15% of students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the *ISIP Español LA* and *Aprenda-3* were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. Conversely, the NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was much higher at .92; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Fall *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 92% of those students were identified as “meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Fall *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier for the overall score indicate that only 77% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 57% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is low.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 5 Winter *ISIP Español LA* level of risk predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are displayed in the middle panel of Table 32. These data indicate significantly higher sensitivity for the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter of Grade 5 (compared to Fall), whereby the level of risk on *ISIP Español LT* accurately identified 73% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 15th percentile in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity of level of risk for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was .78, indicating that 78% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* level of risk was .28, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3* 28% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was high at .96; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 96% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on risk level derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 77% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 75% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 5 Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 15th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 32. The sensitivity value of 0.75 indicates that level of risk based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 75% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity value of .75 indicates that 75% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, was highest for the Spring *ISIP Español LA*, indicating that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español*

LA and the *Aprenda-3*, 27% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .96, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 96% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 75% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 75% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 5 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile indicates that results using this sample may be inconclusive for determining the level of risk associated with which season of *ISIP Español LA* administration may be the most accurate for classifying and predicting performance on the *Aprenda-3*. For example, sensitivity was the greatest for the Spring administration, correctly identifying 75% of Grade 5 students’ who later “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*, but specificity was greatest for the Fall administration, whereby 81% of students who “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* were correctly identified by the *ISIP Español LA*. Comparison of the accuracy values indicates that the level of risk associated with Fall and Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale scores was able to correctly classify the greatest proportion of students (77%) as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*, but inspection of the AUC values across the three seasons reveals the highest AUC for Winter and Spring of Grade 5 (AUC = .75). Collectively these data indicate that the collection of additional data may be needed to be able to discern which season of the *ISIP Español LA* in Grade 5 may provide the most robust classification accuracy estimates for the *Aprenda-3* above the 15th percentile.

Grade 5 Proficiency Above the 40th Percentile

In this section, we present the results of the classification accuracy for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 5 for predicting student performance on the *Aprenda-3* when the threshold for proficiency is set above the 40th percentile. We present the results for Fall, Winter, and Spring in Table 33 below and interpret them in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 33
Classification accuracy of Grade 5 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA level of risk for the Aprenda-3 with proficiency above the 40th percentile

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	0.36	0.88	0.12	0.64	0.62	0.73	0.70	0.62 (0.51, 0.62)	
Lectura con fluidez	0.43	0.76	0.24	0.57	0.50	0.71	0.65	0.72 (0.60, 0.72)	
Vocabulario	0.60	0.82	0.18	0.40	0.65	0.78	0.730.	0.71 (0.60, 0.71)	

Comprensión de Lectura	0.58	0.86	0.14	0.42	0.70	0.78	0.76	0.72 (0.61, 0.72)
Winter								
Overall	0.59	0.93	0.07	0.41	0.85	0.77	0.80	0.76 (0.69, 0.76)
Lectura con fluidez	0.38	0.93	0.07	0.63	0.78	0.69	0.71	0.65 (0.58, 0.65)
Vocabulario	0.73	0.85	0.15	0.27	0.76	0.83	0.80	0.79 (0.72, 0.79)
Comprensión de Lectura	0.46	0.93	0.07	0.54	0.81	0.72	0.74	0.70 (0.62, 0.70)
Spring								
Overall	0.60	0.93	0.07	0.40	0.88	0.75	0.79	0.77 (0.69, 0.77)
Lectura con fluidez	0.51	0.85	0.15	0.49	0.73	0.69	0.70	0.68 (0.59, 0.68)
Vocabulario	0.71	0.88	0.12	0.29	0.81	0.80	0.81	0.80 (0.72, 0.80)
Comprensión de Lectura	0.49	0.93	0.07	0.51	0.85	0.70	0.74	0.71 (0.63, 0.71)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 5 Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the top panel of Table 33. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 5 students' recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified only 36% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* was significantly higher, as 88% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .62, indicating that over half of the students (62%) who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and *Aprenda-3* were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .73, indicating that of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and the *Aprenda-3*, 73% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 70% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 62% of Grade 5 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 5 Winter ISIP Español LA level of risk predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* are displayed in the middle panel of Table 33. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 5 Winter ISIP Español LA was able to identify accurately 59% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* with scores above the 40th percentile in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity of recommended instructional

tier for the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was greater at .93, indicating that 93% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier was .85, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3* 85% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was slightly lower at .75; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LT* and the *Aprenda-3*, 75% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 80% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 76% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. The guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this AUC value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 5 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency above the 40th percentile on the *Aprenda-3* in the lower panel of Table 33. The sensitivity value of .60 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LT* overall scale score accurately identified 60% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity value of .93 indicates that 93% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 88% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .75, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the *Aprenda-3*, 81% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 79% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 77% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the *Aprenda-3* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate when using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 5 when predicting proficiency on the *Aprenda-3* above the 40th percentile using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates estimates were of comparable robustness using the Winter and Spring of Grade 5 *ISIP Español LA* data.

In Table 34, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *STAAR* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 34
Specificity Values for Grade 5 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the Aprenda-3 when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	Above 15 th Percentile			Above 40 th Percentile		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	0.36	0.24	0.12	0.42	0.28	0.14
Lectura con fluidez	0.51	0.37	0.17	0.40	0.27	0.13
Vocabulario	0.49	0.32	0.16	0.61	0.41	0.20
Comprensión de Lectura	0.51	0.34	0.17	0.62	0.41	0.21
Winter						
Overall	0.79	0.58	0.29	0.68	0.45	0.23
Lectura con fluidez	0.64	0.43	0.21	0.45	0.30	0.15
Vocabulario	0.74	0.70	0.51	0.86	0.64	0.32
Comprensión de Lectura	0.61	0.41	0.20	0.52	0.35	0.17
Spring						
Overall	0.77	0.60	0.30	0.71	0.47	0.24
Lectura con fluidez	0.75	0.54	0.27	0.52	0.35	0.17
Vocabulario	0.79	0.76	0.73	0.88	0.61	0.31
Comprensión de Lectura	0.81	0.59	0.29	0.55	0.37	0.18

Grade 5 Predicting Proficiency on the English-language STAAR

In this section, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 5 for predicting proficiency on the *State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness* (STAAR) using proficiency thresholds set by the state department of education. Because some students took the STAAR reading assessment in English while others took it in Spanish, we present the results of the classification accuracy analyses for both languages. We present the results for *ISIP Español LA* with STAAR English in Table 35, followed by the results for *ISIP Español LA* with STAAR Spanish in Table 36.

Table 35
Classification accuracy of Grade 5 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the STAAR Reading (English)

ISIP Español LA subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lectura con fluidez	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vocabulario	5	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.25	0.75	0.50	0.50 (0.00, 0.50)
Comprensión de Lectura	5	1.00	0.80	.020	0.00	0.50	1.00	0.83	0.90 (-, -)
Winter									
Overall	59	0.47	0.84	0.16	0.53	0.50	0.82	0.75	0.65 (0.51, 0.65)

Lectura con fluidez	59	0.33	0.86	0.14	0.67	0.45	0.79	0.73	0.60 (0.46, 0.60)
Vocabulario	59	0.88	0.71	0.29	0.13	0.52	0.94	0.75	0.79 (0.69, 0.79)
Comprensión de Lectura	59	0.47	0.84	0.16	0.53	0.50	0.82	0.75	0.65 (0.51, 0.65)
Spring									
Overall	37	0.80	0.82	0.18	0.20	0.75	0.86	0.81	0.81 (0.68, 0.81)
Lectura con fluidez	37	0.60	0.81	0.18	0.40	0.69	0.75	0.73	0.71 (0.56, 0.71)
Vocabulario	37	0.75	0.68	0.32	0.25	0.60	0.81	0.71	0.72 (0.57, 0.72)
Comprensión de Lectura	37	0.67	0.91	0.10	0.33	0.83	0.80	0.81	0.79 (0.65, 0.79)

Our sample size was insufficient for Grade 5 successfully running classification accuracy analyses to classify and predict performance on the STAAR English in the Spring.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 5 Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on the English STAAR Reading assessment in the middle panel of Table 35. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 5 Winter ISIP Español LA was accurately identified only 47% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter ISIP Español LA was greater at .84, indicating that 84% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the ISIP Español LA in the Winter also “met proficiency” on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier was .50, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter ISIP Español LA and the English STAAR Reading, 50% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the English STAAR Reading. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .82, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter ISIP Español LA and the English STAAR Reading, 82% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the English STAAR Reading. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter ISIP Español LA overall scale score indicate that 75% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Winter correctly classified 65% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring of Grade 5. Interpretations of this value using the guidelines proposed by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest this value is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 5 Spring ISIP Español LA level of risk for predicting proficiency on the English STAAR Reading assessment in the lower panel of Table 35. The sensitivity value of 0.80 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring ISIP Español LA overall scale score accurately identified 80% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the English STAAR Reading in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity value of .82 indicates that 82% of

students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 75% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .86; in other words, of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the English *STAAR Reading*, 86% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 81% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 81% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the English *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered high and indicative of a strong universal screening assessment by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 5 when predicting proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* suggests that data from Spring may be the most robust for accurately classifying and predicting student proficiency on the English *STAAR Reading* assessment. This conclusion is supported by the following evidence: (a) greatest sensitivity value ($Sn = .80$), (b) greatest specificity value ($Sp = .82$), (c) highest accuracy (.81), and greatest AUC ($AUC = .81$).

[Grade 5 Predicting Proficiency on the Spanish-language STAAR](#)

Next, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses with proficiency on the Grade 5 Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment as the outcome (Table 36).

Table 36
Classification accuracy of Grade 5 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the STAAR Reading (Spanish)

<i>ISIP Español LA</i> subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall	45	0.20	0.83	0.18	0.80	0.13	0.89	0.76	0.51 (0.31, 0.51)
Lectura con fluidez	45	0.20	0.75	0.25	0.80	0.10	0.88	0.69	0.48 (0.27, .48)
Vocabulario	45	0.50	0.80	0.20	0.50	0.27	0.92	0.77	0.65 (0.42, 0.65)
Comprensión de Lectura	45	0.20	0.75	0.25	0.80	0.10	0.88	0.69	0.48 (0.27k, 0.48)
Winter									
Overall	64	0.58	0.90	0.10	0.42	0.58	0.90	0.84	0.74 (0.59, 0.74)
Lectura con fluidez	64	0.75	0.90	0.10	0.25	0.64	0.94	0.88	0.83 (0.69, 0.83)
Vocabulario	64	0.67	0.85	0.15	0.33	0.50	0.93	0.82	0.76 (0.61, 0.76)

Comprensión de Lectura	64	0.75	0.90	0.10	0.25	0.65	0.94	0.88	0.83 (0.70, 0.83)
Spring									
Overall	55	0.64	0.91	0.10	0.36	0.64	0.91	0.85	0.77 (0.62, 0.77)
Lectura con fluidez	55	0.45	0.77	0.23	0.55	0.33	0.85	0.71	0.61 (0.45, 0.61)
Vocabulario	55	0.73	0.89	0.11	0.27	0.62	0.94	0.86	0.81 (0.66, 0.81)
Comprensión de Lectura	55	0.36	0.89	0.11	0.64	0.44	0.85	0.78	0.63 (0.47, 0.63)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 5 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on the Spanish STAAR reading assessment are displayed in the top panel of Table 36. The specificity for Fall indicates Grade 5 students' level of risk associated with their recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified only 20% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish STAAR Reading assessment in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the Spanish STAAR Reading was significantly higher, as 83% of students were correctly identified as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .13, indicating that only 13% who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and Spanish STAAR Reading were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Spanish STAAR Reading. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .89; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and the Spanish STAAR Reading, 89% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Spanish STAAR Reading. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 76% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 51% of Grade 5 students their performance on the ISIP Español LA in the Fall correctly classified them as "met proficiency" or "did not meet proficiency" on the Spanish STAAR Reading in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014), this AUC value is low.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 5 Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on the Spanish STAAR Reading assessment in the middle panel of Table 36. These data indicate that level of risk based on the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 5 Winter ISIP Español LA was able to identify accurately 58% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish STAAR Reading in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity of recommended instructional tier for the Winter ISIP Español LA was greater at .90, indicating that 90% of students who were identified as "met proficiency" on the ISIP Español LA in the Winter also "met proficiency" on the Spanish STAAR Reading in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier was .58, indicating that of all the students who were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Winter ISIP Español LA and the Spanish STAAR Reading, 58% of those students were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on the Spanish

STAAR Reading. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .90, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 90% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 84% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 74% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 5. Interpretations of this value using the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) indicate the AUC is moderate.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 5 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment in the lower panel of Table 36. The sensitivity value of 0.64 indicates that the level of risk based on the recommended instructional tier for the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 64% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity value of .91 indicates that 91% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 64% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .91, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and the Spanish *STAAR Reading*, 91% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 85% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 77% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate by Kettler et al. (2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 5 when predicting proficiency on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* assessment using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates the most robust estimates were produced using the Spring *ISIP Español* data. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the level of risk associated with the recommended instructional tier for the Spring accurately identified 64% of students who “did not meet proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading* (compared to only accurate identification of only 20% of students using Fall data and 58% using Winter data). Moreover, the specificity value for the Spring was also the greatest, indicating that Spring performance on the *ISIP Español LA* was able to accurately identify 91% of students who “met proficiency” on the Spanish *STAAR Reading*. In addition, the accuracy and AUC values were also greatest for the Spring (.85 and .77, respectively).

In Table 37, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *STAAR* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 37
Specificity Values for Grade 5 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the STAAR when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	English STAAR			Spanish STAAR		
	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall						
Overall	-	-	-	0.30	0.21	0.10
Lectura con fluidez	-	-	-	0.28	0.19	0.10
Vocabulario	0.30	0.20	0.10	0.48	0.32	0.16
Comprensión de Lectura	0.86	0.84	0.82	0.28	0.19	0.10
Winter						
Overall	0.56	0.38	0.19	0.65	0.43	0.22
Lectura con fluidez	0.39	0.26	0.13	0.52	0.35	0.17
Vocabulario	0.77	0.74	0.57	0.76	0.51	0.25
Comprensión de Lectura	0.47	0.32	0.16	0.91	0.72	0.36
Spring						
Overall	0.84	0.81	0.41	0.75	0.50	0.25
Lectura con fluidez	0.61	0.41	0.20	0.43	0.28	0.14
Vocabulario	0.70	0.54	0.27	0.90	0.65	0.33
Comprensión de Lectura	0.82	0.55	0.27	0.42	0.28	0.14

[Grade 5 Predicting Proficiency on PARCC](#)

In this section, we present the results of classification accuracy analyses for the *ISIP Español LA* administered in the Fall, Winter, and Spring of Grade 5 for predicting proficiency on the *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers English Language Arts/Literacy* assessment (PARCC) using proficiency thresholds set by the New Mexico state department of education. We present the classification accuracy results for *ISIP Español LA* classifying and predicting proficiency with PARCC in Table 38 and interpret the results in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 38

Classification accuracy of Grade 5 Fall, Winter, and Spring ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier for the proficiency on the PARCC

ISIP Español LA subtest	n	Sn	Sp	FPR	FNR	PPV	NPV	Acc	AUC ^a
Fall									
Overall		0.56	1.00	0.00	0.44	1.00	0.56	0.71	0.78 (0.61, 0.78)
Lectura con fluidez		0.50	0.80	0.20	0.50	0.83	0.44	0.60	0.65 (0.40, 0.65)
Vocabulario		0.78	0.80	0.20	0.22	0.88	0.67	0.79	0.79 (0.55, 0.79)
Comprensión de Lectura		0.60	0.80	0.20	0.40	0.86	0.50	0.67	0.70 (0.45, 0.70)
Winter									
Overall		0.50	0.80	0.20	0.50	0.86	0.40	0.59	0.65 (0.40, 0.65)
Lectura con fluidez		0.25	1.00	0.00	0.75	1.00	0.36	0.47	0.63 (0.50, 0.63)
Vocabulario		0.75	0.60	0.40	0.25	0.82	0.50	0.71	0.68 (0.40, 0.68)
Comprensión de Lectura		0.33	1.00	0.00	0.67	1.00	0.39	0.53	0.67 (0.53, 0.67)
Spring									
Overall		0.55	1.00	0.00	0.45	1.00	0.50	0.69	0.77 (0.62, 0.77)
Lectura con fluidez		0.30	0.60	0.40	0.70	0.60	0.30	0.40	0.45 (0.17, 0.45)
Vocabulario		0.91	1.00	0.00	0.09	1.00	0.83	0.94	0.95 (0.87, 0.95)
Comprensión de Lectura		0.60	1.00	0.00	0.40	1.00	0.56	0.73	0.80 (0.64, 0.80)

Classification accuracy using Fall ISIP Español LA scores. Classification accuracy results for Grade 5 Fall ISIP Español LA recommended instructional tier predicting proficiency on PARCC are displayed in the top panel of Table 38. The sensitivity for Fall indicates Grade 5 students' level of risk associated with their recommended instructional tier based on their Fall ISIP Español LA overall score accurately identified 56% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on PARCC in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity for the Fall ISIP Español LA for correctly identifying students who were identified as "met proficiency" on PARCC was greater, with the correct identification of 100% of students as "met proficiency". The precision, or PPV, based on the Fall ISIP Español LA level of risk was .1.00, indicating that all students who were identified as not demonstrating proficiency on the ISIP Español LA and PARCC were identified as "did not meet proficiency" on PARCC. The NPV, or proportion of students who "met proficiency" of all students identified as "met proficiency" was .56; in other words, of all the students identified as "meeting proficiency" on the Fall ISIP Español LA and PARCC, 56% of those students were identified as "meeting proficiency" on PARCC. With respect to accuracy, results based on recommended instructional tier derived from the Fall ISIP Español LA overall score indicate that 71% of students who "met proficiency" and "did not meet proficiency" were

identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 78% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Fall correctly classified them as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring. According to the guidelines suggested by Kettler et al. (2014) this AUC value is low.

Classification accuracy using Winter ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results Grade 5 **Winter ISIP Español LA** recommended instructional tier for predicting proficiency on *PARCC* in the middle panel of Table 38. These data indicate that the recommended instructional tier for the Grade 5 Winter *ISIP Español LA* was able to identify only 50% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on *PARCC* in the Spring of Grade 5. The specificity of the Winter *ISIP Español LA* was .80, indicating that 80% of Grade 5 students who were identified as “met proficiency” on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter also “met proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring. The precision, or PPV, based on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* recommended instructional tier was .86, indicating that of all the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 86% of those students were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .40, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Winter *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 40% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. With respect to accuracy, results based on level of risk associated with the recommended instructional tier derived from the Winter *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score indicate that 59% of students who “met proficiency” and “did not meet proficiency” were identified accurately. Finally, the AUC value indicates that the performance on the *ISIP Español LA* in the Winter correctly classified 65% of students as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring of Grade 5. Interpretations of this value using the guidelines proposed by Kettler et al. (2014) suggest the model is moderately predictive of performance on *PARCC*.

Classification accuracy using Spring ISIP Español LA scores. We present the results for Grade 5 **Spring ISIP Español LA** level of risk for predicting proficiency on *PARCC* in the lower panel of Table 38. The sensitivity value of 0.55 indicates that recommended instructional tier based on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* overall scale score accurately identified 55% of students who did not demonstrate proficiency on *PARCC* in the Spring of Grade 45. The specificity value of .1.00 indicates that 100% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” using the Spring *ISIP Español LA* level of risk were also identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. The precision, or PPV, indicates that of all of the students who were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 100% were identified as “did not meet proficiency” on *PARCC*. The NPV, or proportion of students who “met proficiency” of all students identified as “met proficiency” was .50, indicating that of all the students identified as “meeting proficiency” on the Spring *ISIP Español LA* and *PARCC*, 50% of those students were identified as “met proficiency” on *PARCC*. With respect to accuracy, results from the Spring indicate that 69% of students who were identified as “met proficiency” or “did not meet proficiency” were identified correctly. Finally, the AUC value indicates that for 77% of Grade 5 students their performance on the *ISIP Español LT* in the Spring correctly classified them as “meeting proficiency” or “not meeting proficiency” on *PARCC* in the Spring. This AUC value is considered moderate (Kettler et al., 2014).

Comparison of the classification accuracy results for Grade 5 when predicting proficiency on *PARCC* using data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español LA* indicates inconclusive results for classifying students and predicting performance on *PARCC* in Grade 5. Although the sensitivity was greatest for the Fall ($Sn = 0.60$), specificity was equally high ($Sp = 1.00$) for Fall and Spring. In addition, accuracy was the greatest for Fall (.71), as was the AUC ($AUC = .78$). Given the particularly low sample size and limited generalizability for this criterion assessment, however, these results should be interpreted with caution and additional data should be collected.

In Table 39, we report the specificity values for predicting proficiency on the *STAAR* when the sensitivities for the Fall, Winter, and Spring *ISIP Español* are fixed at 0.70, 0.80, and 0.90.

Table 39
Specificity Values for Grade 5 ISIP Español LA Level of Risk Predicting Proficiency on the PARCC when Sensitivity is Fixed

ISIP Español LA Subtest	0.70	0.80	0.90
Fall			
Overall	0.68	0.45	0.23
Lectura con fluidez	0.48	0.32	0.16
Vocabulario	0.82	0.72	0.36
Comprensión de Lectura	0.60	0.40	0.20
Winter			
Overall	0.48	0.32	0.16
Lectura con fluidez	0.40	0.27	0.13
Vocabulario	0.63	0.48	0.24
Comprensión de Lectura	0.45	0.30	0.15
Spring			
Overall	0.66	0.44	0.22
Lectura con fluidez	0.26	0.17	0.09
Vocabulario	1.00	1.00	1.00
Comprensión de Lectura	0.75	0.50	0.25

Criterion-Related Evidence for Validity

In this section, we present first the concurrent-related validity evidence collected for the *ISIP Español* assessments, followed by the predictive-related validity evidence.

Concurrent-Related Validity Evidence

Concurrent-related evidence for validity examines the relation between performance on a universal screening assessment and a criterion assessment with similar content that is administered at the same point in time. Concurrent-related evidence for validity for the Winter administrations of the *ISIP Español* assessments was calculated by determining the correlation between the scaled scores of the *ISIP Español* assessments and the scaled scores for *FastBridge Early Reading* (Kindergarten – Grade 1) and *Fastbridge CBM-Reading* (Grades 2-5)

assessments. Concurrent-related evidence for validity for the Spring administrations of the *ISIP Español* assessments was calculated by determining the correlation between the scaled scores of the *ISIP Español* assessments and the scaled scores for *FastBridge Early Reading* (Kindergarten – Grade 1), *FastBridge CBM-Reading* (Grades 2-5), *Aprenda-3* (Grades K-5), *STAAR Reading* (Grades 3-5), and *PARCC* (Grades 3-5). Note that for *FastBridge CBM-Reading* (FB CBM-R), concurrent correlations are presented for students Word Read Correct (WRC) score for each of the three connected-text passages read as part of the assessment; no composite score is available. For the purposes of parsimony, we present and interpret the correlation coefficients based on the overall/composite scaled scores within the narrative of this technical report. The concurrent correlation coefficients for the overall/composite scaled scores and all subtest scores are available in Appendix A. Concurrent correlations for Subgroups are presented in Appendix B.

[Kindergarten through Grade 5: Concurrent-related Validity Evidence](#)

Table 40
Concurrent-related evidence for validity

Season/Assessment	KG	1	2	3	4	5
Winter						
FB ER	0.68 (0.59, 0.75)	0.79 (0.72, 0.84)				
FB CBM-R.WRC1*		0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.66 (0.58, 0.72)	0.72 (0.65, 0.77)	0.69 (0.60, 0.77)	
FB CBM-R.WRC2		0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.68 (0.61, 0.75)	0.70 (0.60, 0.77)	
FB CBM-R.WRC3		0.73 (0.67, 0.78)	0.66 (0.58, 0.72)	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.70 (0.60, 0.77)	
Spring						
FB ER	0.73 (0.63, 0.79)	0.78 (0.71, 0.84)				
FB CBM-R.WRC1		0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.63 (0.55, 0.70)	0.70 (0.63, 0.77)	0.72 (0.61, 0.80)	
FB CBM-R.WRC2		0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.65 (0.56, 0.72)	0.74 (0.63, 0.81)	
FB CBM-R.WRC3		0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.71 (0.60, 0.79)	
Aprenda-3	0.71 (0.63, 0.77)	0.77 (0.70, 0.83)	0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.76 (0.69, 0.81)	0.69 (0.57, 0.77)
STAAR (English)				0.64 (0.50, 0.74)	0.60 (0.48, 0.70)	0.53 (0.25, 0.73)
STAAR (Spanish)				0.61 (0.49, 0.71)	0.65 (0.50, 0.76)	0.55 (0.33, 0.71)
PARCC				0.63 (0.20, 0.86)	0.47 (-0.08, 0.80)	0.55 (0.07, 0.82)

Predictive-Related Evidence for Validity

Predictive-related evidence for validity examines the relation between performance on a universal screening assessment and a criterion assessment that is administered at some time in the future. Predictive-related evidence for validity was collected for (a) Fall *ISIP Español* relative to each of the criterion assessments administered in the Spring, and (b) Winter *ISIP*

Español relative to the each of the criterion assessments administered in the Spring. Again, for purposes of parsimony we present and interpret the results based on overall/composite scaled scores in Table 41 (with 95% CI) but correlations among overall/composite scores and all subtest scores are available in Appendix C. Predictive correlations for Subgroups are presented in Appendix D.

Table 41
Predictive-related validity evidence for ISIP Español

Assessment	Grade	Fall ISIP Español	Winter ISIP Español
FB ER	KG	0.23 (0.09, 0.49)	0.61 (0.51, 0.69)
	1	0.64 (0.53, 0.73)	0.78 (0.70, 0.83)
	2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.72 (0.65, 0.78)
FB-CBM WRC1	3	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.68 (0.60, 0.74)
	4	0.67 (0.58, 0.75)	0.70 (0.62, 0.76)
	5	0.62 (0.44, 0.75)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)
FB-CBM WRC2	2	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)
	3	0.61 (0.52, 0.69)	0.66 (0.58, 0.73)
	4	0.67 (0.58, 0.75)	0.64 (0.56, 0.72)
FB-CBM WRC3	5	0.63 (0.45, 0.76)	0.67 (0.57, 0.75)
	2	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)	0.72 (0.66, 0.78)
	3	0.62 (0.54, 0.70)	0.67 (0.60, 0.74)
Aprenda	4	0.69 (0.60, 0.76)	0.70 (0.63, 0.76)
	5	0.64 (0.47, 0.77)	0.65 (0.54, 0.74)
	KG	0.24 (0.10, 0.36)	0.61 (0.51, 0.69)
STAAR (English)	1	0.55 (0.43, 0.65)	0.75 (0.67, 0.81)
	2	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)	0.74 (0.67, 0.79)
	3	0.72 (0.65, 0.78)	0.68 (0.60, 0.74)
	4	0.68 (0.59, 0.76)	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)
	5	0.53 (0.32, 0.68)	0.66 (0.56, 0.74)
	3	0.61	0.62

		(0.46, 0.73)	(0.49, 0.73)
	4	0.59	0.55
		(0.42, 0.72)	(0.41, 0.66)
	5	-0.13	0.61
		(-0.91, 0.85)	(0.42, 0.75)
	3	0.61	0.57
		(0.49, 0.71)	(0.44, 0.68)
STAAR (Spanish)	4	0.56	0.56
		(0.38, 0.70)	(0.39, 0.69)
	5	0.55	0.63
		(0.30, 0.72)	(0.45, 0.76)
	3	0.74	0.59
		(0.39, 0.91)	(0.05, 0.86)
PARCC	4	0.45	0.21
		(-0.14, 0.80)	(-0.36, 0.67)
	5	0.43	0.41
		(-0.14, 0.78)	(-0.09, 0.75)

Validity Evidence Disaggregated by Subgroup

The validity analyses were disaggregated by gender (male/female) and economically disadvantaged (yes/no). Eligibility for free or reduced price meals in the National School Lunch program was used as a proxy for the economically disadvantaged variable. Given the focus of the study, which required that our participants be Spanish-speaking, and because the majority of students in our sample were Hispanic/Latino, we do not report results disaggregated by race/ethnicity

Concurrent-Related Validity Evidence Disaggregated by Subgroup

The evidence for concurrent-related validity evidence is disaggregated by two relevant subgroups – gender and socioeconomic status – in Table 42.

Table 42

Concurrent-related evidence for validity disaggregated by subgroup

Season / Assessment	Grade	Overall Coefficient	Gender		Economically Disadvantaged	
			Male	Female	Yes	No
Winter						
	KG	0.68 (0.59, 0.75)	0.64 (0.50, 0.76)	0.68 (0.55, 0.77)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.71 (0.20, 0.92)
FB ER	1	0.79 (0.72, 0.84)	0.77 (0.66, 0.85)	0.80 (0.71, 0.87)	0.80 (0.73, 0.85)	0.66 (0.22, 0.88)
	2	0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.82 (0.75, 0.87)	0.66 (0.54, 0.75)	0.76 (0.70, 0.81)	0.63 (0.31, 0.82)
	3	0.66 (0.58, 0.72)	0.66 (0.53, 0.75)	0.66 (0.55, 0.74)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.74 (0.47, 0.88)
FB CBM-R.WRC1	4	0.72 (0.65, 0.77)	0.75 (0.66, 0.82)	0.67 (0.56)	0.70 (0.62, 0.76)	0.84 (0.59, 0.94)
	5	0.69 (0.60, 0.77)	0.69 (0.55, 0.80)	0.70 (0.55, 0.81)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.21 (-0.36, 0.66)
	2	0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.82 (0.75, 0.87)	0.67 (0.55, 0.76)	0.76 (0.70, 0.81)	0.73 (0.47, 0.87)
	3	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.65 (0.53, 0.75)	0.65 (0.54, 0.74)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.70 (0.40, 0.86)
FB CBM-R.WRC2	4	0.68 (0.61, 0.75)	0.69 (0.57, 0.78)	0.67 (0.55, 0.76)	0.66 (0.58, 0.73)	0.85 (0.61, 0.94)
	5	0.70 (0.60, 0.77)	0.69 (0.54, 0.79)	0.70 (0.55, 0.81)	0.74 (0.66, 0.81)	0.26 (-0.32, 0.69)
	2	0.73 (0.67, 0.78)	0.80 (0.72, 0.85)	0.64 (0.52, 0.74)	0.75 (0.68, 0.80)	0.56 (0.22, 0.78)
	3	0.66 (0.58, 0.72)	0.65 (0.52, 0.74)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.68 (0.38, 0.86)
FB CBM-R.WRC3	4	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.70 (0.59, 0.79)	0.66 (0.54, 0.75)	0.67 (0.58, 0.74)	0.88 (0.69, 0.96)
	5	0.70 (0.60, 0.77)	0.71 (0.57, 0.81)	0.66 (0.50, 0.78)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.28 (-0.30, 0.71)
Spring						
	KG	0.73 (0.63, 0.79)	0.70 (0.57, 0.80)	0.75 (0.64, 0.82)	0.74 (0.65, 0.80)	0.72 (0.12, 0.94)
FB ER	1	0.78 (0.71, 0.84)	0.66 (0.51, 0.77)	0.86 (0.78, 0.91)	0.78 (0.71, 0.84)	0.68 (0.27, 0.89)

		2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.76 (0.68, 0.83)	0.70 (0.59, 0.78)	0.73 (0.66, 0.79)	0.70 (0.42, 0.86)
		3	0.63 (0.55, 0.70)	0.59 (0.45, 0.71)	0.65 (0.55, 0.74)	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.70 (0.42, 0.86)
	FB CBM-R.WRC1	4	0.70 (0.63, 0.77)	0.69 (0.57, 0.78)	0.71 (0.60, 0.79)	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.82 (0.51, 0.94)
		5	0.72 (0.61, 0.80)	0.71 (0.54, 0.82)	0.71 (0.54, 0.82)	-	-
		2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.79 (0.71, 0.85)	0.65 (0.53, 0.74)	0.73 (0.66, 0.79)	0.73 (0.46, 0.87)
		3	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.59 (0.45, 0.71)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.73 (0.46, 0.87)
	FB CBM-R.WRC2	4	0.65 (0.56, 0.72)	0.62 (0.48, 0.73)	0.66 (0.55, 0.75)	0.63 (0.54, 0.70)	0.80 (0.47, 0.93)
		5	0.74 (0.63, 0.81)	0.70 (0.53, 0.82)	0.78 (0.64, 0.87)	-	-
		2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.78 (0.70, 0.84)	0.65 (0.53, 0.75)	0.73 (0.66, 0.79)	0.68 (0.39, 0.85)
		3	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.64 (0.51, 0.74)	0.66 (0.55, 0.74)	0.66 (0.57, 0.73)	0.68 (0.39, 0.85)
	FB CBM-R.WRC3	4	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.66 (0.54, 0.76)	0.70 (0.59, 0.78)	0.67 (0.59, 0.74)	0.83 (0.53, 0.94)
		5	0.71 (0.60, 0.79)	0.67 (0.49, 0.80)	0.75 (0.61, 0.85)	-	-
		K	0.71 (0.63, 0.77)	0.71 (0.62, 0.82)	0.72 (0.61, 0.80)	0.69 (0.59, 0.77)	0.74 (0.20, 0.93)
		1	0.77 (0.70, 0.83)	0.70 (0.56, 0.80)	0.83 (0.74, 0.88)	0.76 (0.68, 0.82)	0.85 (0.59, 0.95)
		2	0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.78 (0.70, 0.84)	0.72 (0.62, 0.80)	0.76 (0.69, 0.81)	0.74 (0.49, 0.87)
	Aprenda-3	3	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.63 (0.54, 0.76)	0.72 (0.63, 0.79)	0.69 (0.61, 0.75)	0.74 (0.49, 0.87)
		4	0.76 (0.69, 0.81)	0.73 (0.63, 0.81)	0.76 (0.67, 0.83)	0.75 (0.68, 0.80)	0.90 (0.70, 0.97)
		5	0.69 (0.57, 0.77)	0.68 (0.50, 0.80)	0.68 (0.50, 0.80)	-	-
		3	0.64 (0.50, 0.74)	0.60 (0.39, 0.76)	0.66 (0.47, 0.80)	0.63 (0.48, 0.74)	0.70 (0.51, 0.89)
	STAAR (English)	4	0.60 (0.48, 0.70)	0.65 (0.47, 0.77)	0.56 (0.37, 0.71)	0.59 (0.46, 0.70)	0.64 (0.35, 0.93)

	5	0.53 (0.25, 0.73)	0.50 (0.06, 0.79)	0.51 (0.07, 0.78)	-	-
STAAR (Spanish)	3	0.61 (0.49, 0.71)	0.48 (0.23, 0.67)	0.68 (0.54, 0.79)	0.62 (0.49, 0.72)	0.40 (-0.07, 0.87)
	4	0.65 (0.50, 0.76)	0.56 (0.28, 0.75)	0.71 (0.51, 0.83)	0.64 (0.48, 0.76)	0.62 (0.48, 0.76)
	5	0.55 (0.33, 0.71)	0.57 (0.25, 0.77)	0.62 (0.30, 0.81)	-	-
	3	0.63 (0.20, 0.86)	0.57 (-0.32, 0.93)	0.75 (0.17, 0.94)	0.63 (0.20, 0.86)	-
	4	0.47 (-0.08, 0.80)	0.26 (-0.61, 0.85)	0.42 (-0.49, 0.89)	0.47 (-0.08, 0.80)	-
PARCC	5	0.55 (0.07, 0.82)	0.45 (-0.57, 0.92)	0.68 (0.03, 0.93)	-	-

In general, concurrent-related coefficients for validity across subgroups are similar in magnitude and less than .15 from each other. Exceptions to this include differences larger than .15 for gender in isolated instances for the FastBridge assessments - Grade 1 (Spring FB ER Spanish) Grade 2 (Winter FB CBM-R Spanish Passage 3) – and more consistently for *STAAR Spanish* (Grades 3 and 4), and *PARCC* (Grades 3, 4, and 5). Differences larger than .15 were also observed for economically disadvantaged status for Grade 1 (Winter FB ER Spanish) Grade 2 (Winter FastBridge CBM-R Spanish Passage 3), Grade 3 (*STAAR Spanish*) and Grade 4 (*Aprenda-3*). Given the relatively large differences in the concurrent correlations for *ISIP Español* with the FB CBM-R Spanish Passage 3 from the Winter of Grade 2 for gender *and* economically disadvantaged status, further exploration of the properties of that passage (e.g., readability, familiarity/bias associated with topic, etc.) may be warranted. Similarly, the differences in the disaggregated correlations by gender and economically disadvantaged status for the *STAAR Spanish* in Grades 3 and 4 may need further investigation.

Predictive-Related Evidence for Validity Disaggregated by Subgroup

The evidence for predictive-related validity evidence is disaggregated by the two relevant subgroups (gender and economically disadvantaged status) and presented in Tables 43 (using Fall *ISIP Español*) and 44 (using *Winter ISIP Español*), respectively.

Table 43

Predictive-related evidence for validity disaggregated by subgroup (Fall ISIP)

Season / Assessment	Grade	Overall Coefficient	Gender		Economically Disadvantaged	
			Male	Female	Yes	No
Winter						
ISIP Overall	KG	0.43 (0.31, 0.54)	0.33 (0.13, 0.51)	0.51 (0.35, 0.64)	0.43 (0.28, 0.55)	0.68 (0.14, 0.91)
	1	0.81 (0.74, 0.86)	0.75 (0.63, 0.83)	0.86 (0.78, 0.91)	0.80 (0.73, 0.86)	0.82 (0.53, 0.94)
	2	0.81 (0.76, 0.85)	0.83 (0.76, 0.87)	0.79 (0.70, 0.85)	0.81 (0.75, 0.85)	0.82 (0.63, 0.92)
	3	0.85 (0.81, 0.88)	0.82 (0.74, 0.87)	0.87 (0.83, 0.91)	0.84 (0.80, 0.88)	0.96 (0.90, 0.98)
	4	0.81 (0.74, 0.86)	0.85 (0.77, 0.91)	0.77 (0.67, 0.85)	0.81 (0.74, 0.86)	0.92 (0.44, 0.99)
	5	0.78 (0.66, 0.86)	0.80 (0.62, 0.90)	0.81 (0.63, 0.90)	0.82 (0.71, 0.89)	0.33 (-0.56, 0.87)
	KG	0.32 (0.18, 0.44)	0.64 (0.50, 0.76)	0.68 (0.55, 0.77)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.71 (0.20, 0.92)
	1	0.68 (0.58, 0.76)	0.77 (0.66, 0.85)	0.80 (0.71, 0.87)	0.80 (0.73, 0.85)	0.66 (0.22, 0.88)
	2	0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.82 (0.75, 0.87)	0.66 (0.54, 0.75)	0.76 (0.70, 0.81)	0.63 (0.31, 0.82)
	3	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.66 (0.53, 0.75)	0.66 (0.55, 0.74)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.74 (0.47, 0.88)
FB CBM-R.WRC1	4	0.68 (0.59, 0.76)	0.75 (0.66, 0.82)	0.67 (0.56)	0.70 (0.62, 0.76)	0.84 (0.59, 0.94)
	5	0.60 (0.41, 0.73)	0.69 (0.55, 0.80)	0.70 (0.55, 0.81)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.21 (-0.36, 0.66)
	2	0.75 (0.69, 0.80)	0.82 (0.75, 0.87)	0.67 (0.55, 0.76)	0.76 (0.70, 0.81)	0.73 (0.47, 0.87)
	3	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.65 (0.53, 0.75)	0.65 (0.54, 0.74)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.70 (0.40, 0.86)
	4	0.69 (0.60, 0.76)	0.69 (0.57, 0.78)	0.67 (0.55, 0.76)	0.66 (0.58, 0.73)	0.85 (0.61, 0.94)
FB CBM-R.WRC2	5	0.68 (0.52, 0.79)	0.69 (0.54, 0.79)	0.70 (0.55, 0.81)	0.74 (0.66, 0.81)	0.26 (-0.32, 0.69)
	2	0.73	0.80	0.64	0.75	0.56
FB CBM-R.WRC3						

		(0.67, 0.78)	(0.72, 0.85)	(0.52, 0.74)	(0.68, 0.80)	(0.22, 0.78)
	3	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.65 (0.52, 0.74)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.65 (0.57, 0.72)	0.68 (0.38, 0.86)
	4	0.68 (0.59, 0.76)	0.70 (0.59, 0.79)	0.66 (0.54, 0.75)	0.67 (0.58, 0.74)	0.88 (0.69, 0.96)
	5	0.67 (0.51, 0.79)	0.71 (0.57, 0.81)	0.66 (0.50, 0.78)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.28 (-0.30, 0.71)
Spring						
ISIP Overall	KG	0.37 (0.25, 0.49)	0.31 (0.10, 0.49)	0.45 (0.28, 0.59)	0.41 (0.26, 0.54)	0.58 (-0.03, 0.87)
	1	0.70 (0.61, 0.77)	0.65 (0.49, 0.76)	0.74 (0.62, 0.82)	0.70 (0.60, 0.77)	0.68 (0.26, 0.89)
	2	0.77 (0.71, 0.82)	0.77 (0.69, 0.83)	0.78 (0.69, 0.84)	0.77 (0.71, 0.82)	0.77 (0.54, 0.89)
	3	0.79 (0.73, 0.83)	0.74 (0.64, 0.82)	0.82 (0.75, 0.87)	0.78 (0.72, 0.83)	0.89 (0.74, 0.95)
	4	0.78 (0.70, 0.83)	0.78 (0.65, 0.86)	0.78 (0.67, 0.85)	0.77 (0.69, 0.83)	0.97 (0.63, 1.00)
	5	0.82 (0.70, 0.89)	0.83 (0.64, 0.92)	0.83 (0.65, 0.92)	-	-
	KG	0.23 (0.09, 0.36)	0.20 (-0.02, 0.40)	0.30 (0.11, 0.47)	0.31 (0.15, 0.45)	-0.26 (-0.79, 0.49)
	1	0.64 (0.53, 0.73)	0.55 (0.36, 0.69)	0.73 (0.60, 0.82)	0.66 (0.55, 0.74)	0.43 (-0.10, 0.77)
	2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.72 (0.61, 0.80)	0.74 (0.67, 0.79)	0.76 (0.54, 0.89)
	3	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.60 (0.46, 0.71)	0.65 (0.53, 0.74)	0.63 (0.55, 0.71)	0.69 (0.37, 0.86)
FB CBM-R.WRC1	4	0.67 (0.58, 0.75)	0.63 (0.47, 0.75)	0.70 (0.7, 0.79)	0.67 (0.57, 0.75)	0.69 (-0.28, 0.96)
	5	0.62 (0.44, 0.75)	0.74 (0.52, 0.86)	0.48 (0.15, 0.71)	-	-
	2	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.70 (0.58, 0.78)	0.74 (0.68, 0.80)	0.60 (0.27, 0.80)
	3	0.61 (0.52, 0.69)	0.59 (0.44, 0.70)	0.62 (0.50, 0.71)	0.61 (0.52, 0.69)	0.68 (0.36, 0.86)
	4	0.67 (0.58, 0.75)	0.56 (0.38, 0.70)	0.75 (0.65, 0.83)	0.68 (0.58, 0.75)	0.79 (-0.05, 0.98)
	5	0.63 (0.45, 0.76)	0.72 (0.49, 0.86)	0.49 (0.17, 0.72)	-	-
	KG	0.23 (0.09, 0.36)	0.20 (-0.02, 0.40)	0.30 (0.11, 0.47)	0.31 (0.15, 0.45)	-0.26 (-0.79, 0.49)
	1	0.64 (0.53, 0.73)	0.55 (0.36, 0.69)	0.73 (0.60, 0.82)	0.66 (0.55, 0.74)	0.43 (-0.10, 0.77)
	2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.72 (0.61, 0.80)	0.74 (0.67, 0.79)	0.76 (0.54, 0.89)
	3	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.60 (0.46, 0.71)	0.65 (0.53, 0.74)	0.63 (0.55, 0.71)	0.69 (0.37, 0.86)
FB CBM-R.WRC2	4	0.67 (0.58, 0.75)	0.63 (0.47, 0.75)	0.70 (0.7, 0.79)	0.67 (0.57, 0.75)	0.69 (-0.28, 0.96)
	5	0.62 (0.44, 0.75)	0.74 (0.52, 0.86)	0.48 (0.15, 0.71)	-	-
	2	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.70 (0.58, 0.78)	0.74 (0.68, 0.80)	0.60 (0.27, 0.80)
	3	0.61 (0.52, 0.69)	0.59 (0.44, 0.70)	0.62 (0.50, 0.71)	0.61 (0.52, 0.69)	0.68 (0.36, 0.86)
	4	0.67 (0.58, 0.75)	0.56 (0.38, 0.70)	0.75 (0.65, 0.83)	0.68 (0.58, 0.75)	0.79 (-0.05, 0.98)
	5	0.63 (0.45, 0.76)	0.72 (0.49, 0.86)	0.49 (0.17, 0.72)	-	-
	KG	0.23 (0.09, 0.36)	0.20 (-0.02, 0.40)	0.30 (0.11, 0.47)	0.31 (0.15, 0.45)	-0.26 (-0.79, 0.49)
	1	0.64 (0.53, 0.73)	0.55 (0.36, 0.69)	0.73 (0.60, 0.82)	0.66 (0.55, 0.74)	0.43 (-0.10, 0.77)
	2	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.72 (0.61, 0.80)	0.74 (0.67, 0.79)	0.76 (0.54, 0.89)
	3	0.64 (0.55, 0.71)	0.60 (0.46, 0.71)	0.65 (0.53, 0.74)	0.63 (0.55, 0.71)	0.69 (0.37, 0.86)

FB CBM-R.WRC3	2	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)	0.77 (0.68, 0.83)	0.66 (0.54, 0.75)	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)
	3	0.62 (0.54, 0.70)	0.60 (0.46, 0.71)	0.63 (0.52, 0.73)	0.62 (0.53, 0.70)
	4	0.69 (0.60, 0.76)	0.64 (0.48, 0.76)	0.72 (0.60, 0.80)	0.69 (0.59, 0.76)
	5	0.64 (0.47, 0.77)	0.73 (0.51, 0.86)	0.51 (0.20, 0.73)	-
	K	0.24 (0.10, 0.36)	0.10 (-0.12, 0.31)	0.34 (0.15, 0.50)	0.27 (0.11, 0.42)
	1	0.55 (0.43, 0.65)	0.37 (0.15, 0.55)	0.72 (0.59, 0.81)	0.55 (0.42, 0.6)
	2	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)	0.75 (0.66, 0.82)	0.68 (0.56, 0.76)	0.72 (0.65, 0.78)
	3	0.72 (0.65, 0.78)	0.67 (0.54, 0.76)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)
	4	0.68 (0.59, 0.76)	0.62 (0.45, 0.74)	0.73 (0.62, 0.82)	0.69 (0.59, 0.76)
	5	0.53 (0.32, 0.68)	0.55 (0.24, 0.76)	0.51 (0.20, 0.73)	-
Aprenda-3	3	0.61 (0.46, 0.73)	0.51 (0.25, 0.70)	0.67 (0.47, 0.81)	0.60 (0.44, 0.73)
	4	0.59 (0.42, 0.72)	0.67 (0.40, 0.84)	(0.57 (0.33, 0.73))	0.63 (0.46, 0.75)
	5	-0.13 (-0.91, 0.85)	- (-0.91, 0.85)	0.26 (-0.91, 0.85)	-
	3	0.61 (0.49, 0.71)	0.44 (0.19, 0.64)	0.72 (0.58, 0.81)	0.61 (0.48, 0.71)
	4	0.56 (0.38, 0.70)	0.46 (0.16, 0.68)	0.70 (0.48, 0.84)	0.56 (0.38, 0.70)
	5	0.55 (0.30, 0.72)	0.55 (0.18, 0.78)	0.58 (0.19, 0.81)	-
	3	0.74 (0.39, 0.91)	0.79 (0.20, 0.96)	0.61 (-0.16, 0.92)	0.74 (0.39, 0.91)
	4	0.45 (-0.14, 0.80)	0.54 (-0.49, 0.94)	0.28 (-0.60, 0.85)	0.45 (-0.14, 0.80)
	5	0.43 (-0.14, 0.78)	0.70 (-0.47, 0.98)	0.34 (-0.48, 0.84)	-

In general, predictive-related coefficients for validity using the Fall *ISIP Español* assessments are similar in magnitude and stable across subgroups, with differences less than .15. Exceptions to this can be seen with respect to gender for Grade 1 (FB ER Spanish and *Aprenda-3*), Grade 2 (FB CBM-R Spanish Passages 2 and 3), and Grade 4 (Winter FB CBM-R Spanish Passage 1, as well as for *STAAR Spanish* (Grades 3 and 4), and *PARCC* (Grades 3, 4, and 5). Differences of greater than .15 were also observed for economically disadvantaged status for multiple FB CBM-R Passages in the Winter, and FB ER Spanish for Grade 1. However, when interpreting the disaggregated coefficients for economically disadvantaged status it is also necessary to remember that the majority of students in our sample qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch and, consequently, that unbalanced sample sizes may be influencing the results.

Table 44

Predictive-related evidence for validity disaggregated by subgroup (Winter ISIP)

Assessment	Grade	Overall Coefficient	Gender		Economically Disadvantaged	
			Male	Female	Yes	No
ISIP Overall	1	KG	0.71 (0.63, 0.77)	0.68 (0.55, 0.78)	0.70 (0.59, 0.79)	0.72 (0.63, 0.79)
		1	0.89 (0.85, 0.92)	0.87 (0.80, 0.92)	0.90 (0.85, 0.93)	0.89 (0.84, 0.92)
		2	0.89 (0.86, 0.91)	0.89 (0.84, 0.92)	0.89 (0.84, 0.92)	0.89 (0.86, 0.91)
		3	0.86 (0.82, 0.89)	0.84 (0.77, 0.89)	0.88 (0.83, 0.91)	0.86 (0.82, 0.89)
		4	0.84 (0.79, 0.88)	0.86 (0.80, 0.90)	0.81 (0.74, 0.87)	0.84 (0.79, 0.88)
	2	5	0.92 (0.88, 0.94)	0.93 (0.88, 0.96)	0.91 (0.85, 0.95)	- -
		KG	0.61 (0.51, 0.69)	0.55 (0.37, 0.68)	0.66 (0.54, 0.76)	0.63 (0.52, 0.72)
		1	0.78 (0.70, 0.83)	0.68 (0.54, 0.79)	0.84 (0.76, 0.90)	0.79 (0.71, 0.84)
		2	0.72 (0.65, 0.78)	0.76 (0.68, 0.83)	0.67 (0.56, 0.76)	0.73 (0.65, 0.78)
		3	0.68 (0.60, 0.74)	0.67 (0.55, 0.76)	0.68 (0.57, 0.76)	0.68 (0.60, 0.74)
FB ER	3	4	0.70 (0.62, 0.76)	0.71 (0.60, 0.79)	0.68 (0.56, 0.76)	0.68 (0.60, 0.75)
		5	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.68 (0.53, 0.78)	0.64 (0.47, 0.76)	- -
		2	0.73 (0.67, 0.79)	0.80 (0.73, 0.86)	0.64 (0.51, 0.74)	0.73 (0.66, 0.79)
		3	0.66 (0.58, 0.73)	0.65 (0.52, 0.75)	0.66 (0.56, 0.75)	0.66 (0.57, 0.73)
		4	0.64 (0.56, 0.72)	0.61 (0.48, 0.72)	0.66 (0.54, 0.75)	0.62 (0.53, 0.70)
	4	5	0.67 (0.57, 0.75)	0.65 (0.49, 0.77)	0.69 (0.54, 0.80)	- -
		2	0.72 (0.66, 0.78)	0.78 (0.70, 0.84)	0.64 (0.52, 0.74)	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)
		3	0.66 (0.58, 0.72)	0.63 (0.50, 0.74)	0.66 (0.55, 0.75)	0.66 (0.57, 0.73)
		4	0.64 (0.56, 0.70)	0.61 (0.48, 0.70)	0.66 (0.54, 0.74)	0.62 (0.53, 0.70)
		5	0.67 (0.57, 0.75)	0.65 (0.49, 0.77)	0.69 (0.54, 0.80)	- -
FB CBM-R.WRC3	2	2	0.72 (0.66, 0.78)	0.78 (0.70, 0.84)	0.64 (0.52, 0.74)	0.73 (0.66, 0.78)
		3	0.66 (0.58, 0.72)	0.63 (0.50, 0.74)	0.66 (0.55, 0.75)	0.66 (0.57, 0.73)

	3	0.67 (0.60, 0.74)	0.67 (0.55, 0.76)	0.68 (0.57, 0.76)	0.68 (0.60, 0.74)	0.61 (0.25, 0.82)
	4	0.70 (0.63, 0.76)	0.69 (0.58, 0.78)	0.69 (0.58, 0.78)	0.68 (0.60, 0.75)	0.83 (0.57, 0.94)
	5	0.65 (0.54, 0.74)	0.64 (0.48, 0.76)	0.65 (0.48, 0.77)	-	-
	KG	0.61 (0.51, 0.69)	0.56 (0.39, 0.69)	0.61 (0.41, 0.72)	0.58 (0.46, 0.68)	0.58 (-0.08, 0.88)
Aprenda-3	1	0.75 (0.67, 0.81)	0.67 (0.52, 0.78)	0.81 (0.72, 0.88)	0.74 (0.65, 0.81)	0.84 (0.58, 0.95)
	2	0.74 (0.67, 0.79)	0.75 (0.67, 0.82)	0.72 (0.62, 0.80)	0.74 (0.68, 0.80)	0.70 (0.43, 0.86)
	3	0.68 (0.60, 0.74)	0.61 (0.48, 0.72)	0.72 (0.63, 0.79)	0.66 (0.58, 0.73)	0.84 (0.66, 0.93)
	4	0.71 (0.64, 0.77)	0.70 (0.59, 0.79)	0.70 (0.59, 0.78)	0.70 (0.63, 0.77)	0.82 (0.56, 0.93)
	5	0.66 (0.56, 0.74)	0.67 (0.53, 0.78)	0.63 (0.46, 0.76)	-	-
	3	0.62 (0.49, 0.73)	0.58 (0.36, 0.74)	0.66 (0.46, 0.79)	0.61 (0.46, 0.72)	0.86 (0.54, 0.96)
STAAR (English)	4	0.55 (0.41, 0.66)	0.64 (0.48, 0.77)	0.46 (0.24, 0.63)	0.56 (0.42, 0.67)	0.62 (0.16, 0.86)
	5	0.61 (0.42, 0.75)	0.55 (0.26, 0.75)	0.68 (0.40, 0.85)	-	-
	3	0.57 (0.44, 0.68)	0.36 (0.09, 0.58)	0.70 (0.57, 0.80)	0.57 (0.44, 0.68)	0.51 (-0.14, 0.85)
STAAR (Spanish)	4	0.56 (0.39, 0.69)	0.52 (0.23, 0.72)	0.59 (0.35, 0.76)	0.56 (0.38, 0.69)	-
	5	0.63 (0.45, 0.76)	0.58 (0.29, 0.77)	0.71 (0.47, 0.85)	-	-
	3	0.59 (0.05, 0.86)	0.61 (-0.27, 0.93)	0.50 (-0.53, 0.93)	0.59 (0.05, 0.86)	-
PARCC	4	0.21 (-0.36, 0.67)	0.20 (-0.65, 0.83)	0.08 (-0.72, 0.78)	0.21 (-0.36, 0.67)	-
	5	0.41 (-0.09, 0.75)	0.64 (-0.36, 0.95)	0.16 (-0.56, 0.75)	-	-

Note: - indicates insufficient sample size to estimate correlation

In general, predictive-related coefficients for validity using the Winter *ISIP Espanol* assessments are similar in magnitude and stable across subgroups, with differences less than .15. Exceptions to this can be seen with respect to gender in Grade 2 (FB CBM-Reading Passage 2), Grade 3 (*STAAR Spanish*), and Grade 5 (*PARCC*). Differences of greater than .15 were also observed for economically disadvantaged status for FB ER Spanish for Kindergarten and Grade 1, and FB CBM-Reading Passage 3 for Grade 4. However, when interpreting the disaggregated coefficients for economically disadvantaged status it is also necessary to remember that the majority of students in our sample qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch and, consequently, that unbalanced sample sizes may be influencing the results.

Conclusions

This study collected evidence to evaluate the appropriateness of Istation's Indicators of Progress (ISIP) Español *Lectura Temprana* and *Lectura Avanzada* assessments for making screening decisions for students in Grades Kindergarten – 5.

The generalizability of the sample is moderate, as indicated in Table 7. The sample is similar to both the statewide and national proportions for gender and is relatively comparable to participating states with respect to the proportion of students whose race was Hispanic/Latino. Not surprisingly (given the strategic recruitment of a Spanish-speaking ELs), the proportion of Hispanic/Latino students in our sample was almost twice as large as that of the participating states and almost four times as large as the nationwide sample. Given the potentially confounded nature of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status (e.g., approximately 30% of Hispanic/Latino children under the age of 18 live in poverty compared to 20% of children nationwide; Krogstad, 2014), it may also not be surprising that the proportion of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch is almost twice as large as the Texas and nationwide samples. The results of this study may be generalizable to the larger student population of Texas and New Mexico, as well as other states with similar demographics.

We presented summaries of evidence for the classification accuracy of *ISIP Español*. The strength of the classification accuracy of *ISIP Español* increases across the administration seasons (Fall, Winter, Spring). Closer examination of the classification accuracy results for Spring also indicates that setting the threshold for proficiency above the 15th percentile produces results that are similar to setting the threshold for proficiency above the 40th percentile. Therefore, users of both assessments may want to consult additional sources of evidence when establishing the thresholds for proficiency if using the *Aprenda-3* as a criterion assessment within the context of their multi-tiered system of support.

We also presented summaries of the levels of evidence for the concurrent-related validity evidence of the *ISIP Español* assessments with the multiple criterion assessments for Grades Kindergarten – 5.

Predictive-related validity evidence may also need to be gathered for Kindergarten with different criterion assessments, as the evidence from the criterion assessment used in this grade (*ER Spanish* and the *Aprenda-3*). Results also suggest that *FB ER Spanish*, *FastBridge CBM-Reading*, and the *Aprenda-3* may be acceptable criterion assessments for Grades 1 and 2. The results for Grades 3–5, however, are less consistent and vary by criterion assessment, although results for the English Language Arts/Reading subtests of the state achievement tests are consistent with the other sources of evidence gathered as part of this study and suggest potential misalignment in the skills assessed with the skills assessed by *ISIP Español LA*.

Examination of the evidence for validity disaggregated by subgroups follows similar trends as the evidence presented for aggregate level data.

Overall, the evidence suggests the following:

- The generalizability of the *ISIP Español* within this study is moderate to strong, although collecting additional data from students within these (and other states) with high proportions of Spanish-speaking English Learners is undoubtedly warranted, particularly given significant increases in the proportions of English Learners across multiple states (e.g., Kansas, Maryland, North Carolina).
- Additional evidence should be gathered for the technical adequacy of the *ISIP Español LT* for Kindergarten using another criterion assessment and larger samples to gather additional evidence beyond the results obtained from the *FastBridge EarlyReading Spanish*.
- For Grades 1 and 2, *FastBridge EarlyReading* and *CBM-Reading Spanish*, as well as the *Aprenda-3* appear to be acceptable criterion assessments for concurrent-related and predictive-related validity evidence (including classification accuracy).
- For Grades 3 through 5, inconsistent concurrent-related and predictive-related validity evidence (including classification accuracy) across multiple criterion assessments suggests additional data collection with larger samples and other criterion assessments may be warranted.

References

- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49, 222-251.
- Glover, T. A., & Albers, C. A. (2007). Considerations for evaluating universal screening assessments. *Journal of School Psychology*, 45, 117-135.
- Keller-Marguilis, M. A., & Mercer, S. H. (2014). R-CBM in Spanish and in English: Differential relations depending on student reading performance. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51, 677-692.
- Keller-Marguilis, M. A., Payan, A., & Booth, C. (2012). Reading curriculum-based measures in Spanish: An examination of validity and diagnostic accuracy. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 37, 212-223.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Morath, M. (2017). *Pocket Edition: 2016-17 Texas Public School Statistics*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency
- National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES] (2017). *The condition of education* (NCES 2017-144). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved 06/01/2018 from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2017144>.
- National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] (2017). *National Assessment of Educational Progress, Reading Assessment* (2013-2017). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- National Center on Intensive Intervention (2018). *Academic Screening Tools Chart Rating Rubric*. Washington DC: American Institutes for Research.
- PARCC (2017). ELA/L Redesign_Adjustments Blueprints Grades 3-5 (Version 7.00).
- Pearson. (2018). *PARCC: Final technical report for 2017 administration*. Washington DC: Pearson
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "Local Education Agency (School District) Universe Survey LEP Data", 2015-16

Appendix A:

Concurrent Correlation Coefficients for Overall/Composite Scale Scores and All Subtest Scores

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Kindergarten

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Composite	0.677	0.594	0.746
	Letter Sounds	0.531	0.423	0.624
	Onset Sounds	0.427	0.305	0.535
	Syllable Reading	0.669	0.583	0.739
	Word Segmenting	0.491	0.377	0.590
Reading Comprehension				
	Composite	0.469	0.352	0.571
	Letter Sounds	0.374	0.247	0.488
	Onset Sounds	0.283	0.149	0.407
	Syllable Reading	0.445	0.326	0.551
	Word Segmenting	0.378	0.251	0.492
Listening Comprehension				
	Composite	0.316	0.185	0.437
	Letter Sounds	0.226	0.090	0.355
	Onset Sounds	0.326	0.195	0.445
	Syllable Reading	0.261	0.126	0.387
	Word Segmenting	0.296	0.163	0.419
Phonemic Awareness				
	Composite	0.655	0.568	0.728
	Letter Sounds	0.509	0.397	0.605
	Onset Sounds	0.477	0.361	0.578
	Syllable Reading	0.636	0.545	0.712
	Word Segmenting	0.479	0.364	0.580
Vocabulary				
	Composite	0.497	0.384	0.595
	Letter Sounds	0.416	0.294	0.525
	Onset Sounds	0.288	0.154	0.411
	Syllable Reading	0.502	0.390	0.600
	Word Segmenting	0.364	0.236	0.479

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 1

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Composite	0.787	0.718	0.841
	Sight Words	0.786	0.717	0.840
	Syllable Reading	0.686	0.592	0.762
	Word Segmenting	0.417	0.277	0.539
	CBM-WRC	0.810	0.748	0.859
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.572	0.455	0.670
Reading Comprehension				
	Composite	0.643	0.539	0.727
	Sight Words	0.670	0.573	0.749
	Syllable Reading	0.457	0.323	0.574
	Word Segmenting	0.300	0.149	0.437
	CBM-WRC	0.671	0.574	0.750
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.340	0.192	0.473
Phonemic Awareness				
	Composite	0.688	0.595	0.764
	Sight Words	0.693	0.601	0.767
	Syllable Reading	0.641	0.537	0.726
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.208	0.485
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.626	0.782
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.424	0.648
Vocabulary				
	Composite	0.607	0.496	0.699
	Sight Words	0.607	0.496	0.698
	Syllable Reading	0.515	0.389	0.623
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.208	0.485
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.525	0.717
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.268	0.532

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 2

<i>ISIP Español</i>	Fast Bridge	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.751	0.690	0.801
	Passage 2 WRC	0.753	0.692	0.803
	Passage 3 WRC	0.730	0.665	0.784
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.502	0.401	0.590
Reading Comprehension				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.661	0.584	0.727
	Passage 2 WRC	0.664	0.587	0.729
	Passage 3 WRC	0.655	0.576	0.721
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.362	0.247	0.467
Reading Fluency				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.703	0.633	0.762
	Passage 2 WRC	0.692	0.620	0.752
	Passage 3 WRC	0.717	0.650	0.774
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.270	0.149	0.383
Phonemic Awareness				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.622	0.538	0.694
	Passage 2 WRC	0.635	0.553	0.705
	Passage 3 WRC	0.600	0.513	0.676
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.425	0.316	0.523
Vocabulary				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.540	0.444	0.623
	Passage 2 WRC	0.540	0.444	0.624
	Passage 3 WRC	0.520	0.421	0.606
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.328	0.210	0.436

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 3

<i>ISIP Español</i>	Fast Bridge	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.658	0.581	0.724
	Passage 2 WRC	0.652	0.573	0.719
	Passage 3 WRC	0.656	0.578	0.722
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.570	0.479	0.649
Reading Comprehension				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.605	0.519	0.679
	Passage 2 WRC	0.596	0.508	0.671
	Passage 3 WRC	0.613	0.528	0.686
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.534	0.438	0.618
Reading Fluency				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.712	0.644	0.769
	Passage 2 WRC	0.705	0.635	0.763
	Passage 3 WRC	0.729	0.664	0.783
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.430	0.322	0.527
Phonemic Awareness				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.511	0.412	0.598
	Passage 2 WRC	0.497	0.396	0.586
	Passage 3 WRC	0.514	0.415	0.601
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.384	0.272	0.486
Vocabulary				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.579	0.489	0.657
	Passage 2 WRC	0.557	0.464	0.637
	Passage 3 WRC	0.548	0.454	0.630
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.387	0.275	0.489

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 4

<i>ISIP Español</i>	Fast Bridge	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.716	0.645	0.774
	Passage 2 WRC	0.683	0.606	0.747
	Passage 3 WRC	0.689	0.614	0.753
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.440	0.328	0.540
Reading Comprehension				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.577	0.482	0.658
	Passage 2 WRC	0.550	0.451	0.635
	Passage 3 WRC	0.553	0.454	0.638
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.285	0.160	0.401
Reading Fluency				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.580	0.486	0.661
	Passage 2 WRC	0.578	0.483	0.659
	Passage 3 WRC	0.576	0.481	0.658
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.344	0.223	0.455
Vocabulary				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.521	0.420	0.610
	Passage 2 WRC	0.484	0.378	0.578
	Passage 3 WRC	0.469	0.361	0.565
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.305	0.182	0.418

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 5

<i>ISIP Español</i>	Fast Bridge	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.694	0.597	0.771
	Passage 2 WRC	0.695	0.598	0.772
	Passage 3 WRC	0.695	0.599	0.772
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.420	0.273	0.548
Reading Comprehension				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.616	0.502	0.710
	Passage 2 WRC	0.598	0.479	0.695
	Passage 3 WRC	0.597	0.479	0.694
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.272	0.112	0.419
Reading Fluency				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.558	0.432	0.662
	Passage 2 WRC	0.576	0.454	0.678
	Passage 3 WRC	0.569	0.445	0.671
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.386	0.236	0.519
Vocabulary				
	Passage 1 WRC	0.581	0.461	0.681
	Passage 2 WRC	0.581	0.461	0.680
	Passage 3 WRC	0.584	0.464	0.682
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.303	0.146	0.445

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) K

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Composite	0.73	0.66	0.79
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.44	0.32	0.55
	FB-Sight Words	0.77	0.71	0.83
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.67	0.58	0.74
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.44	0.32	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.63	0.77
	APR3-Word Reading	0.62	0.53	0.70
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.53	0.42	0.62
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.71	0.64	0.78
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.66	0.58	0.74
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.42	0.29	0.53
	FB-Sight Words	0.71	0.64	0.78
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.65	0.56	0.72
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.38	0.25	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.49	0.68
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.40	0.60
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.44	0.32	0.54
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.63	0.54	0.71
Listening Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.20	0.06	0.33
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.14	-0.00	0.27
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.06	0.33
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.20	0.06	0.33
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.15	0.00	0.28
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.18	0.44
	APR3-Word Reading	0.26	0.13	0.39
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.24	0.10	0.36
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31		
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Composite	0.75	0.68	0.80
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.48	0.37	0.58

	FB-Sight Words	0.75	0.68	0.80
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.71	0.63	0.77
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.37	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.65	0.78
	APR3-Word Reading	0.65	0.56	0.72
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.56	0.46	0.65
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.69	0.61	0.76
Vocabulary				
	FB-Composite	0.48	0.37	0.58
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.32	0.19	0.44
	FB-Sight Words	0.53	0.42	0.62
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.41	0.29	0.52
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.27	0.13	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.45	0.33	0.55
	APR3-Word Reading	0.37	0.25	0.49
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.33	0.20	0.45
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.47	0.36	0.58

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 1

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Composite	0.78	0.71	0.84
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.30	0.56
	FB-Sight Words	0.74	0.66	0.81
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.69	0.60	0.77
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.78	0.71	0.84
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.61	0.50	0.70
	APR3-Composite	0.77	0.70	0.83
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.58	0.75
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.65	0.55	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.76	0.68	0.82
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.68	0.58	0.75
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.30	0.15	0.44
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.54	0.73
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.53	0.41	0.64
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.71	0.62	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.26	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.49	0.69
	APR3-Word Reading	0.53	0.41	0.64
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.54	0.42	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.51	0.71
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Composite	0.65	0.55	0.74
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.36	0.60
	FB-Sight Words	0.60	0.48	0.69
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.59	0.48	0.69
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.62	0.52	0.71
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.58	0.46	0.68
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.58	0.75

	APR3-Word Reading	0.59	0.48	0.69
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.56	0.44	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.52	0.72
Vocabulary				
	FB-Composite	0.54	0.42	0.65
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.25	0.10	0.40
	FB-Sight Words	0.51	0.38	0.62
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.32	0.57
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.53	0.41	0.64
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.42	0.27	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.43	0.65
	APR3-Word Reading	0.43	0.30	0.55
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.30	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.43	0.65

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 2

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.56	0.47	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.69	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.59	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.65	0.77
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.69	0.62	0.72
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.69	0.62	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.62	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.35	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.64	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.50	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.63	0.76
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.58	0.73
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.58	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.61	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.28	0.16	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.56	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.50	0.40	0.59
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.58	0.73
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.54	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.35	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.55	0.70
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.46	0.63

	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.52	0.68
Vocabulary				
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.52	0.42	0.61
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.43	0.61
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.51	0.41	0.60
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.36	0.24	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.49	0.66
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.42	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.44	0.62

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 3

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.55	0.70
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.55	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.57	0.72
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.61	0.75
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.52	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.60	0.74
	STAAR Reading-English	0.64	0.50	0.74
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.61	0.49	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.63	0.20	0.86
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.47	0.64
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.49	0.66
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.40	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.58	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.48	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.56	0.71
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.53	0.76
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.54	0.40	0.65
	PARCC Reading	0.66	0.25	0.87
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.33	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.59	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.53	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.55	0.70
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.54	0.76

	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.48	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.73	0.36	0.90
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.34	0.55
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.35	0.55
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.38	0.57
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.41	0.30	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.39	0.58
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.30	0.51
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.40	0.59
	STAAR Reading-English	0.47	0.30	0.61
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.43	0.27	0.56
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.17	0.85
Vocabulary	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.47	0.64
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.49	0.66
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.49	0.66
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.32	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.61	0.74
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.53	0.69
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.58	0.72
	STAAR Reading-English	0.59	0.45	0.71
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.62	0.50	0.72
	PARCC Reading	0.42	-0.08	0.75

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 4

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.63	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.56	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.61	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.34	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.76	0.69	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.70	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.65	0.78
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.48	0.70
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.65	0.50	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.47	-0.08	0.80
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.48	0.66
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.46	0.64
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.55	0.45	0.64
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.19	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.68	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.53	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.74	0.68	0.80
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.47	0.70
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.57	0.40	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.01	0.85
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.56	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.54	0.70
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.38	0.26	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.56	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.45	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.54	0.70
	STAAR Reading-English	0.51	0.37	0.63

	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.49	0.30	0.64
	PARCC Reading	0.30	-0.27	0.72
Vocabulary	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.51	0.40	0.60
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.34	0.55
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.36	0.57
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.27	0.17	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.60	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.55	0.71
	STAAR Reading-English	0.63	0.52	0.73
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.67	0.53	0.78
	PARCC Reading	0.09	-0.46	0.59

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 5

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.61	0.80
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.74	0.63	0.81
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.60	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.48	0.32	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.57	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.47	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.52	0.74
	STAAR Reading-English	0.53	0.25	0.73
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.55	0.33	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.55	0.07	0.82
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.58	0.44	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.42	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.42	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.22	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.53	0.75
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.31	0.61
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.53	0.75
	STAAR Reading-English	0.74	0.54	0.86
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.59	0.38	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.43	-0.10	0.77
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55	0.41	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.43	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.53	0.38	0.65
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.17	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.51	0.36	0.64
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.39	0.22	0.54
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.38	0.66
	STAAR Reading-English	0.43	0.12	0.66

	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.52	0.30	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.18	-0.37	0.63
Vocabulary	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.65	0.53	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.51	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.51	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.37	0.20	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.35	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.57	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.49	0.72
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.35	0.76
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.40	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.18	0.85

Appendix B:

Concurrent Correlation Coefficients for Subgroups

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Kindergarten Females

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.677	0.675	0.552	0.769
	Letter Sounds	0.531	0.565	0.415	0.685
	Onset Sounds	0.427	0.449	0.278	0.593
	Syllable Reading	0.669	0.681	0.560	0.774
	Word Segmenting	0.491	0.465	0.297	0.606
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.469	0.443	0.271	0.588
	Letter Sounds	0.374	0.338	0.153	0.501
	Onset Sounds	0.283	0.309	0.120	0.475
	Syllable Reading	0.445	0.449	0.278	0.592
	Word Segmenting	0.378	0.325	0.139	0.490
Listening Comprehension					
	Composite	0.316	0.294	0.105	0.463
	Letter Sounds	0.226	0.195	-0.001	0.376
	Onset Sounds	0.326	0.248	0.055	0.423
	Syllable Reading	0.261	0.271	0.080	0.443
	Word Segmenting	0.296	0.254	0.061	0.428
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.655	0.689	0.571	0.780
	Letter Sounds	0.509	0.576	0.428	0.693
	Onset Sounds	0.477	0.515	0.355	0.646
	Syllable Reading	0.636	0.686	0.566	0.777
	Word Segmenting	0.479	0.453	0.282	0.596
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.497	0.493	0.329	0.628
	Letter Sounds	0.416	0.418	0.242	0.567
	Onset Sounds	0.288	0.313	0.125	0.479
	Syllable Reading	0.502	0.490	0.326	0.625
	Word Segmenting	0.364	0.364	0.181	0.522

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Kindergarten Males

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.677	0.644	0.496	0.755
	Letter Sounds	0.531	0.480	0.293	0.631
	Onset Sounds	0.427	0.400	0.200	0.568
	Syllable Reading	0.669	0.631	0.480	0.746
	Word Segmenting	0.491	0.485	0.300	0.635
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.469	0.473	0.286	0.626
	Letter Sounds	0.374	0.390	0.189	0.560
	Onset Sounds	0.283	0.268	0.054	0.458
	Syllable Reading	0.445	0.424	0.228	0.588
	Word Segmenting	0.378	0.445	0.252	0.603
Listening Comprehension					
	Composite	0.316	0.312	0.102	0.496
	Letter Sounds	0.226	0.390	0.012	0.424
	Onset Sounds	0.326	0.367	0.163	0.541
	Syllable Reading	0.261	0.424	0.020	0.431
	Word Segmenting	0.296	0.321	0.112	0.503
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.655	0.567	0.399	0.698
	Letter Sounds	0.509	0.420	0.224	0.584
	Onset Sounds	0.477	0.395	0.194	0.563
	Syllable Reading	0.636	0.546	0.373	0.682
	Word Segmenting	0.479	0.434	0.239	0.595
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.497	0.492	0.308	0.641
	Letter Sounds	0.416	0.366	0.162	0.540
	Onset Sounds	0.288	0.286	0.074	0.474
	Syllable Reading	0.502	0.506	0.324	0.651
	Word Segmenting	0.364	0.354	0.149	0.530

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Kindergarten Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval		
			Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.677	0.662	0.556	0.746
	Letter Sounds	0.531	0.556	0.429	0.662
	Onset Sounds	0.427	0.397	0.247	0.529
	Syllable Reading	0.669	0.678	0.576	0.759
	Word Segmenting	0.491	0.467	0.325	0.588
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.469	0.478	0.338	0.598
	Letter Sounds	0.374	0.415	0.266	0.544
	Onset Sounds	0.283	0.286	0.125	0.433
	Syllable Reading	0.445	0.477	0.336	0.596
	Word Segmenting	0.378	0.366	0.212	0.503
Listening Comprehension					
	Composite	0.316	0.322	0.164	0.464
	Letter Sounds	0.226	0.254	0.091	0.404
	Onset Sounds	0.326	0.300	0.140	0.445
	Syllable Reading	0.261	0.290	0.129	0.436
	Word Segmenting	0.296	0.263	0.101	0.412
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.655	0.649	0.541	0.736
	Letter Sounds	0.509	0.537	0.406	0.646
	Onset Sounds	0.477	0.421	0.273	0.549
	Syllable Reading	0.636	0.659	0.553	0.744
	Word Segmenting	0.479	0.455	0.311	0.578
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.497	0.484	0.345	0.603
	Letter Sounds	0.416	0.433	0.286	0.559
	Onset Sounds	0.288	0.285	0.124	0.431
	Syllable Reading	0.502	0.506	0.370	0.620
	Word Segmenting	0.364	0.326	0.168	0.467

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Kindergarten Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	Composite	0.677	0.712	0.195 0.919
	Letter Sounds	0.531	0.644	0.072 0.897
	Onset Sounds	0.427	0.412	-0.250 0.811
	Syllable Reading	0.669	0.586	-0.021 0.877
	Word Segmenting	0.491	0.214	-0.443 0.721
Reading Comprehension				
	Composite	0.469	0.329	-0.338 0.776
	Letter Sounds	0.374	0.348	-0.319 0.784
	Onset Sounds	0.283	0.292	-0.373 0.759
	Syllable Reading	0.445	0.355	-0.311 0.787
	Word Segmenting	0.378	-0.364	-0.791 0.301
Listening Comprehension				
	Composite	0.316	0.170	-0.479 0.699
	Letter Sounds	0.226	0.300	-0.365 0.763
	Onset Sounds	0.326	0.294	-0.372 0.760
	Syllable Reading	0.261	-0.091	-0.655 0.538
	Word Segmenting	0.296	0.426	-0.234 0.817
Phonemic Awareness				
	Composite	0.655	0.657	0.094 0.902
	Letter Sounds	0.509	0.571	-0.044 0.872
	Onset Sounds	0.477	0.498	-0.146 0.845
	Syllable Reading	0.636	0.465	-0.187 0.833
	Word Segmenting	0.479	0.360	-0.306 0.789
Vocabulary				
	Composite	0.497	0.545	-0.082 0.863
	Letter Sounds	0.416	0.142	-0.500 0.684
	Onset Sounds	0.288	0.162	-0.485 0.694
	Syllable Reading	0.502	0.519	-0.117 0.853
	Word Segmenting	0.364	0.155	-0.490 0.691

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 1 Females

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.787	0.802	0.706	0.870
	Sight Words	0.786	0.811	0.719	0.875
	Syllable Reading	0.686	0.740	0.620	0.826
	Word Segmenting	0.417	0.538	0.359	0.678
	CBM-WRC	0.810	0.817	0.727	0.879
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.572	0.642	0.491	0.756
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.643	0.665	0.520	0.773
	Sight Words	0.670	0.711	0.581	0.805
	Syllable Reading	0.457	0.505	0.319	0.653
	Word Segmenting	0.300	0.333	0.120	0.516
	CBM-WRC	0.671	0.675	0.534	0.780
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.340	0.401	0.198	0.572
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.688	0.692	0.555	0.792
	Sight Words	0.693	0.715	0.587	0.808
	Syllable Reading	0.641	0.684	0.546	0.786
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.470	0.277	0.626
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.772	0.597	0.814
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.606	0.444	0.729
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.607	0.591	0.425	0.719
	Sight Words	0.607	0.583	0.415	0.712
	Syllable Reading	0.515	0.530	0.349	0.672
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.446	0.250	0.607
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.618	0.460	0.738
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.449	0.253	0.610

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 1 Males

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.787	0.770	0.657	0.848
	Sight Words	0.786	0.753	0.634	0.837
	Syllable Reading	0.686	0.636	0.478	0.754
	Word Segmenting	0.417	0.270	0.046	0.468
	CBM-WRC	0.810	0.803	0.705	0.871
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.572	0.498	0.305	0.651
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.643	0.616	0.452	0.739
	Sight Words	0.670	0.620	0.457	0.742
	Syllable Reading	0.457	0.426	0.221	0.596
	Word Segmenting	0.300	0.271	0.047	0.469
	CBM-WRC	0.671	0.670	0.523	0.779
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.340	0.287	0.064	0.483
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.688	0.689	0.548	0.792
	Sight Words	0.693	0.666	0.517	0.775
	Syllable Reading	0.641	0.621	0.458	0.743
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.218	-0.010	0.424
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.708	0.573	0.805
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.503	0.312	0.655
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.607	0.630	0.470	0.750
	Sight Words	0.607	0.635	0.477	0.753
	Syllable Reading	0.515	0.522	0.335	0.670
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.257	0.032	0.457
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.647	0.492	0.762
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.391	0.180	0.567

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 1 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.787	0.798	0.728	0.852
	Sight Words	0.786	0.798	0.728	0.851
	Syllable Reading	0.686	0.688	0.589	0.767
	Word Segmenting	0.417	0.401	0.251	0.532
	CBM-WRC	0.810	0.813	0.748	0.863
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.572	0.579	0.457	0.680
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.643	0.654	0.546	0.740
	Sight Words	0.670	0.677	0.576	0.758
	Syllable Reading	0.457	0.464	0.322	0.585
	Word Segmenting	0.300	0.307	0.148	0.450
	CBM-WRC	0.671	0.671	0.568	0.754
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.340	0.353	0.198	0.491
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.688	0.707	0.612	0.782
	Sight Words	0.693	0.715	0.623	0.788
	Syllable Reading	0.641	0.650	0.542	0.737
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.326	0.168	0.467
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.725	0.635	0.795
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.562	0.436	0.666
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.607	0.607	0.489	0.703
	Sight Words	0.607	0.603	0.485	0.699
	Syllable Reading	0.515	0.504	0.369	0.619
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.350	0.195	0.488
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.626	0.513	0.718
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.403	0.253	0.533

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 1 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Composite	0.787	0.659	0.222	0.876
	Sight Words	0.786	0.631	0.176	0.864
	Syllable Reading	0.686	0.665	0.231	0.878
	Word Segmenting	0.417	0.588	0.108	0.846
	CBM-WRC	0.810	0.779	0.444	0.923
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.572	0.553	0.057	0.830
Reading Comprehension					
	Composite	0.643	0.510	-0.003	0.810
	Sight Words	0.670	0.550	0.053	0.829
	Syllable Reading	0.457	0.372	-0.173	0.743
	Word Segmenting	0.300	0.335	-0.214	0.723
	CBM-WRC	0.671	0.690	0.276	0.888
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.340	0.278	-0.273	0.692
Phonemic Awareness					
	Composite	0.688	0.462	-0.066	0.788
	Sight Words	0.693	0.384	-0.159	0.749
	Syllable Reading	0.641	0.534	0.031	0.822
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.646	0.201	0.870
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.584	0.102	0.844
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.447	-0.085	0.780
Vocabulary					
	Composite	0.607	0.624	0.164	0.861
	Sight Words	0.607	0.678	0.253	0.883
	Syllable Reading	0.515	0.683	0.263	0.886
	Word Segmenting	0.354	0.455	-0.075	0.784
	CBM-WRC	0.630	0.707	0.306	0.895
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.409	0.525	0.018	0.818

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 2 Females

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.751	0.656	0.536	0.750
	Passage 2 WRC	0.753	0.670	0.553	0.761
	Passage 3 WRC	0.730	0.639	0.515	0.737
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.502	0.533	0.386	0.654
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.661	0.634	0.509	0.734
	Passage 2 WRC	0.664	0.638	0.513	0.736
	Passage 3 WRC	0.655	0.634	0.509	0.734
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.362	0.405	0.238	0.549
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.703	0.680	0.566	0.769
	Passage 2 WRC	0.692	0.680	0.565	0.768
	Passage 3 WRC	0.717	0.684	0.570	0.771
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.270	0.303	0.125	0.463
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.622	0.530	0.382	0.651
	Passage 2 WRC	0.635	0.553	0.410	0.670
	Passage 3 WRC	0.600	0.501	0.348	0.629
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.425	0.447	0.285	0.584
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.540	0.372	0.200	0.522
	Passage 2 WRC	0.540	0.399	0.230	0.544
	Passage 3 WRC	0.520	0.366	0.193	0.516
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.328	0.337	0.162	0.492

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 2 Males

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.751	0.817	0.749	0.867
	Passage 2 WRC	0.753	0.815	0.747	0.866
	Passage 3 WRC	0.730	0.795	0.720	0.851
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.502	0.488	0.344	0.610
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.661	0.710	0.612	0.786
	Passage 2 WRC	0.664	0.721	0.625	0.795
	Passage 3 WRC	0.655	0.698	0.596	0.778
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.362	0.353	0.191	0.496
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.703	0.734	0.642	0.805
	Passage 2 WRC	0.692	0.714	0.617	0.790
	Passage 3 WRC	0.717	0.746	0.657	0.814
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.270	0.252	0.082	0.408
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.622	0.696	0.594	0.776
	Passage 2 WRC	0.635	0.701	0.600	0.779
	Passage 3 WRC	0.600	0.673	0.566	0.759
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.425	0.417	0.262	0.551
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.540	0.640	0.525	0.732
	Passage 2 WRC	0.540	0.629	0.511	0.723
	Passage 3 WRC	0.520	0.621	0.501	0.717
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.328	0.326	0.162	0.473

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 2 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.751	0.763	0.700	0.813
	Passage 2 WRC	0.753	0.757	0.693	0.809
	Passage 3 WRC	0.730	0.746	0.680	0.800
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.502	0.515	0.409	0.607
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.661	0.671	0.590	0.739
	Passage 2 WRC	0.664	0.668	0.587	0.737
	Passage 3 WRC	0.655	0.674	0.593	0.741
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.362	0.368	0.246	0.479
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.703	0.714	0.641	0.774
	Passage 2 WRC	0.692	0.693	0.616	0.757
	Passage 3 WRC	0.717	0.720	0.648	0.779
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.270	0.270	0.141	0.390
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.622	0.630	0.542	0.705
	Passage 2 WRC	0.635	0.639	0.552	0.712
	Passage 3 WRC	0.600	0.605	0.512	0.684
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.425	0.436	0.321	0.539
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.540	0.550	0.449	0.637
	Passage 2 WRC	0.540	0.544	0.442	0.632
	Passage 3 WRC	0.520	0.538	0.435	0.627
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.328	0.335	0.210	0.449

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 2 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.751	0.625	0.314	0.815
	Passage 2 WRC	0.753	0.727	0.472	0.869
	Passage 3 WRC	0.730	0.556	0.215	0.776
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.502	0.363	-0.028	0.658
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.661	0.531	0.180	0.762
	Passage 2 WRC	0.664	0.616	0.300	0.810
	Passage 3 WRC	0.655	0.463	0.092	0.721
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.362	0.355	-0.037	0.653
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.703	0.699	0.427	0.855
	Passage 2 WRC	0.692	0.785	0.571	0.899
	Passage 3 WRC	0.717	0.732	0.482	0.872
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.270	0.461	0.089	0.720
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.622	0.610	0.292	0.807
	Passage 2 WRC	0.635	0.662	0.369	0.835
	Passage 3 WRC	0.600	0.573	0.239	0.786
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.425	0.347	-0.047	0.647
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.540	0.397	0.012	0.680
	Passage 2 WRC	0.540	0.475	0.108	0.729
	Passage 3 WRC	0.520	0.302	-0.097	0.617
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.328	0.264	-0.137	0.591

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 3 Females

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.658	0.655	0.547	0.741
	Passage 2 WRC	0.652	0.652	0.543	0.739
	Passage 3 WRC	0.656	0.663	0.557	0.748
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.570	0.491	0.352	0.609
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.605	0.596	0.476	0.695
	Passage 2 WRC	0.596	0.589	0.467	0.689
	Passage 3 WRC	0.613	0.616	0.499	0.710
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.534	0.512	0.376	0.626
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.712	0.740	0.653	0.808
	Passage 2 WRC	0.705	0.749	0.664	0.814
	Passage 3 WRC	0.729	0.776	0.699	0.835
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.430	0.452	0.307	0.577
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.511	0.335	0.352	0.609
	Passage 2 WRC	0.497	0.281	0.333	0.596
	Passage 3 WRC	0.514	0.334	0.355	0.612
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.384	0.180	0.149	0.455
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.579	0.597	0.476	0.695
	Passage 2 WRC	0.557	0.590	0.468	0.689
	Passage 3 WRC	0.548	0.584	0.461	0.685
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.387	0.373	0.218	0.509

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 3 Males

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.658	0.655	0.532	0.751
	Passage 2 WRC	0.652	0.651	0.526	0.748
	Passage 3 WRC	0.656	0.645	0.519	0.743
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.570	0.650	0.526	0.747
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.605	0.617	0.485	0.721
	Passage 2 WRC	0.596	0.624	0.493	0.727
	Passage 3 WRC	0.613	0.631	0.501	0.732
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.534	0.560	0.415	0.677
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.712	0.671	0.553	0.763
	Passage 2 WRC	0.705	0.650	0.526	0.747
	Passage 3 WRC	0.729	0.674	0.556	0.765
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.430	0.436	0.270	0.577
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.511	0.371	0.383	0.655
	Passage 2 WRC	0.497	0.393	0.372	0.649
	Passage 3 WRC	0.514	0.430	0.390	0.661
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.384	0.370	0.308	0.604
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.579	0.551	0.406	0.669
	Passage 2 WRC	0.557	0.509	0.355	0.636
	Passage 3 WRC	0.548	0.498	0.341	0.627
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.387	0.423	0.256	0.566

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 3 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.658	0.652	0.570	0.722
	Passage 2 WRC	0.652	0.649	0.565	0.719
	Passage 3 WRC	0.656	0.653	0.571	0.723
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.570	0.565	0.468	0.648
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.605	0.606	0.516	0.683
	Passage 2 WRC	0.596	0.606	0.515	0.683
	Passage 3 WRC	0.613	0.623	0.535	0.698
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.534	0.529	0.427	0.617
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.712	0.718	0.648	0.777
	Passage 2 WRC	0.705	0.714	0.643	0.773
	Passage 3 WRC	0.729	0.734	0.667	0.790
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.430	0.435	0.322	0.536
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.511	0.356	0.391	0.590
	Passage 2 WRC	0.497	0.339	0.376	0.579
	Passage 3 WRC	0.514	0.384	0.397	0.595
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.384	0.297	0.255	0.482
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.579	0.588	0.495	0.668
	Passage 2 WRC	0.557	0.559	0.462	0.644
	Passage 3 WRC	0.548	0.554	0.456	0.639
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.387	0.388	0.270	0.494

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 3 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.658	0.739	0.470	0.882
	Passage 2 WRC	0.652	0.697	0.399	0.861
	Passage 3 WRC	0.656	0.684	0.379	0.855
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.570	0.666	0.351	0.846
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.605	0.595	0.242	0.809
	Passage 2 WRC	0.596	0.486	0.093	0.749
	Passage 3 WRC	0.613	0.498	0.107	0.755
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.534	0.646	0.318	0.835
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.712	0.645	0.316	0.835
	Passage 2 WRC	0.705	0.631	0.295	0.828
	Passage 3 WRC	0.729	0.690	0.388	0.858
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.430	0.361	-0.060	0.673
Phonemic Awareness					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.511	0.696	0.398	0.861
	Passage 2 WRC	0.497	0.688	0.385	0.857
	Passage 3 WRC	0.514	0.678	0.368	0.852
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.384	0.565	0.199	0.793
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.579	0.478	0.082	0.744
	Passage 2 WRC	0.557	0.507	0.120	0.760
	Passage 3 WRC	0.548	0.457	0.055	0.731
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.387	0.389	-0.028	0.690

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 4 Females

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.716	0.673	0.558	0.763
	Passage 2 WRC	0.683	0.666	0.549	0.757
	Passage 3 WRC	0.689	0.661	0.543	0.754
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.440	0.448	0.288	0.584
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.577	0.577	0.439	0.688
	Passage 2 WRC	0.550	0.523	0.376	0.645
	Passage 3 WRC	0.553	0.509	0.359	0.634
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.285	0.301	0.124	0.460
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.580	0.633	0.508	0.732
	Passage 2 WRC	0.578	0.622	0.494	0.723
	Passage 3 WRC	0.576	0.595	0.461	0.702
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.344	0.321	0.146	0.477
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.521	0.491	0.339	0.619
	Passage 2 WRC	0.484	0.480	0.326	0.610
	Passage 3 WRC	0.469	0.459	0.301	0.592
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.305	0.348	0.176	0.499

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 4 Males

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.716	0.750	0.655	0.822
	Passage 2 WRC	0.683	0.687	0.572	0.775
	Passage 3 WRC	0.689	0.701	0.591	0.785
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.440	0.487	0.329	0.618
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.577	0.553	0.409	0.671
	Passage 2 WRC	0.550	0.555	0.410	0.673
	Passage 3 WRC	0.553	0.569	0.427	0.684
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.285	0.303	0.123	0.464
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.580	0.488	0.331	0.619
	Passage 2 WRC	0.578	0.496	0.339	0.625
	Passage 3 WRC	0.576	0.526	0.375	0.650
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.344	0.434	0.269	0.575
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.521	0.550	0.407	0.667
	Passage 2 WRC	0.484	0.486	0.330	0.616
	Passage 3 WRC	0.469	0.475	0.317	0.607
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.305	0.272	0.092	0.435

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 4 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.716	0.700	0.622	0.763
	Passage 2 WRC	0.683	0.664	0.579	0.734
	Passage 3 WRC	0.689	0.666	0.582	0.736
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.440	0.390	0.267	0.500
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.577	0.560	0.458	0.647
	Passage 2 WRC	0.550	0.534	0.429	0.626
	Passage 3 WRC	0.553	0.537	0.431	0.627
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.285	0.260	0.128	0.383
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.580	0.550	0.447	0.639
	Passage 2 WRC	0.578	0.554	0.451	0.642
	Passage 3 WRC	0.576	0.547	0.443	0.636
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.344	0.331	0.203	0.447
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.521	0.511	0.404	0.605
	Passage 2 WRC	0.484	0.466	0.353	0.566
	Passage 3 WRC	0.469	0.448	0.332	0.550
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.305	0.260	0.129	0.382

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 4 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.716	0.835	0.591	0.939
	Passage 2 WRC	0.683	0.845	0.613	0.943
	Passage 3 WRC	0.689	0.880	0.693	0.956
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.440	0.744	0.410	0.902
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.577	0.812	0.544	0.930
	Passage 2 WRC	0.550	0.796	0.511	0.923
	Passage 3 WRC	0.553	0.832	0.586	0.938
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.285	0.617	0.194	0.847
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.580	0.867	0.663	0.951
	Passage 2 WRC	0.578	0.816	0.551	0.931
	Passage 3 WRC	0.576	0.862	0.651	0.949
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.344	0.460	-0.027	0.770
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.521	0.654	0.253	0.863
	Passage 2 WRC	0.484	0.677	0.290	0.873
	Passage 3 WRC	0.469	0.675	0.288	0.873
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.305	0.609	0.181	0.843

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 5 Females

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.694	0.700	0.552	0.806
	Passage 2 WRC	0.695	0.700	0.551	0.805
	Passage 3 WRC	0.695	0.661	0.499	0.778
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.420	0.403	0.178	0.587
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.616	0.673	0.515	0.787
	Passage 2 WRC	0.598	0.674	0.516	0.788
	Passage 3 WRC	0.597	0.648	0.481	0.769
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.272	0.384	0.156	0.572
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.558	0.450	0.233	0.624
	Passage 2 WRC	0.576	0.496	0.288	0.659
	Passage 3 WRC	0.569	0.473	0.261	0.642
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.386	0.187	-0.058	0.410
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.581	0.559	0.369	0.703
	Passage 2 WRC	0.581	0.581	0.398	0.720
	Passage 3 WRC	0.584	0.553	0.363	0.700
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.303	0.272	0.036	0.479

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 5 Males

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.694	0.691	0.546	0.795
	Passage 2 WRC	0.695	0.686	0.541	0.792
	Passage 3 WRC	0.695	0.707	0.569	0.807
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.420	0.417	0.205	0.592
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.616	0.594	0.420	0.726
	Passage 2 WRC	0.598	0.574	0.395	0.711
	Passage 3 WRC	0.597	0.582	0.405	0.717
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.272	0.262	0.032	0.465
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.558	0.645	0.486	0.763
	Passage 2 WRC	0.576	0.620	0.454	0.745
	Passage 3 WRC	0.569	0.623	0.457	0.747
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.386	0.481	0.281	0.641
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.581	0.617	0.451	0.742
	Passage 2 WRC	0.581	0.596	0.424	0.727
	Passage 3 WRC	0.584	0.612	0.444	0.738
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.303	0.332	0.110	0.522

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 5 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.694	0.741	0.651	0.811
	Passage 2 WRC	0.695	0.744	0.655	0.813
	Passage 3 WRC	0.695	0.741	0.651	0.811
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.420	0.440	0.287	0.571
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.616	0.659	0.547	0.747
	Passage 2 WRC	0.598	0.639	0.523	0.732
	Passage 3 WRC	0.597	0.631	0.512	0.726
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.272	0.308	0.141	0.458
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.558	0.543	0.407	0.656
	Passage 2 WRC	0.576	0.563	0.431	0.672
	Passage 3 WRC	0.569	0.553	0.419	0.664
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.386	0.385	0.225	0.524
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.581	0.606	0.483	0.705
	Passage 2 WRC	0.581	0.607	0.485	0.706
	Passage 3 WRC	0.584	0.606	0.484	0.705
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.303	0.333	0.170	0.478

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (MOY) Grade 5 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Fast Bridge	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.694	0.207	-0.364	0.664
	Passage 2 WRC	0.695	0.257	-0.317	0.693
	Passage 3 WRC	0.695	0.279	-0.296	0.705
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.420	0.265	-0.309	0.697
Reading Comprehension					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.616	0.274	-0.300	0.703
	Passage 2 WRC	0.598	0.345	-0.228	0.740
	Passage 3 WRC	0.597	0.406	-0.159	0.770
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.272	-0.097	-0.597	0.457
Reading Fluency					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.558	0.815	0.500	0.939
	Passage 2 WRC	0.576	0.862	0.612	0.956
	Passage 3 WRC	0.569	0.849	0.580	0.951
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.386	0.427	-0.135	0.780
Vocabulary					
	Passage 1 WRC	0.581	0.311	-0.263	0.722
	Passage 2 WRC	0.581	0.340	-0.232	0.738
	Passage 3 WRC	0.584	0.361	-0.209	0.748
	CBM-Median Accuracy	0.303	-0.093	-0.594	0.460

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) K Females

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall		95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Composite	0.73	0.75	0.64	0.82
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.44	0.47	0.30	0.61
	FB-Sight Words	0.77	0.77	0.68	0.84
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.67	0.69	0.57	0.78
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.44	0.43	0.26	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.72	0.61	0.80
	APR3-Word Reading	0.62	0.65	0.52	0.75
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.53	0.57	0.42	0.69
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.71	0.68	0.57	0.78
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.66	0.65	0.52	0.75
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.42	0.33	0.15	0.49
	FB-Sight Words	0.71	0.69	0.57	0.78
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.65	0.66	0.54	0.76
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.38	0.39	0.22	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.56	0.40	0.68
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.49	0.32	0.62
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.44	0.45	0.28	0.59
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.63	0.59	0.44	0.70
Listening Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.20	0.19	0.00	0.37
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.14	0.16	-0.03	0.35
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.16	-0.03	0.35
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.20	0.20	0.01	0.38
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.15	0.14	-0.06	0.32
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.40	0.22	0.55
	APR3-Word Reading	0.26	0.35	0.17	0.51

	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.24	0.34	0.16	0.50
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.34	0.15	0.50
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Composite	0.75	0.77	0.68	0.84
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.48	0.55	0.40	0.67
	FB-Sight Words	0.75	0.74	0.63	0.81
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.71	0.73	0.63	0.81
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.50	0.33	0.63
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.75	0.65	0.82
	APR3-Word Reading	0.65	0.69	0.57	0.78
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.56	0.56	0.41	0.68
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.69	0.70	0.58	0.78
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.48	0.52	0.37	0.65
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.32	0.32	0.14	0.49
	FB-Sight Words	0.53	0.59	0.45	0.71
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.41	0.47	0.31	0.61
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.27	0.26	0.06	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.45	0.50	0.34	0.63
	APR3-Word Reading	0.37	0.45	0.27	0.59
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.33	0.41	0.24	0.56
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.47	0.48	0.32	0.62

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) K Males

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Composite	0.73	0.70	0.57	0.80
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.44	0.43	0.24	0.60
	FB-Sight Words	0.77	0.75	0.64	0.83
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.67	0.66	0.51	0.76
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.44	0.44	0.24	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.68	0.54	0.78
	APR3-Word Reading	0.62	0.52	0.34	0.66
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.53	0.45	0.26	0.61
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.71	0.74	0.62	0.82
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Composite	0.66	0.68	0.54	0.78
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.42	0.47	0.28	0.63
	FB-Sight Words	0.71	0.74	0.62	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.65	0.64	0.49	0.75
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.38	0.36	0.16	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.60	0.44	0.72
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.48	0.29	0.63
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.44	0.38	0.18	0.55
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.63	0.65	0.50	0.76
Listening Comprehension					
	FB-Composite	0.20	0.11	-0.11	0.32
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.14	0.05	-0.17	0.27
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.18	-0.04	0.38
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.20	0.14	-0.08	0.35
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.15	0.01	-0.21	0.23
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.24	0.03	0.44
	APR3-Word Reading	0.26	0.18	-0.03	0.39

	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.24	0.10	-0.11	0.31
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.30	0.09	0.49
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Composite	0.75	0.72	0.60	0.81
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.48	0.44	0.25	0.60
	FB-Sight Words	0.75	0.74	0.62	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.71	0.68	0.55	0.78
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.52	0.34	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.75	0.64	0.83
	APR3-Word Reading	0.65	0.58	0.42	0.71
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.56	0.59	0.42	0.71
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.69	0.72	0.60	0.81
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.48	0.37	0.16	0.54
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.32	0.27	0.06	0.46
	FB-Sight Words	0.53	0.39	0.19	0.56
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.41	0.30	0.09	0.49
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.27	0.19	-0.03	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.45	0.31	0.10	0.50
	APR3-Word Reading	0.37	0.20	-0.02	0.40
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.33	0.17	-0.05	0.37
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.47	0.41	0.22	0.58

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) K Free/Reduced Lunch

<i>ISIP Español</i>	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Composite	0.73	0.74	0.65	0.80
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.44	0.51	0.37	0.62
	FB-Sight Words	0.77	0.76	0.68	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.67	0.66	0.56	0.75
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.44	0.47	0.33	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.70	0.60	0.78
	APR3-Word Reading	0.62	0.65	0.54	0.73
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.53	0.50	0.37	0.62
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.71	0.69	0.59	0.77
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Composite	0.66	0.67	0.57	0.76
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.42	0.42	0.28	0.55
	FB-Sight Words	0.71	0.72	0.62	0.79
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.65	0.65	0.54	0.74
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.38	0.42	0.27	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.57	0.45	0.68
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.50	0.36	0.61
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.44	0.41	0.26	0.54
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.63	0.61	0.49	0.70
Listening Comprehension					
	FB-Composite	0.20	0.20	0.03	0.35
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.14	0.19	0.02	0.34
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.25	0.09	0.40
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.20	0.24	0.08	0.39
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.15	0.02	-0.15	0.18
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.38	0.23	0.52
	APR3-Word Reading	0.26	0.36	0.20	0.49

	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.24	0.25	0.09	0.40
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.38	0.23	0.52
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Composite	0.75	0.78	0.70	0.84
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.48	0.56	0.43	0.66
	FB-Sight Words	0.75	0.76	0.68	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.71	0.73	0.64	0.80
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.53	0.40	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.76	0.68	0.82
	APR3-Word Reading	0.65	0.71	0.62	0.78
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.56	0.57	0.45	0.67
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.69	0.70	0.61	0.78
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.48	0.43	0.29	0.56
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.32	0.32	0.17	0.46
	FB-Sight Words	0.53	0.48	0.35	0.60
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.41	0.36	0.21	0.50
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.27	0.21	0.05	0.37
	APR3-Composite	0.45	0.37	0.22	0.51
	APR3-Word Reading	0.37	0.34	0.18	0.48
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.33	0.25	0.09	0.40
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.47	0.39	0.24	0.53

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) K Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall	95% Confidence Interval		
		Coefficient	Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Composite	0.73	0.72	0.12	0.94
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.44	-0.22	-0.77	0.52
	FB-Sight Words	0.77	0.69	0.05	0.93
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.67	0.72	0.11	0.94
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.44	-0.24	-0.78	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.74	0.20	0.93
	APR3-Word Reading	0.62	0.60	-0.04	0.89
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.53	0.50	-0.19	0.86
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.71	0.85	0.48	0.96
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Composite	0.66	0.79	0.27	0.95
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.42	-0.17	-0.75	0.56
	FB-Sight Words	0.71	0.87	0.50	0.97
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.65	0.87	0.49	0.97
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.38	-0.58	-0.90	0.14
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.48	-0.22	0.85
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.43	-0.27	0.83
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.44	0.36	-0.35	0.81
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.63	0.55	-0.12	0.88
Listening Comprehension					
	FB-Composite	0.20	-0.01	-0.67	0.66
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.14	-0.58	-0.90	0.14
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.05	-0.63	0.69
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.20	-0.10	-0.72	0.60
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.15	-0.24	-0.78	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.00	-0.63	0.63
	APR3-Word Reading	0.26	-0.22	-0.74	0.48

	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.24	0.11	-0.56	0.69
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	-0.11	-0.69	0.56
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Composite	0.75	0.66	0.00	0.92
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.48	0.18	-0.55	0.75
	FB-Sight Words	0.75	0.55	-0.18	0.89
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.71	0.61	-0.09	0.91
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	-0.06	-0.70	0.63
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.77	0.27	0.94
	APR3-Word Reading	0.65	0.64	0.02	0.90
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.56	0.53	-0.15	0.87
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.69	0.85	0.48	0.96
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.48	0.47	-0.29	0.86
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.32	-0.30	-0.80	0.46
	FB-Sight Words	0.53	0.41	-0.34	0.85
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.41	0.45	-0.30	0.86
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.27	0.16	-0.56	0.74
	APR3-Composite	0.45	0.32	-0.39	0.79
	APR3-Word Reading	0.37	0.40	-0.31	0.82
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.33	0.08	-0.58	0.68
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.47	0.51	-0.18	0.86

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 1 Females

<i>ISIP Español</i>	Concurrent Assessment	Overall		95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Composite	0.78	0.86	0.78	0.91
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.55	0.37	0.69
	FB-Sight Words	0.74	0.80	0.70	0.87
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.69	0.77	0.66	0.85
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.78	0.83	0.75	0.89
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.61	0.65	0.50	0.77
	APR3-Composite	0.77	0.83	0.74	0.88
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.75	0.64	0.83
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.65	0.72	0.60	0.81
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.76	0.79	0.69	0.86
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.68	0.77	0.66	0.85
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.30	0.39	0.18	0.57
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.69	0.55	0.79
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.53	0.60	0.44	0.73
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.71	0.77	0.66	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.42	0.21	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.66	0.51	0.77
	APR3-Word Reading	0.53	0.61	0.45	0.73
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.54	0.64	0.48	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.66	0.52	0.77
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Composite	0.65	0.72	0.59	0.81
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-Sight Words	0.60	0.66	0.51	0.77
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.59	0.67	0.52	0.78
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.62	0.67	0.52	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.58	0.62	0.46	0.74

	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.74	0.62	0.82
	APR3-Word Reading	0.59	0.68	0.54	0.78
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.56	0.62	0.46	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.69	0.55	0.79
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.54	0.54	0.36	0.68
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.25	0.36	0.14	0.54
	FB-Sight Words	0.51	0.50	0.31	0.65
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.49	0.29	0.64
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.53	0.54	0.35	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.42	0.44	0.24	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.56	0.39	0.69
	APR3-Word Reading	0.43	0.50	0.31	0.64
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.45	0.26	0.61
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.57	0.39	0.70

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 1 Males

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Composite	0.78	0.66	0.51	0.77
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.30	0.08	0.49
	FB-Sight Words	0.74	0.64	0.48	0.75
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.69	0.56	0.38	0.70
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.78	0.70	0.56	0.80
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.61	0.52	0.34	0.67
	APR3-Composite	0.77	0.70	0.56	0.80
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.58	0.40	0.71
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.65	0.53	0.35	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.76	0.70	0.56	0.80
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.68	0.54	0.36	0.68
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.30	0.18	-0.05	0.39
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.56	0.39	0.70
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.53	0.44	0.24	0.61
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.71	0.61	0.45	0.74
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.38	0.17	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.53	0.34	0.67
	APR3-Word Reading	0.53	0.46	0.26	0.62
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.54	0.39	0.18	0.57
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.55	0.37	0.69
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Composite	0.65	0.58	0.40	0.71
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.37	0.16	0.55
	FB-Sight Words	0.60	0.51	0.32	0.66
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.59	0.53	0.35	0.68
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.62	0.55	0.38	0.69
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.58	0.55	0.36	0.69

	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.61	0.45	0.74
	APR3-Word Reading	0.59	0.52	0.34	0.67
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.56	0.49	0.30	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.57	0.39	0.70
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.54	0.50	0.31	0.65
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.25	0.12	-0.11	0.34
	FB-Sight Words	0.51	0.46	0.27	0.63
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.36	0.14	0.54
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.53	0.48	0.29	0.64
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.42	0.32	0.10	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.53	0.35	0.68
	APR3-Word Reading	0.43	0.36	0.15	0.54
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.41	0.20	0.58
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.53	0.35	0.68

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 1 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Lower	Upper	
Overall	FB-Composite	0.78	0.78	0.71	0.84
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.45	0.30	0.57
	FB-Sight Words	0.74	0.74	0.66	0.81
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.69	0.67	0.56	0.75
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.78	0.78	0.71	0.84
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.61	0.59	0.46	0.69
	APR3-Composite	0.77	0.76	0.68	0.82
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.67	0.57	0.75
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.65	0.64	0.53	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.76	0.75	0.67	0.82
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.68	0.70	0.61	0.78
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.30	0.31	0.15	0.46
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.67	0.57	0.76
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.53	0.53	0.40	0.64
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.71	0.74	0.65	0.81
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.41	0.26	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.59	0.47	0.69
	APR3-Word Reading	0.53	0.53	0.40	0.64
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.54	0.52	0.39	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.62	0.50	0.71
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Composite	0.65	0.65	0.54	0.74
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.50	0.37	0.62
	FB-Sight Words	0.60	0.59	0.47	0.69
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.59	0.58	0.46	0.68
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.62	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.58	0.57	0.45	0.67

	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.67	0.56	0.75
	APR3-Word Reading	0.59	0.59	0.47	0.69
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.56	0.56	0.43	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.62	0.51	0.72
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.54	0.51	0.37	0.62
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.25	0.24	0.07	0.39
	FB-Sight Words	0.51	0.47	0.32	0.59
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.40	0.25	0.53
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.53	0.49	0.35	0.61
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.42	0.36	0.20	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.54	0.41	0.65
	APR3-Word Reading	0.43	0.43	0.29	0.56
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.43	0.29	0.56
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.55	0.42	0.65

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 1 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval		
			Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Composite	0.78	0.68	0.27	0.89
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.32	-0.23	0.71
	FB-Sight Words	0.74	0.61	0.15	0.86
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.69	0.75	0.38	0.91
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.78	0.74	0.37	0.91
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.61	0.67	0.24	0.88
	APR3-Composite	0.77	0.85	0.59	0.95
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.73	0.34	0.90
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.65	0.71	0.32	0.90
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.76	0.79	0.47	0.93
Reading Comprehension	FB-Composite	0.68	0.37	-0.18	0.74
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.30	0.15	-0.40	0.61
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.25	-0.30	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.53	0.42	-0.12	0.77
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.71	0.37	-0.17	0.74
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.26	-0.30	0.68
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.71	0.31	0.90
	APR3-Word Reading	0.53	0.76	0.41	0.92
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.54	1.00	1.00	1.00
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.92	0.78	0.97
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Composite	0.65	0.58	0.10	0.84
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.49	0.33	-0.22	0.72
	FB-Sight Words	0.60	0.53	0.02	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.59	0.57	0.09	0.84
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.62	0.61	0.14	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.58	0.62	0.15	0.86

	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.76	0.40	0.91
	APR3-Word Reading	0.59	0.64	0.20	0.87
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.56	0.59	0.10	0.84
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.72	0.33	0.90
Vocabulary					
	FB-Composite	0.54	0.66	0.22	0.87
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.25	0.31	-0.24	0.71
	FB-Sight Words	0.51	0.64	0.19	0.87
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.67	0.24	0.88
	FB-CBM Words Read Correct	0.53	0.76	0.40	0.92
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.42	0.60	0.12	0.85
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.59	0.11	0.85
	APR3-Word Reading	0.43	0.51	0.00	0.81
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.42	-0.12	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.59	0.11	0.85

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 2 Female

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval		
			Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.70	0.59	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.65	0.53	0.74
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.73	0.65	0.53	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.56	0.54	0.40	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.72	0.62	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.61	0.49	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.69	0.58	0.78
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.69	0.70	0.59	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.69	0.72	0.61	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.70	0.59	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.43	0.27	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.71	0.61	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.57	0.43	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.71	0.60	0.79
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.64	0.52	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.67	0.56	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.67	0.55	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.28	0.30	0.13	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.61	0.47	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.50	0.45	0.29	0.59
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.64	0.52	0.74
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.39	0.65
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.62	0.48	0.33	0.61
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.50	0.35	0.63
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.43	0.27	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.58	0.44	0.69

	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.49	0.33	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.57	0.43	0.68
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.52	0.50	0.34	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.43	0.27	0.57
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.51	0.43	0.26	0.57
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.36	0.34	0.17	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.55	0.41	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.47	0.32	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.52	0.38	0.65

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 2 Male

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.76	0.678	0.83
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.79	0.71	0.85
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.73	0.78	0.70	0.84
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.56	0.59	0.46	0.69
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.78	0.70	0.84
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.71	0.61	0.78
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.73	0.64	0.80
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.69	0.69	0.59	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.69	0.69	0.58	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.70	0.60	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.49	0.35	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.71	0.61	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.61	0.49	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.69	0.59	0.77
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.69	0.58	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.66	0.55	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.71	0.61	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.28	0.26	0.09	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.69	0.58	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.50	0.58	0.46	0.69
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.68	0.58	0.77
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.70	0.60	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.62	0.72	0.62	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.71	0.61	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.48	0.33	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.68	0.58	0.76

	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.63	0.51	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.64	0.52	0.73
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.52	0.55	0.42	0.66
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.60	0.47	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.51	0.57	0.44	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.36	0.38	0.21	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.60	0.48	0.70
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.55	0.42	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.55	0.42	0.66

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 2 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.73	0.66	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.73	0.66	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.73	0.73	0.66	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.56	0.58	0.49	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.76	0.69	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.72	0.64	0.77
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.69	0.69	0.62	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.69	0.70	0.62	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.71	0.63	0.77
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.46	0.35	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.71	0.64	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.58	0.48	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.71	0.64	0.77
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.73
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.65	0.57	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.69	0.61	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.28	0.28	0.15	0.40
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.64	0.56	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.50	0.50	0.40	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.73
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.47	0.36	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.64	0.55	0.71

	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.56	0.46	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.61	0.52	0.69
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.52	0.52	0.42	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.53	0.42	0.62
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.51	0.51	0.40	0.60
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.36	0.37	0.25	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.51	0.40	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.52	0.41	0.61

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 2 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval		
			Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.70	0.42	0.86
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.73	0.46	0.87
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.73	0.68	0.39	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.56	0.17	-0.24	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.74	0.49	0.87
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.72	0.46	0.87
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.70	0.44	0.86
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.69	0.66	0.36	0.84
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.69	0.63	0.32	0.82
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.58	0.24	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.28	-0.12	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.69	0.41	0.85
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.72	0.46	0.87
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.61	0.30	0.81
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.66	0.35	0.83
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.72	0.45	0.87
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.39	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.28	0.29	-0.11	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.68	0.40	0.84
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.50	0.66	0.36	0.83
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.65	0.35	0.83
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.61	0.29	0.81
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.62	0.60	0.28	0.81
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.61	0.29	0.81
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.08	-0.32	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.63	0.32	0.82

	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.60	0.27	0.80
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.62	0.30	0.81
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.52	0.55	0.20	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.57	0.22	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.51	0.55	0.20	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.36	0.19	-0.22	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.69	0.41	0.85
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.60	0.28	0.80
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.70	0.43	0.86

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 3 Female

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.65	0.55	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.66	0.56	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.66	0.55	0.74
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.57	0.49	0.35	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.72	0.63	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.63	0.51	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.73	0.64	0.80
	STAAR Reading-English	0.64	0.66	0.47	0.80
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.61	0.68	0.54	0.79
	PARCC Reading	0.63	0.75	0.17	0.94
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.60	0.47	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.58	0.46	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.59	0.47	0.69
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.48	0.34	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.70	0.60	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.62	0.51	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.69	0.60	0.77
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.63	0.43	0.77
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.54	0.61	0.45	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.66	0.46	-0.29	0.86
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.74	0.66	0.81
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.74	0.65	0.81
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.75	0.67	0.82
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.47	0.33	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.70	0.60	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.62	0.51	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.67	0.57	0.75

	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.61	0.40	0.76
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.66	0.51	0.77
	PARCC Reading	0.73	0.69	0.05	0.93
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.45	0.30	0.57
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.46	0.32	0.59
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.59
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.41	0.31	0.15	0.45
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.53	0.40	0.64
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.43	0.28	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.56	0.43	0.66
	STAAR Reading-English	0.47	0.46	0.21	0.66
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.43	0.47	0.28	0.63
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.69	0.04	0.93
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.61	0.50	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.64	0.52	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.63	0.52	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.45	0.30	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.72	0.62	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.62	0.51	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.71	0.61	0.78
	STAAR Reading-English	0.59	0.67	0.48	0.80
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.62	0.70	0.57	0.80
	PARCC Reading	0.42	0.81	0.31	0.96

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 3 Male

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.59	0.45	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.59	0.45	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.64	0.51	0.74
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.57	0.66	0.54	0.76
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.63	0.50	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.56	0.41	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.59	0.45	0.70
	STAAR Reading-English	0.64	0.60	0.39	0.76
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.61	0.48	0.23	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.63	0.57	-0.32	0.93
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.57	0.42	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.53	0.38	0.66
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.58	0.44	0.70
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.54	0.38	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.57	0.43	0.69
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.47	0.30	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.54	0.39	0.66
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.66	0.47	0.79
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.54	0.46	0.21	0.65
	PARCC Reading	0.66	0.93	0.59	0.99
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.69	0.57	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.68	0.56	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.68	0.56	0.77
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.43	0.26	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.61	0.48	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.58	0.43	0.69

	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.56	0.41	0.68
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.67	0.48	0.80
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.52	0.28	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.73	0.86	0.31	0.98
Phonemic Awareness					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.46	0.29	0.60
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.45	0.28	0.59
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.50	0.34	0.64
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.41	0.54	0.39	0.67
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.42	0.25	0.57
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.39	0.22	0.54
APR3-Reading Comprehension					
	STAAR Reading-English	0.47	0.45	0.20	0.65
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.43	0.35	0.08	0.57
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.62	-0.25	0.94
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.48	0.31	0.61
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.49	0.33	0.63
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.52	0.36	0.65
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.46	0.29	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.63	0.50	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.60	0.46	0.71
APR3-Reading Comprehension					
	STAAR Reading-English	0.59	0.51	0.27	0.69
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.62	0.50	0.25	0.68
	PARCC Reading	0.42	0.00	-0.70	0.71

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 3 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.64	0.55	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.64	0.55	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.66	0.57	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.57	0.57	0.48	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.69	0.61	0.75
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.60	0.51	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.68	0.60	0.74
	STAAR Reading-English	0.64	0.63	0.48	0.74
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.61	0.62	0.49	0.72
	PARCC Reading	0.63	0.63	0.20	0.86
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.58	0.49	0.66
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.55	0.45	0.64
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.58	0.48	0.66
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.51	0.40	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.65	0.57	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.64	0.56	0.71
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.67	0.53	0.77
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.54	0.54	0.40	0.66
	PARCC Reading	0.66	0.66	0.25	0.87
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.43	0.31	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.66	0.58	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.60	0.51	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.63	0.54	0.70

	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.67	0.53	0.77
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.62	0.49	0.72
	PARCC Reading	0.73	0.73	0.36	0.90
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.46	0.34	0.56
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.46	0.35	0.56
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.49	0.38	0.59
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.41	0.42	0.30	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.51	0.41	0.60
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.42	0.31	0.52
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.52	0.41	0.61
	STAAR Reading-English	0.47	0.50	0.28	0.58
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.43	0.44	0.41	0.60
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.62	0.17	0.85
Vocabulary	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.58	0.48	0.66
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.60	0.51	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.44	0.33	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.69	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.63	0.54	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.73
	STAAR Reading-English	0.59	0.58	0.42	0.70
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.62	0.63	0.51	0.73
	PARCC Reading	0.42	0.42	-0.08	0.75

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 3 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.70	0.42	0.86
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.73	0.46	0.87
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.68	0.39	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.57	0.17	-0.24	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.74	0.49	0.87
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.72	0.46	0.87
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.70	0.44	0.86
	STAAR Reading-English	0.64	0.70	0.51	0.89
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.61	0.40	-0.07	0.87
	PARCC Reading	0.63	NA	NA	NA
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.66	0.36	0.84
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.63	0.32	0.82
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.58	0.24	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.28	-0.12	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.79	0.58	0.90
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.72	0.46	0.87
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.61	0.30	0.81
	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.72	0.54	0.90
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.54	0.39	-0.08	0.86
	PARCC Reading	0.66	NA	NA	NA
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.66	0.35	0.83
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.72	0.45	0.87
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.68	0.39	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.29	-0.11	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.68	0.40	0.84
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.66	0.36	0.83
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.65	0.35	0.83

	STAAR Reading-English	0.66	0.64	0.41	0.86
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.24	-0.31	0.79
	PARCC Reading	0.73	NA	NA	NA
Phonemic Awareness	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.61	0.29	0.81
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.60	0.28	0.81
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.61	0.29	0.81
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.41	0.08	-0.32	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.63	0.32	0.82
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.60	0.27	0.80
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.62	0.30	0.81
	STAAR Reading-English	0.47	0.22	-0.17	0.60
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.43	0.02	-0.58	0.62
	PARCC Reading	0.62	NA	NA	NA
Vocabulary	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.55	0.20	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.57	0.22	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.55	0.20	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.19	-0.22	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.69	0.41	0.85
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.60	0.28	0.80
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.70	0.43	0.86
	STAAR Reading-English	0.59	0.49	0.19	0.79
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.62	0.29	-0.24	0.82
	PARCC Reading	0.42	NA	NA	NA

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 4 Female

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.71	0.60	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.66	0.55	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.70	0.59	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.45	0.29	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.76	0.76	0.67	0.83
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.70	0.68	0.57	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.73	0.64	0.81
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.56	0.37	0.71
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.65	0.71	0.51	0.83
	PARCC Reading	0.47	0.42	-0.49	0.89
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.62	0.50	0.72
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.59	0.45	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.55	0.59	0.46	0.70
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.30	0.13	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.80	0.73	0.86
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.67	0.56	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.74	0.80	0.73	0.86
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.65	0.49	0.77
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.57	0.62	0.39	0.78
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.62	-0.26	0.94
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.72	0.62	0.80
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.71	0.61	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.68	0.56	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.38	0.41	0.24	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.69	0.58	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.63	0.50	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.65	0.54	0.75

	STAAR Reading-English	0.51	0.47	0.25	0.64
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.49	0.58	0.34	0.75
	PARCC Reading	0.30	0.19	-0.66	0.83
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.51	0.52	0.38	0.64
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.51	0.36	0.63
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.50	0.35	0.62
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.27	0.26	0.08	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.72	0.62	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.65	0.53	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.69	0.58	0.77
	STAAR Reading-English	0.63	0.62	0.45	0.75
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.67	0.63	0.41	0.78
	PARCC Reading	0.09	-0.17	-0.82	0.67

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 4 Male

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.69	0.57	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.62	0.48	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.66	0.54	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.46	0.29	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.76	0.73	0.63	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.70	0.70	0.58	0.79
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.68	0.56	0.77
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.65	0.47	0.77
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.65	0.56	0.28	0.75
	PARCC Reading	0.47	0.26	-0.61	0.85
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.48	0.32	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.51	0.35	0.64
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.55	0.46	0.29	0.60
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.32	0.13	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.66	0.53	0.75
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.53	0.38	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.74	0.65	0.52	0.75
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.55	0.35	0.70
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.57	0.47	0.17	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.00	-0.81	0.81
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.49	0.32	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.57	0.43	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.56	0.41	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.38	0.35	0.16	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.59	0.45	0.70
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.46	0.30	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.59	0.44	0.70

	STAAR Reading-English	0.51	0.56	0.36	0.71
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.49	0.34	0.01	0.61
	PARCC Reading	0.30	0.31	-0.58	0.86
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.51	0.49	0.33	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.40	0.22	0.55
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.44	0.27	0.58
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.27	0.27	0.08	0.44
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.68	0.56	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.71	0.60	0.79
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.59	0.45	0.71
	STAAR Reading-English	0.63	0.65	0.47	0.77
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.67	0.72	0.51	0.85
	PARCC Reading	0.09	0.77	0.03	0.96

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 4 Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.69	0.61	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.63	0.54	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.67	0.59	0.74
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.43	0.31	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.76	0.75	0.68	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.70	0.70	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.70	0.63	0.77
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.59	0.46	0.70
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.65	0.64	0.48	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.47	0.47	-0.08	0.80
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.55	0.44	0.64
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.53	0.42	0.62
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.55	0.53	0.42	0.62
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.30	0.17	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.73	0.66	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.74	0.72	0.64	0.78
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.58	0.45	0.69
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.57	0.55	0.37	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.56	0.01	0.85
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.60	0.50	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.65	0.56	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.38	0.37	0.24	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.64	0.55	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.55	0.45	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.62	0.53	0.70

	STAAR Reading-English	0.51	0.50	0.35	0.63
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.49	0.51	0.32	0.66
	PARCC Reading	0.30	0.30	-0.27	0.72
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.51	0.49	0.38	0.59
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.44	0.32	0.54
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.44	0.33	0.55
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.27	0.24	0.11	0.37
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.70	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.69	0.61	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.64	0.55	0.71
	STAAR Reading-English	0.63	0.63	0.51	0.73
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.67	0.70	0.56	0.80
	PARCC Reading	0.09	0.09	-0.46	0.59

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 4 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.82	0.51	0.94
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.80	0.47	0.93
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.83	0.53	0.94
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.59	0.09	0.85
	APR3-Composite	0.76	0.90	0.70	0.97
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.70	0.80	0.47	0.93
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.89	0.69	0.97
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.64	0.35	0.93
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.65	0.62	0.48	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.47	NA	NA	NA
Reading Comprehension	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.78	0.43	0.93
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.76	0.38	0.92
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.55	0.74	0.35	0.91
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.45	-0.11	0.79
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.88	0.66	0.96
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.77	0.41	0.92
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.74	0.91	0.75	0.97
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.60	0.27	0.92
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.57	0.53	0.37	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.56	NA	NA	NA
Reading Fluency	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.90	0.72	0.97
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.65	0.82	0.52	0.94
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.85	0.58	0.95
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.38	0.67	0.21	0.88
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.84	0.56	0.95
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.70	0.27	0.90
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.82	0.52	0.94

	STAAR Reading-English	0.51	0.57	0.22	0.91
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.49	0.49	0.32	0.66
	PARCC Reading	0.30	NA	NA	NA
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.51	0.72	0.33	0.90
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.46	0.70	0.30	0.89
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.76	0.40	0.91
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.27	0.52	0.01	0.81
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.79	0.47	0.93
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.73	0.34	0.90
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.76	0.41	0.92
	STAAR Reading-English	0.63	0.60	0.28	0.91
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.67	0.68	0.56	0.80
	PARCC Reading	0.09	NA	NA	NA

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 5 Female

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.71	0.54	0.82
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.74	0.78	0.64	0.87
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.75	0.61	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.48	0.56	0.34	0.72
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.68	0.50	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.62	0.42	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.62	0.42	0.76
	STAAR Reading-English	0.53	0.51	0.07	0.78
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.55	0.62	0.30	0.81
	PARCC Reading	0.55	0.68	0.03	0.93
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.58	0.59	0.38	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.60	0.40	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.61	0.41	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.42	0.18	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.69	0.51	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.53	0.31	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.68	0.50	0.80
	STAAR Reading-English	0.74	0.77	0.49	0.91
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.59	0.69	0.41	0.85
	PARCC Reading	0.43	0.27	-0.48	0.79
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55	0.39	0.14	0.60
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.45	0.20	0.64
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.53	0.37	0.12	0.58
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.30	0.03	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.51	0.50	0.27	0.68
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.39	0.32	0.06	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.54	0.31	0.70

	STAAR Reading-English	0.43	0.28	-0.20	0.65
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.52	0.58	0.24	0.79
	PARCC Reading	0.18	-0.08	-0.75	0.66
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.65	0.65	0.47	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.67	0.49	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.68	0.51	0.80
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.37	0.45	0.22	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.73	0.58	0.83
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.69	0.53	0.81
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.66	0.48	0.78
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.64	0.29	0.84
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.66	0.38	0.83
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.82	0.34	0.96

Concurrent-related evidence for validity (EOY) Grade 5 Male

ISIP Español	Concurrent Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.71	0.54	0.82
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.74	0.70	0.53	0.82
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.67	0.49	0.80
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.48	0.47	0.23	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.68	0.50	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.60	0.59	0.38	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.67	0.48	0.80
	STAAR Reading-English	0.53	0.51	0.06	0.79
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.55	0.57	0.25	0.77
	PARCC Reading	0.55	0.45	-0.57	0.92
Reading Comprehension					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.58	0.57	0.35	0.73
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.54	0.32	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.53	0.30	0.70
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.39	0.13	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.62	0.43	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.43	0.18	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.63	0.43	0.77
	STAAR Reading-English	0.74	0.70	0.35	0.88
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.59	0.51	0.18	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.43	0.68	-0.29	0.96
Reading Fluency					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55	0.67	0.49	0.80
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.66	0.47	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.53	0.64	0.45	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.39	0.13	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.51	0.52	0.29	0.69
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.39	0.44	0.20	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.53	0.30	0.70

	STAAR Reading-English	0.43	0.54	0.10	0.80
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.52	0.47	0.13	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.18	0.53	-0.49	0.94
Vocabulary					
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.65	0.65	0.46	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.62	0.43	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.63	0.60	0.40	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.37	0.39	0.14	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.66	0.48	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.70	0.53	0.81
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.60	0.39	0.74
	STAAR Reading-English	0.60	0.55	0.14	0.80
	STAAR Reading-Spanish	0.60	0.56	0.25	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.62	0.43	-0.59	0.92

Appendix C:

Predictive Correlation Coefficients for Overall/Composite Scales Scores and All Subtest Scores

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to MOY ISIP/Fast Bridge K

BOY ISIP Español	MOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP Overall	0.43	0.31	0.54
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.26	0.13	0.39
	ISIP Listening Comprehension	0.29	0.16	0.41
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.36	0.23	0.48
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.29	0.16	0.41
	FB Composite	0.32	0.18	0.44
	FB Word Segmenting	0.22	0.08	0.35
	FB Letter Sounds	0.21	0.07	0.34
	FB Onset Sounds	0.29	0.16	0.41
	FB Syllable Reading	0.30	0.17	0.43
Reading Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.20	0.06	0.33
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.07	-0.07	0.21
	ISIP Listening Comprehension	0.02	-0.12	0.15
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.13	-0.01	0.27
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.15	0.01	0.28
	FB Composite	0.21	0.07	0.34
	FB Word Segmenting	0.15	0.01	0.28
	FB Letter Sounds	0.06	-0.08	0.20
	FB Onset Sounds	0.20	0.06	0.33
	FB Syllable Reading	0.22	0.08	0.35
Listening Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.32	0.19	0.44
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.17	0.03	0.30
	ISIP Listening Comprehension	0.53	0.42	0.62
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.27	0.14	0.40
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.25	0.12	0.38
	FB Composite	0.29	0.15	0.41
	FB Word Segmenting	0.30	0.17	0.42

	FB Letter Sounds	0.18	0.04	0.31
	FB Onset Sounds	0.26	0.12	0.39
	FB Syllable Reading	0.24	0.10	0.36
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP Overall	0.37	0.24	0.48
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.23	0.09	0.36
	ISIP Listening Comprehension	0.27	0.13	0.39
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.35	0.23	0.47
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.23	0.09	0.35
	FB Composite	0.32	0.19	0.44
	FB Word Segmenting	0.19	0.05	0.33
	FB Letter Sounds	0.24	0.10	0.37
	FB Onset Sounds	0.24	0.11	0.37
	FB Syllable Reading	0.32	0.19	0.44
Vocabulary				
	ISIP Overall	0.25	0.11	0.37
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.18	0.05	0.32
	ISIP Listening Comprehension	0.24	0.10	0.37
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.19	0.05	0.32
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.21	0.07	0.34
	FB Composite	0.10	-0.04	0.24
	FB Word Segmenting	0.09	-0.05	0.23
	FB Letter Sounds	0.09	-0.05	0.23
	FB Onset Sounds	0.15	0.01	0.29
	FB Syllable Reading	0.09	-0.05	0.23

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to MOY ISIP/Fast Bridge Grade 1

BOY ISIP Español	MOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP Overall	0.81	0.74	0.86
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.67	0.81
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.73	0.65	0.80
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.60	0.49	0.70
	FB Composite	0.68	0.58	0.76
	FB Word Segmenting	0.30	0.15	0.44
	FB Sight Words	0.70	0.61	0.77
	FB Syllable Reading	0.54	0.42	0.65
	FB CBM WRC	0.72	0.63	0.79
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.38	0.24	0.51
Reading Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.63	0.52	0.72
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.47	0.68
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.41	0.64
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.51	0.38	0.62
	FB Composite	0.63	0.52	0.71
	FB Word Segmenting	0.33	0.18	0.46
	FB Sight Words	0.63	0.52	0.71
	FB Syllable Reading	0.49	0.36	0.60
	FB CBM WRC	0.63	0.52	0.72
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.37	0.22	0.50
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP Overall	0.78	0.71	0.84
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.64	0.79
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.72	0.63	0.79
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.58	0.47	0.68
	FB Composite	0.58	0.47	0.68
	FB Word Segmenting	0.26	0.11	0.41
	FB Sight Words	0.62	0.52	0.71

	FB Syllable Reading	0.48	0.35	0.60
	FB CBM WRC	0.62	0.52	0.71
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.25	0.52
Vocabulary				
	ISIP Overall	0.60	0.49	0.69
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.48	0.69
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.42	0.64
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.46	0.32	0.57
	FB Composite	0.49	0.36	0.61
	FB Word Segmenting	0.21	0.05	0.35
	FB Sight Words	0.51	0.38	0.62
	FB Syllable Reading	0.37	0.22	0.50
	FB CBM WRC	0.54	0.42	0.65
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.10	0.40

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to MOY ISIP/Fast Bridge Grade 2

BOY ISIP Español	MOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP Overall	0.81	0.76	0.85
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.73	0.66	0.78
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.69	0.62	0.75
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.66	0.59	0.73
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.75	0.69	0.80
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.75	0.69	0.80
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.73	0.67	0.79
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.29	0.50
Reading Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.72	0.66	0.78
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.74	0.68	0.80
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.50	0.67
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.61	0.52	0.68
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.51	0.41	0.60
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.65	0.77
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.72	0.65	0.77
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.63	0.76
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.30	0.18	0.41
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP Overall	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.46	0.63
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.46	0.35	0.55
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.42	0.31	0.52
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.54	0.45	0.63
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.55	0.46	0.63
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.54	0.44	0.62
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.43	0.32	0.52

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP Overall	0.55	0.45	0.63
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.39	0.58
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.44	0.33	0.53
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.58	0.49	0.66
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.46	0.35	0.55
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.55	0.70
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.54	0.70
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.24	0.12	0.36
Vocabulary				
	ISIP Overall	0.42	0.31	0.52
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.18	0.41
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.33	0.21	0.44
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.40	0.29	0.50
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.44	0.34	0.54
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.37	0.25	0.47
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.37	0.26	0.48
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.35	0.24	0.46
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.14	0.01	0.26

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to MOY ISIP/Fast Bridge Grade 3

BOY ISIP Español	MOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP Overall	0.85	0.81	0.88
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.65	0.77
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.67	0.59	0.74
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.64	0.56	0.71
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.65	0.57	0.72
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.55	0.71
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.57	0.72
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.50	0.40	0.59
Reading Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.72	0.65	0.77
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.78	0.72	0.82
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.57	0.47	0.65
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.60	0.51	0.68
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.53	0.43	0.62
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.49	0.66
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.67
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.47	0.36	0.56
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP Overall	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.39	0.58
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.62	0.53	0.69
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.43	0.32	0.53
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.48	0.38	0.58
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.34	0.54
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.33	0.54
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.39	0.58
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.36	0.25	0.47

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP Overall	0.55	0.45	0.63
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.51	0.41	0.60
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.43	0.32	0.53
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.64	0.55	0.71
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.44	0.33	0.54
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.55	0.70
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.64	0.55	0.71
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.40	0.29	0.50
Vocabulary				
	ISIP Overall	0.67	0.59	0.74
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.36	0.56
	ISIP Phonemic Awareness	0.47	0.37	0.57
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.48	0.37	0.57
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.47	0.36	0.56
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.33	0.54
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.42	0.31	0.52
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.23	0.45

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to MOY ISIP/Fast Bridge Grade 4

BOY ISIP Español	MOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP Overall	0.81	0.74	0.86
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.56	0.75
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.51	0.38	0.63
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.69	0.59	0.76
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.59	0.76
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.69	0.60	0.76
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.59	0.76
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.45	0.32	0.56
Reading Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.67	0.57	0.75
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.58	0.76
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.44	0.30	0.56
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.61	0.50	0.70
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.58	0.46	0.67
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.58	0.47	0.67
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.47	0.67
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.28	0.13	0.41
Reading Fluency	ISIP Overall	0.67	0.56	0.75
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.55	0.74
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.58	0.45	0.68
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.46	0.32	.058
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.58	0.75
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.56	0.74
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.59	0.75
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.39	0.25	0.51
Vocabulary	ISIP Overall	0.61	0.50	0.70
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.41	0.64

ISIP Reading Fluency	0.37	0.22	0.50
ISIP Vocabulary	0.77	0.69	0.82
FB Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.38	0.60
FB Passage 2 WRC	0.48	0.36	0.59
FB Passage 3 WRC	0.46	0.34	0.57
FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.33	0.19	0.46

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to MOY ISIP/Fast Bridge Grade 5

BOY ISIP Español	MOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP Overall	0.78	0.66	0.86
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.44	0.75
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.41	0.18	0.59
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.69	0.53	0.80
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.41	0.73
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.68	0.52	0.79
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.67	0.51	0.79
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.46	0.24	0.63
Reading Comprehension	ISIP Overall	0.73	0.59	0.82
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.54	0.80
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.37	0.14	0.56
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.59	0.41	0.73
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.51	0.31	0.67
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.39	0.72
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.55	0.36	0.70
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.12	0.55
Reading Fluency	ISIP Overall	0.50	0.29	0.66
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.34	0.11	0.54
	ISIP Reading Fluency	0.59	0.40	0.73
	ISIP Vocabulary	0.33	0.10	0.53
	FB Passage 1 WRC	0.49	0.28	0.66
	FB Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.36	0.70
	FB Passage 3 WRC	0.54	0.35	0.70
	FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.34	0.11	0.54
Vocabulary	ISIP Overall	0.72	0.58	0.82
	ISIP Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.42	0.73

ISIP Reading Fluency	0.23	-0.00	0.45
ISIP Vocabulary	0.74	0.61	0.83
FB Passage 1 WRC	0.42	0.20	0.60
FB Passage 2 WRC	0.48	0.27	0.64
FB Passage 3 WRC	0.46	0.26	0.63
FB CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.03	0.47

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment K

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.37	0.25	0.49
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.22	0.09	0.35
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.25	0.11	0.37
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.38	0.26	0.49
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.11	0.37
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.09	0.36
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	-0.02	0.26
	FB-Sight Words	0.26	0.13	0.39
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.12	0.39
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.07	-0.07	0.21
	APR3-Composite	0.24	0.10	0.36
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.17	0.03	0.30
	APR3-Word Reading	0.21	0.08	0.34
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.21	0.07	0.34
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.04	0.31
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.09	-0.05	0.23
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.01	-0.13	0.14
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.15	0.01	0.28
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.12	-0.02	0.26
	FB-Composite	0.14	0.00	0.28
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.01	-0.14	0.15
	FB-Sight Words	0.15	0.01	0.29
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.19	0.05	0.32
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.08	-0.06	0.22
	APR3-Composite	0.09	-0.05	0.23
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.00	-0.14	0.14
	APR3-Word Reading	0.07	-0.07	0.21
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.03	0.30
Listening Comprehension				

	ISIP-Overall	0.38	0.25	0.49
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.17	0.42
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.43	0.31	0.53
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.36	0.23	0.47
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.27	0.14	0.39
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.09	0.35
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.22	0.08	0.35
	FB-Sight Words	0.18	0.04	0.32
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.21	0.08	0.34
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.22	0.08	0.35
	APR3-Composite	0.37	0.25	0.49
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.34	0.21	0.46
	APR3-Word Reading	0.29	0.15	0.41
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.35	0.22	0.47
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.35	0.22	0.46
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.23	0.09	0.36
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.24	0.10	0.36
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.39	0.26	0.50
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.20	0.06	0.33
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.09	0.36
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	-0.02	0.26
	FB-Sight Words	0.27	0.13	0.39
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.25	0.11	0.38
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.06	-0.08	0.20
	APR3-Composite	0.22	0.08	0.35
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.18	0.05	0.32
	APR3-Word Reading	0.19	0.05	0.32
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.03	0.31
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.04	0.31
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.11	-0.03	0.25
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.22	0.08	0.34
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.17	0.04	0.31
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.15	0.01	0.28

FB-Composite	0.07	-0.07	0.21
FB-Letter Sounds	0.08	-0.06	0.22
FB-Sight Words	0.10	-0.04	0.24
FB-Syllable Reading	0.08	-0.06	0.22
FB-Word Segmenting	-0.01	-0.15	0.13
APR3-Composite	0.12	-0.02	0.26
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.07	-0.07	0.21
APR3-Word Reading	0.11	-0.03	0.24
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.09	-0.05	0.23

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.61	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.52	0.72
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.62	0.51	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.35	0.60
	FB-Composite	0.64	0.53	0.73
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.53	0.72
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.47	0.34	0.59
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.18	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.67	0.57	0.75
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.20	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.43	0.65
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.32	0.57
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.29	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.46	0.67
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.43	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.33	0.58
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.36	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.31	0.56
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.47	0.68
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.46	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.42	0.28	0.55
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.15	0.45
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.47	0.69
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.16	0.45
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.36	0.60
	APR3-Word Reading	0.40	0.26	0.53
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.25	0.52
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.34	0.59
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.58	0.75

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.49	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.60	0.48	0.69
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.29	0.55
	FB-Composite	0.57	0.45	0.67
	FB-Sight Words	0.59	0.47	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.33	0.58
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.19	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.58	0.46	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.34	0.19	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.57	0.45	0.67
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.38	0.62
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.44	0.30	0.56
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.45	0.67
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.41	0.64
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.35	0.60
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.48	0.35	0.59
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.22	0.49
	FB-Composite	0.49	0.36	0.60
	FB-Sight Words	0.45	0.32	0.57
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.34	0.19	0.48
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.37	0.22	0.50
	FB-CBM WRC	0.51	0.38	0.62
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.10	0.40
	APR3-Composite	0.39	0.24	0.51
	APR3-Word Reading	0.31	0.16	0.45
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.25	0.09	0.39
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.30	0.56

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.77	0.71	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.60	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.52	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.67	0.59	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.67	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.31	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.64	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.53	0.69
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.61	0.75
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.57	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.56	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.52	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.53	0.43	0.62
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.41	0.59
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.60	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.16	0.40
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.59	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.47	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.58	0.72
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.60	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.45	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.33	0.53
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.58	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.35	0.55

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.53	0.44	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.43	0.62
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.42	0.61
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.34	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.42	0.60
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.46	0.35	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.38	0.57
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.44	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.39	0.58
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.49	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.34	0.55
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.35	0.55
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.55	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.52	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.10	0.34
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.45	0.63
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.36	0.56
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.43	0.62
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.42	0.31	0.52
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.31	0.19	0.42
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.28	0.16	0.39
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.33	0.21	0.44
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.38	0.57
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.35	0.23	0.45
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.33	0.21	0.44
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.31	0.19	0.42
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.20	0.07	0.32
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.29	0.50
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.36	0.25	0.47
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.37	0.26	0.48

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.73	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.59	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.56	0.71
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.63	0.55	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.72	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.64	0.55	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.54	0.70
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.49	0.38	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.65	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.59	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.60	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.46	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.61	0.49	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.39	0.91
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.61	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.62	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.59	0.49	0.67
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.46	0.64
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.55	0.45	0.63
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.46	0.35	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.56	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.46	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.53	0.69
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.43	0.71
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.38	0.63
	PARCC Reading	0.76	0.42	0.91

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.43	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.37	0.57
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.57	0.48	0.65
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.46	0.35	0.55
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.36	0.56
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.69
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.29	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.38	0.58
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.43	0.32	0.53
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.39	0.59
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.27	0.61
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.24	0.54
	PARCC Reading	0.77	0.44	0.92
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.53	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.37	0.57
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.33	0.54
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.46	0.64
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.54	0.44	0.62
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.34	0.54
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.45	0.33	0.54
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.45	0.34	0.55
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.24	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.48	0.37	0.57
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.45	0.34	0.54
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.33	0.54
	STAAR English Reading	0.43	0.24	0.58
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.24	0.54
	PARCC Reading	0.41	-0.10	0.75
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.51	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.35	0.55

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.41	0.60
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.34	0.54
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.58	0.73
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.43	0.31	0.53
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.40	0.28	0.50
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.42	0.30	0.52
FB-Median Accuracy	0.31	0.19	0.42
APR3-Composite	0.59	0.50	0.67
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.47	0.65
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.46	0.63
STAAR English Reading	0.38	0.19	0.55
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.43	0.67
PARCC Reading	0.26	-0.27	0.67

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.78	0.70	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.41	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.43	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.56	0.75
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.58	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.58	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.60	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.22	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.59	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.56	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.52	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.42	0.72
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.38	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.45	-0.14	0.80
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.54	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.50	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.37	0.62
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.50	0.70
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.48	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.48	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.45	0.66
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.12	0.40
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.60	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.51	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.56	0.73
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.44	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.53	0.35	0.68
	PARCC Reading	0.39	-0.18	0.76
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.64	0.53	0.73

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.45	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.49	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.34	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.57	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.58	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.58	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.22	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.46	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.39	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.43	0.64
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.24	0.61
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.38	0.17	0.56
	PARCC Reading	-0.08	-0.60	0.49
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.57	0.45	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.30	0.56
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.31	0.56
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.76	0.69	0.82
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.38	0.60
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.47	0.35	0.58
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.35	0.58
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.09	0.37
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.53	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.59	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.43	0.64
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.42	0.71
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.39	0.70
	PARCC Reading	-0.19	-0.67	0.40

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.82	0.70	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.46	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49	0.25	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.64	0.44	0.77
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.44	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.45	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.64	0.47	0.77
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.41	0.18	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.32	0.68
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.18	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.29	0.67
	STAAR English Reading	-0.13	-0.91	0.85
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.30	0.72
	PARCC Reading	0.43	-0.14	0.78
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.54	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.51	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47	0.23	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.28	0.68
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.37	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.42	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59	0.40	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.10	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.46	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.44	0.23	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.47	0.76
	STAAR English Reading	0.15	-0.75	0.86
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.45	0.18	0.66
	PARCC Reading	0.57	0.08	0.84
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.33	0.71

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.39	0.14	0.60
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.40	0.13	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.32	0.06	0.54
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.29	0.66
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.30	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.28	0.66
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.30	0.06	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.08	0.52
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.19	-0.06	0.41
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.26	0.02	0.48
	STAAR English Reading	-0.04	-0.89	0.87
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.28	-0.01	0.53
	PARCC Reading	0.32	-0.23	0.72
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.59	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.30	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.21	0.64
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.71	0.89
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.49	0.29	0.65
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.42	0.20	0.60
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.46	0.25	0.63
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.03	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.35	0.69
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.33	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.36	0.70
	STAAR English Reading	0.27	-0.53	0.82
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.27	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.26	-0.31	0.70

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Kindergarten

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.63	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.36	0.57
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.33	0.20	0.44
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.31	0.54
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.51	0.69
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.40	0.28	0.51
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.48	0.67
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.51	0.40	0.61
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.28	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.61	0.51	0.69
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.48	0.36	0.58
	APR3-Word Reading	0.55	0.44	0.64
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.42	0.62
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.48	0.36	0.58
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.17	0.42
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.09	0.35
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.40	0.27	0.50
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.26	0.13	0.38
	FB-Composite	0.40	0.27	0.51
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.27	0.13	0.39
	FB-Sight Words	0.37	0.25	0.49
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.31	0.18	0.43
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.17	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.28	0.51
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.31	0.18	0.43
	APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.29	0.52
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.18	0.43
Listening Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.29	0.16	0.41

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.19	0.05	0.32
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.54	0.43	0.63
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.37	0.24	0.48
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.11	0.37
	FB-Composite	0.26	0.13	0.39
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.23	0.09	0.36
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.06	0.33
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.12	0.38
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.26	0.12	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.19	0.44
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.29	0.15	0.41
	APR3-Word Reading	0.25	0.12	0.38
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.29	0.16	0.41
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.59	0.49	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.32	0.54
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.31	0.18	0.43
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.57	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.24	0.48
	FB-Composite	0.58	0.48	0.67
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.43	0.31	0.54
	FB-Sight Words	0.55	0.44	0.64
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.50	0.39	0.60
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.28	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.45	0.64
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.43	0.31	0.54
	APR3-Word Reading	0.48	0.37	0.58
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.51	0.40	0.60
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.56	0.46	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.38	0.26	0.49
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.10	0.36
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.51	0.40	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.23	0.47
	FB-Composite	0.47	0.35	0.57

FB-Letter Sounds	0.26	0.13	0.39
FB-Sight Words	0.47	0.36	0.58
FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.27	0.51
FB-Word Segmenting	0.29	0.16	0.42
APR3-Composite	0.47	0.36	0.57
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.39	0.27	0.50
APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.29	0.53
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.42	0.30	0.53

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.85	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.68	0.81
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.70	0.83
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.63	0.53	0.72
	FB-Composite	0.78	0.70	0.83
	FB-Sight Words	0.76	0.69	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.64	0.53	0.73
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.29	0.55
	FB-CBM WRC	0.78	0.71	0.84
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.53	0.41	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.67	0.81
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.57	0.75
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.62	0.51	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.73	0.64	0.79
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.60	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.54	0.73
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.48	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.49	0.36	0.60
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.48	0.69
	FB-Sight Words	0.61	0.50	0.70
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.26	0.53
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.32	0.17	0.46
	FB-CBM WRC	0.64	0.54	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.30	0.14	0.44
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.40	0.63
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.32	0.57
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.25	0.52
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.42	0.65
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.83	0.78	0.87

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.59	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.70	0.83
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.58	0.46	0.67
	FB-Composite	0.71	0.61	0.78
	FB-Sight Words	0.66	0.56	0.74
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.62	0.52	0.71
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.39	0.25	0.52
	FB-CBM WRC	0.70	0.61	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.39	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.64	0.79
	APR3-Word Reading	0.64	0.54	0.73
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.60	0.49	0.69
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.59	0.76
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.61	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.47	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.57	0.45	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.60	0.49	0.69
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.49	0.70
	FB-Sight Words	0.57	0.45	0.67
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.44	0.30	0.56
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.19	0.48
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.47	0.68
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.20	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.46	0.67
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.38	0.62
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.40	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.40	0.63

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.86	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.69	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.53	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.74	0.68	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.69	0.62	0.75
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.67	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.66	0.78
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.50	0.40	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.67	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.57	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.63	0.76
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.73	0.67	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.80	0.75	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.49	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.50	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.38	0.57
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.59	0.73
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.68	0.60	0.74
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.66	0.59	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.24	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.50	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.61	0.74
Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.63	0.55	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.48	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.52	0.43	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.41	0.60

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.61	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.62	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.61	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.17	0.41
	APR3-Composite	0.62	0.54	0.69
Phonemic Awareness	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.51	0.41	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.53	0.68
	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.67	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.48	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.50	0.40	0.59
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.73	0.67	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.41	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.53	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.52	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.52	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.29	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.50	0.67
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.39	0.58
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.49	0.65
	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.61	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.39	0.58
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.34	0.54
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.47	0.37	0.57
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.75	0.69	0.80
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.48	0.37	0.57
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.41	0.60
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.38	0.58
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.21	0.44
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.46	0.63
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.38	0.58
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.51	0.41	0.60

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.86	0.82	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.66	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.55	0.71
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.69	0.62	0.75
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.78	0.72	0.82
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.60	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.58	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.67	0.60	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.55	0.46	0.63
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.60	0.74
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.54	0.69
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.56	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.49	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.44	0.68
	PARCC Reading	0.59	0.05	0.86
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.61	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.79	0.74	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.49	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.45	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.41	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.55	0.70
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.52	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.52	0.42	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.51	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.43	0.61
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.49	0.66
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.40	0.67
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.44	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.75	0.33	0.92

Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.57	0.72
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.55	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.72	0.65	0.77
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.39	0.58
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.57	0.48	0.65
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.63	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.63	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.34	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.57	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.48	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.56	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.44	0.70
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.59	0.47	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.31	0.92
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.61	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.45	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.48	0.37	0.57
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.58	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.56	0.47	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.39	0.58
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.49	0.38	0.58
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.50	0.40	0.59
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.25	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.39	0.58
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.37	0.56
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.34	0.54
	STAAR English Reading	0.51	0.35	0.64
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.41	0.25	0.54
	PARCC Reading	0.25	-0.35	0.70
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.63	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.39	0.58

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.46	0.64
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.39	0.58
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.77	0.85
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.47	0.64
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.47	0.65
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.47	0.64
FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.26	0.48
APR3-Composite	0.62	0.54	0.69
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.58	0.49	0.66
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.50	0.66
STAAR English Reading	0.48	0.31	0.62
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.47	0.70
PARCC Reading	0.12	-0.44	0.61

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.84	0.79	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.52	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.55	0.45	0.64
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.68	0.59	0.74
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.62	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.56	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.63	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.47	0.36	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.64	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.60	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.57	0.72
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.41	0.66
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.39	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.21	-0.36	0.67
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.59	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.64	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.54	0.44	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.51	0.68
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.47	0.65
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.46	0.64
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.57	0.47	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.32	0.20	0.44
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.67	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.64	0.56	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.63	0.77
	STAAR English Reading	0.53	0.39	0.64
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.44	0.72
	PARCC Reading	0.15	-0.41	0.63
Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.51	0.68

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.43	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.48	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.34	0.56
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.49	0.66
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.25	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.56	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.38	0.58
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.45	0.63
	STAAR English Reading	0.47	0.32	0.59
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.30	0.08	0.48
	PARCC Reading	0.23	-0.34	0.68
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.59	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.43	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.38	0.26	0.49
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.77	0.86
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.39	0.59
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.33	0.54
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.37	0.57
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.24	0.11	0.36
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.58	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.59	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.50	0.67
	STAAR English Reading	0.57	0.44	0.68
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.38	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.16	-0.41	0.63

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.92	0.88	0.94
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.56	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47	0.31	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.80	0.72	0.86
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.56	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.57	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.54	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.27	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.56	0.74
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.50	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.50	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.42	0.75
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.63	0.45	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.41	-0.09	0.75
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.54	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.51	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.43	0.25	0.58
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.70	0.59	0.79
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.48	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.47	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59	0.47	0.69
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.27	0.11	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.58	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.43	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.56	0.75
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.43	0.75
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.68	0.52	0.79
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.11	0.82
Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.49	0.73

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.39	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49	0.32	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.50	0.34	0.63
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55	0.42	0.65
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.44	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.39	0.63
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.27	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.39	0.63
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.42	0.27	0.55
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.36	0.61
	STAAR English Reading	0.35	0.10	0.55
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.37	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.25	-0.26	0.65
	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.70	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.47	0.72
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.46	0.29	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.88	0.83	0.92
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.44	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.54	0.41	0.65
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.54	0.41	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.18	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.53	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.54	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.46	0.68
	STAAR English Reading	0.65	0.47	0.77
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.65	0.49	0.77
	PARCC Reading	0.12	-0.39	0.57

Appendix D:

Predictive Correlation Coefficients for Subgroups

Beginning of Year to End of Year

<i>Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment K Females</i>					
BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.37	0.45	0.28	0.59
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.22	0.20	0.01	0.38
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.25	0.24	0.05	0.42
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.38	0.45	0.28	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.35	0.16	0.51
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.30	0.11	0.47
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	0.19	-0.01	0.37
	FB-Sight Words	0.26	0.36	0.18	0.52
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.34	0.16	0.50
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.07	0.08	-0.12	0.27
	APR3-Composite	0.24	0.34	0.15	0.50
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.17	0.30	0.11	0.47
	APR3-Word Reading	0.21	0.31	0.12	0.48
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.21	0.27	0.08	0.45
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.22	0.03	0.40
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.09	0.12	-0.07	0.31
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.01	-0.01	-0.21	0.18
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.15	0.16	-0.04	0.34
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.12	0.20	0.00	0.38
	FB-Composite	0.14	0.17	-0.02	0.36
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.01	0.03	-0.17	0.22
	FB-Sight Words	0.15	0.18	-0.02	0.37
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.19	0.17	-0.03	0.35
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.08	0.08	-0.11	0.28
	APR3-Composite	0.09	0.06	-0.14	0.25
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.00	-0.03	-0.22	0.17
	APR3-Word Reading	0.07	0.06	-0.13	0.26
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.16	-0.04	0.34

Listening Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.38	0.36	0.18
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.29	0.10
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.43	0.48	0.31
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.36	0.43	0.25
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.27	0.24	0.04
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.31	0.13
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.22	0.30	0.11
	FB-Sight Words	0.18	0.26	0.06
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.21	0.34	0.15
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.22	0.22	0.02
	APR3-Composite	0.37	0.46	0.29
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.34	0.45	0.28
	APR3-Word Reading	0.29	0.40	0.22
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.35	0.35	0.17
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.35	0.36	0.18
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.23	0.13	-0.07
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.24	0.18	-0.01
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.39	0.42	0.24
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.20	0.26	0.07
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.25	0.06
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	0.23	0.03
	FB-Sight Words	0.27	0.30	0.11
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.25	0.28	0.09
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.06	0.03	-0.17
	APR3-Composite	0.22	0.26	0.07
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.18	0.26	0.07
	APR3-Word Reading	0.19	0.21	0.01
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.20	0.00
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.31	0.13
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.11	0.17	-0.02
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.22	0.26	0.07
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.17	0.31	0.12

ISIP-Vocabulary	0.15	0.25	0.06	0.43
FB-Composite	0.07	0.20	0.00	0.38
FB-Letter Sounds	0.08	0.09	-0.11	0.28
FB-Sight Words	0.10	0.25	0.06	0.42
FB-Syllable Reading	0.08	0.26	0.07	0.43
FB-Word Segmenting	-0.01	0.06	-0.14	0.25
APR3-Composite	0.12	0.34	0.16	0.50
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.07	0.32	0.13	0.48
APR3-Word Reading	0.11	0.29	0.10	0.46
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.09	0.24	0.04	0.41

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment K Males

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.37	0.31	0.10	0.49
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.22	0.34	0.13	0.52
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.25	0.32	0.11	0.50
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.38	0.35	0.14	0.52
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.11	-0.10	0.32
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.20	-0.02	0.40
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	0.15	-0.07	0.36
	FB-Sight Words	0.26	0.22	0.00	0.42
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.20	-0.02	0.40
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.07	0.08	-0.14	0.29
	APR3-Composite	0.24	0.10	-0.12	0.31
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.17	0.01	-0.21	0.22
	APR3-Word Reading	0.21	0.07	-0.15	0.28
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.21	0.17	-0.05	0.37
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.11	-0.11	0.32
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.09	0.08	-0.14	0.29
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.01	0.04	-0.17	0.26
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.15	0.13	-0.09	0.34
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.12	0.05	-0.16	0.27
	FB-Composite	0.14	0.13	-0.09	0.34
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.01	0.06	-0.16	0.28
	FB-Sight Words	0.15	0.13	-0.10	0.34
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.19	0.22	0.00	0.42
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.08	0.10	-0.12	0.31
	APR3-Composite	0.09	0.09	-0.13	0.30
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.00	0.01	-0.21	0.23
	APR3-Word Reading	0.07	0.02	-0.20	0.23
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.20	-0.02	0.40
Listening Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.38	0.38	0.18	0.55

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.28	0.07	0.47
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.43	0.39	0.19	0.56
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.36	0.27	0.06	0.46
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.27	0.24	0.03	0.44
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.08	-0.14	0.29
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.22	0.06	-0.16	0.28
	FB-Sight Words	0.18	0.06	-0.16	0.28
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.21	0.03	-0.19	0.25
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.22	0.19	-0.04	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.37	0.28	0.06	0.47
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.34	0.22	0.00	0.42
	APR3-Word Reading	0.29	0.15	-0.07	0.36
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.35	0.31	0.10	0.49
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.35	0.38	0.18	0.55
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.23	0.42	0.22	0.58
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.24	0.32	0.11	0.50
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.39	0.42	0.23	0.59
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.20	0.13	-0.08	0.34
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.25	0.04	0.45
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	0.13	-0.09	0.34
	FB-Sight Words	0.27	0.29	0.07	0.48
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.25	0.24	0.02	0.43
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.06	0.09	-0.13	0.31
	APR3-Composite	0.22	0.18	-0.04	0.38
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.18	0.11	-0.11	0.32
	APR3-Word Reading	0.19	0.14	-0.08	0.35
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.19	-0.03	0.39
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.07	-0.15	0.28
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.11	0.11	-0.11	0.32
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.22	0.26	0.05	0.45
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.17	0.06	-0.15	0.28
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.15	0.06	-0.16	0.27
	FB-Composite	0.07	-0.01	-0.23	0.21

FB-Letter Sounds	0.08	0.09	-0.14	0.30
FB-Sight Words	0.10	0.01	-0.21	0.23
FB-Syllable Reading	0.08	-0.05	-0.27	0.17
FB-Word Segmenting	-0.01	-0.06	-0.27	0.16
APR3-Composite	0.12	-0.10	-0.31	0.12
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.07	-0.19	-0.39	0.03
APR3-Word Reading	0.11	-0.06	-0.27	0.16
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.09	-0.04	-0.25	0.18

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment K Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.37	0.41	0.26	0.54
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.22	0.30	0.14	0.44
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.25	0.25	0.08	0.40
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.38	0.41	0.26	0.54
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.29	0.13	0.44
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.31	0.15	0.45
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	0.24	0.07	0.39
	FB-Sight Words	0.26	0.35	0.19	0.49
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.31	0.15	0.46
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.07	0.08	-0.09	0.25
	APR3-Composite	0.24	0.27	0.11	0.42
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.17	0.23	0.06	0.38
	APR3-Word Reading	0.21	0.23	0.06	0.38
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.21	0.23	0.07	0.39
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.19	0.03	0.35
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.09	0.10	-0.07	0.26
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.01	0.00	-0.17	0.16
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.15	0.15	-0.02	0.31
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.12	0.15	-0.02	0.31
	FB-Composite	0.14	0.17	0.00	0.33
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.01	0.07	-0.10	0.23
	FB-Sight Words	0.15	0.17	0.00	0.33
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.19	0.16	-0.01	0.32
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.08	0.15	-0.02	0.31
	APR3-Composite	0.09	0.13	-0.04	0.29
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.00	0.09	-0.08	0.26
	APR3-Word Reading	0.07	0.07	-0.09	0.24
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.21	0.05	0.37
Listening Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.38	0.44	0.29	0.56

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.34	0.18	0.48
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.43	0.39	0.24	0.52
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.36	0.38	0.23	0.51
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.27	0.27	0.11	0.42
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.22	0.05	0.37
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.22	0.18	0.02	0.34
	FB-Sight Words	0.18	0.21	0.04	0.37
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.21	0.23	0.07	0.39
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.22	0.17	0.01	0.33
	APR3-Composite	0.37	0.37	0.22	0.51
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.34	0.33	0.18	0.48
	APR3-Word Reading	0.29	0.29	0.13	0.44
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.35	0.34	0.18	0.48
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.35	0.36	0.20	0.50
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.23	0.31	0.15	0.45
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.24	0.26	0.10	0.41
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.39	0.41	0.26	0.54
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.20	0.23	0.07	0.39
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.30	0.13	0.44
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	0.23	0.07	0.39
	FB-Sight Words	0.27	0.33	0.17	0.47
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.25	0.28	0.12	0.43
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.06	0.08	-0.09	0.24
	APR3-Composite	0.22	0.22	0.05	0.38
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.18	0.21	0.05	0.37
	APR3-Word Reading	0.19	0.18	0.02	0.34
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.18	0.02	0.34
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.21	0.05	0.37
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.11	0.14	-0.03	0.30
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.22	0.17	0.00	0.33
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.17	0.19	0.02	0.34
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.15	0.18	0.01	0.33
	FB-Composite	0.07	0.10	-0.07	0.26

FB-Letter Sounds	0.08	0.10	-0.07	0.27
FB-Sight Words	0.10	0.16	-0.01	0.32
FB-Syllable Reading	0.08	0.11	-0.06	0.28
FB-Word Segmenting	-0.01	-0.06	-0.23	0.11
APR3-Composite	0.12	0.14	-0.03	0.30
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.07	0.07	-0.10	0.24
APR3-Word Reading	0.11	0.11	-0.06	0.27
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.09	0.07	-0.10	0.24

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment K Not Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.37	0.58	-0.03	0.87
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.22	0.24	-0.42	0.73
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.25	0.05	-0.57	0.63
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.38	0.58	-0.03	0.88
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.22	-0.44	0.72
	FB-Composite	0.23	-0.26	-0.79	0.49
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	-0.08	-0.71	0.61
	FB-Sight Words	0.26	-0.15	-0.74	0.57
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	-0.06	-0.70	0.63
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.07	0.14	-0.58	0.74
	APR3-Composite	0.24	0.37	-0.34	0.81
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.17	0.15	-0.53	0.71
	APR3-Word Reading	0.21	0.34	-0.37	0.80
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.21	0.46	-0.24	0.84
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.59	-0.02	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.09	0.43	-0.23	0.82
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.01	0.00	-0.60	0.60
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.15	0.52	-0.12	0.85
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.12	0.57	-0.04	0.87
	FB-Composite	0.14	0.56	-0.17	0.89
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.01	0.18	-0.55	0.75
	FB-Sight Words	0.15	0.60	-0.11	0.90
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.19	0.65	-0.03	0.92
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.08	-0.08	-0.71	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.09	0.40	-0.30	0.82
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.00	0.24	-0.46	0.75
	APR3-Word Reading	0.07	0.52	-0.17	0.86
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.42	-0.28	0.83
Listening Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.38	0.21	-0.45	0.72

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.20	-0.45	0.71
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.43	-0.40	-0.81	0.26
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.36	0.28	-0.39	0.75
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.27	0.03	-0.58	0.62
	FB-Composite	0.23	0.26	-0.49	0.79
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.22	0.20	-0.54	0.76
	FB-Sight Words	0.18	-0.02	-0.68	0.65
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.21	0.15	-0.57	0.74
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.22	0.28	-0.47	0.80
	APR3-Composite	0.37	0.55	-0.13	0.87
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.34	0.48	-0.22	0.85
	APR3-Word Reading	0.29	0.45	-0.25	0.84
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.35	0.53	-0.15	0.87
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.35	0.60	0.01	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.23	0.16	-0.49	0.69
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.24	0.16	-0.49	0.69
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.39	0.68	0.14	0.91
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.20	0.02	-0.59	0.61
	FB-Composite	0.23	-0.16	-0.74	0.57
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.12	-0.06	-0.70	0.63
	FB-Sight Words	0.27	-0.04	-0.69	0.64
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.25	0.05	-0.64	0.69
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.06	-0.20	-0.76	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.22	0.44	-0.26	0.84
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.18	0.21	-0.48	0.74
	APR3-Word Reading	0.19	0.36	-0.35	0.81
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.17	0.55	-0.12	0.88
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.18	0.34	-0.33	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.11	0.25	-0.41	0.74
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.22	-0.10	-0.66	0.53
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.17	0.25	-0.41	0.74
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.15	0.23	-0.43	0.73
	FB-Composite	0.07	-0.57	-0.90	0.15

FB-Letter Sounds	0.08	-0.17	-0.75	0.56
FB-Sight Words	0.10	-0.52	-0.88	0.23
FB-Syllable Reading	0.08	-0.47	-0.86	0.28
FB-Word Segmenting	-0.01	0.39	-0.37	0.84
APR3-Composite	0.12	0.19	-0.50	0.73
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.07	0.07	-0.58	0.67
APR3-Word Reading	0.11	0.19	-0.50	0.73
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.09	0.24	-0.46	0.76

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Females

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.74	0.62	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.64	0.49	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.62	0.67	0.53	0.78
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.46	0.27	0.62
	FB-Composite	0.64	0.73	0.60	0.82
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.73	0.60	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.47	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.39	0.17	0.57
	FB-CBM WRC	0.67	0.69	0.55	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.43	0.23	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.72	0.59	0.81
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.66	0.51	0.77
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.60	0.44	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.68	0.53	0.78
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.66	0.52	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.54	0.36	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.64	0.49	0.76
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.43	0.24	0.60
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.69	0.55	0.80
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.70	0.56	0.80
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.42	0.55	0.37	0.70
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.39	0.17	0.57
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.68	0.53	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.41	0.20	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.68	0.54	0.79
	APR3-Word Reading	0.40	0.59	0.42	0.72
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.63	0.47	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.61	0.44	0.73
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.67	0.52	0.77

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.56	0.39	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.60	0.59	0.43	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.40	0.19	0.57
	FB-Composite	0.57	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-Sight Words	0.59	0.62	0.45	0.75
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.53	0.34	0.68
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.38	0.17	0.56
	FB-CBM WRC	0.58	0.56	0.38	0.70
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.34	0.37	0.15	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.57	0.66	0.52	0.77
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.60	0.44	0.73
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.44	0.57	0.40	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.62	0.45	0.74
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.55	0.38	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.48	0.29	0.63
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.48	0.48	0.29	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.39	0.19	0.56
	FB-Composite	0.49	0.56	0.38	0.70
	FB-Sight Words	0.45	0.51	0.31	0.66
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.34	0.46	0.26	0.63
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.37	0.46	0.26	0.63
	FB-CBM WRC	0.51	0.50	0.31	0.66
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.36	0.14	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.39	0.50	0.32	0.65
	APR3-Word Reading	0.31	0.50	0.31	0.65
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.25	0.37	0.16	0.54
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.52	0.33	0.66

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Males

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.65	0.49	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.60	0.43	0.73
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.62	0.53	0.35	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.48	0.28	0.64
	FB-Composite	0.64	0.55	0.36	0.69
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.53	0.35	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.47	0.34	0.13	0.53
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.27	0.04	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.67	0.64	0.48	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.25	0.03	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.37	0.15	0.55
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.25	0.02	0.45
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.22	-0.01	0.42
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.47	0.26	0.63
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.46	0.25	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.39	0.18	0.57
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.35	0.13	0.53
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.49	0.29	0.65
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.49	0.29	0.64
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.45	0.25	0.62
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.42	0.30	0.07	0.49
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.24	0.01	0.44
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.51	0.32	0.66
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.22	-0.01	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.25	0.02	0.45
	APR3-Word Reading	0.40	0.19	-0.04	0.40
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.09	-0.14	0.31
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.32	0.10	0.51
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.69	0.54	0.79

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.64	0.48	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.60	0.58	0.40	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.46	0.25	0.62
	FB-Composite	0.57	0.54	0.35	0.68
	FB-Sight Words	0.59	0.54	0.36	0.69
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.42	0.21	0.59
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.27	0.04	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.58	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.34	0.32	0.09	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.57	0.44	0.24	0.61
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.41	0.20	0.58
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.44	0.24	0.02	0.45
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.49	0.30	0.65
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.49	0.30	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.46	0.26	0.63
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.48	0.43	0.23	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.30	0.08	0.50
	FB-Composite	0.49	0.43	0.22	0.60
	FB-Sight Words	0.45	0.40	0.19	0.58
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.34	0.23	0.01	0.44
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.37	0.27	0.04	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.51	0.51	0.32	0.66
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.15	-0.08	0.37
	APR3-Composite	0.39	0.27	0.04	0.47
	APR3-Word Reading	0.31	0.13	-0.10	0.35
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.25	0.11	-0.13	0.33
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.36	0.14	0.54

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.70	0.60	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.63	0.51	0.72
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.62	0.62	0.50	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.59
	FB-Composite	0.64	0.66	0.55	0.74
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.66	0.56	0.75
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.47	0.47	0.32	0.59
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.32	0.16	0.46
	FB-CBM WRC	0.67	0.68	0.58	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.35	0.19	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.55	0.42	0.66
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.45	0.30	0.57
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.42	0.27	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.58	0.46	0.69
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.57	0.44	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.48	0.34	0.60
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.49	0.35	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.45	0.30	0.57
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.60	0.48	0.70
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.60	0.48	0.70
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.42	0.44	0.29	0.57
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.28	0.11	0.43
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.61	0.49	0.71
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.33	0.17	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.50	0.36	0.61
	APR3-Word Reading	0.40	0.40	0.25	0.53
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.39	0.24	0.53
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.49	0.35	0.61
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.71	0.61	0.78

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.62	0.51	0.72
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.60	0.62	0.50	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.45	0.30	0.57
	FB-Composite	0.57	0.60	0.48	0.70
	FB-Sight Words	0.59	0.63	0.52	0.72
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.49	0.34	0.61
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.33	0.17	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.58	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.34	0.37	0.21	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.57	0.59	0.46	0.69
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.52	0.38	0.63
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.44	0.46	0.32	0.58
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.59	0.47	0.69
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.52	0.39	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.59
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.48	0.48	0.34	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.34	0.19	0.48
	FB-Composite	0.49	0.48	0.34	0.60
	FB-Sight Words	0.45	0.45	0.30	0.57
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.34	0.31	0.15	0.46
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.37	0.36	0.21	0.50
	FB-CBM WRC	0.51	0.49	0.35	0.61
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.24	0.07	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.39	0.37	0.22	0.51
	APR3-Word Reading	0.31	0.30	0.14	0.44
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.25	0.24	0.07	0.39
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.43	0.28	0.56

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.68	0.26	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.59	0.11	0.84
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.62	0.62	0.16	0.86
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.51	0.00	0.81
	FB-Composite	0.64	0.43	-0.10	0.77
	FB-Sight Words	0.64	0.26	-0.29	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.47	0.39	-0.16	0.75
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.46	-0.07	0.79
	FB-CBM WRC	0.67	0.47	-0.05	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.22	-0.33	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.60	0.13	0.85
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.49	-0.03	0.80
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.43	0.55	0.05	0.83
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.52	0.01	0.82
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.62	0.16	0.86
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.38	-0.16	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.65	0.20	0.87
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.63	0.17	0.86
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.60	0.12	0.85
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.42	-0.11	0.77
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.42	0.40	-0.15	0.75
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.63	0.18	0.86
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.50	-0.02	0.80
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.31	0.31	-0.24	0.71
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.46	-0.07	0.79
	APR3-Word Reading	0.40	0.48	-0.04	0.80
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.41	-0.13	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.35	-0.20	0.73
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.32	-0.23	0.71

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.60	0.30	-0.25	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.60	0.25	-0.31	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.16	-0.39	0.62
	FB-Composite	0.57	0.16	-0.39	0.62
	FB-Sight Words	0.59	0.01	-0.51	0.52
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.46	0.14	-0.40	0.61
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.40	-0.14	0.76
	FB-CBM WRC	0.58	0.15	-0.39	0.62
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.34	0.02	-0.50	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.57	0.39	-0.15	0.75
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.34	-0.20	0.73
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.44	0.29	-0.26	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.33	-0.22	0.72
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.64	0.19	0.87
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.60	0.12	0.85
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.48	0.42	-0.12	0.77
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.49	-0.02	0.80
	FB-Composite	0.49	0.58	0.10	0.84
	FB-Sight Words	0.45	0.49	-0.02	0.80
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.34	0.59	0.11	0.84
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.37	0.35	-0.20	0.73
	FB-CBM WRC	0.51	0.66	0.22	0.88
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.26	0.32	-0.23	0.71
	APR3-Composite	0.39	0.57	0.09	0.84
	APR3-Word Reading	0.31	0.45	-0.08	0.78
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.25	0.44	-0.10	0.78
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.61	0.15	0.86

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Females

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.77	0.78	0.69	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.71	0.60	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.54	0.40	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.67	0.61	0.48	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.62	0.63	0.50	0.73
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.72	0.61	0.80
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.70	0.58	0.78
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.66	0.54	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.51	0.36	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.68	0.56	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.55	0.40	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.67	0.55	0.76
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.63	0.50	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.63	0.50	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.53	0.38	0.65
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.53	0.47	0.32	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.52	0.37	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.71	0.70	0.60	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.68	0.57	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.63	0.51	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.35	0.17	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.65	0.53	0.75
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.50	0.35	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.67	0.56	0.76
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.44	0.28	0.58
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.44	0.28	0.58
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.55	0.40	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.36	0.18	0.51
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.37	0.19	0.52

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.53	0.57	0.42	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.59	0.45	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.56	0.41	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.24	0.05	0.41
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.50	0.35	0.63
Phonemic Awareness	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.46	0.38	0.21	0.53
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.52	0.37	0.65
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.72	0.62	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.64	0.52	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.40	0.23	0.54
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.63	0.50	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.48	0.32	0.61
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.51	0.36	0.63
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.45	0.29	0.59
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.46	0.30	0.60
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.52	0.37	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.50	0.34	0.62
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.41	0.25	0.56
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.48	0.32	0.61
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.42	0.42	0.26	0.56
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.31	0.25	0.07	0.42
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.28	0.25	0.07	0.42
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.33	0.34	0.16	0.49
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.55	0.40	0.67
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.35	0.34	0.16	0.49
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.33	0.33	0.15	0.48
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.31	0.30	0.12	0.46
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.20	0.19	0.00	0.36
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.37	0.20	0.52
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.36	0.35	0.17	0.50
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.37	0.33	0.15	0.48

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Males

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.77	0.77	0.69	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.66	0.55	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.67	0.57	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.67	0.71	0.62	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.62	0.63	0.51	0.73
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.74	0.65	0.81
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.77	0.68	0.83
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.75	0.66	0.82
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.34	0.17	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.75	0.66	0.82
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.69	0.59	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.70	0.60	0.78
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.68	0.58	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.66	0.55	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.68	0.58	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.53	0.60	0.47	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.55	0.41	0.66
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.71	0.73	0.63	0.80
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.77	0.68	0.83
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.74	0.64	0.81
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.23	0.06	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.70	0.59	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.65	0.54	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.64	0.53	0.74
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.61	0.49	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.54	0.40	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.60	0.47	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.53	0.39	0.64
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.55	0.41	0.66

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.53	0.63	0.51	0.72
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.67	0.56	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.64	0.53	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.23	0.05	0.39
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.60	0.47	0.70
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.46	0.56	0.43	0.67
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.54	0.40	0.65
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.64	0.52	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.47	0.33	0.60
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.48	0.34	0.61
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.69	0.58	0.77
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.44	0.29	0.57
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.56	0.42	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.59	0.46	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.57	0.44	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.39	0.23	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.53	0.39	0.65
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.50	0.35	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.49	0.34	0.61
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.42	0.43	0.28	0.56
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.31	0.39	0.23	0.53
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.28	0.33	0.17	0.48
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.33	0.33	0.17	0.48
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.45	0.29	0.57
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.35	0.36	0.19	0.50
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.33	0.34	0.17	0.49
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.31	0.33	0.16	0.48
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.20	0.21	0.03	0.37
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.43	0.28	0.56
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.36	0.38	0.22	0.52
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.37	0.42	0.26	0.55

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.77	0.77	0.71	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.70	0.62	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.60	0.51	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.67	0.66	0.57	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.62	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.74	0.67	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.74	0.68	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.44	0.33	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.72	0.65	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.63	0.54	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.75
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.65	0.56	0.72
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.69
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.53	0.52	0.41	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.50	0.40	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.71	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.72	0.65	0.78
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.69	0.61	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.29	0.16	0.41
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.67	0.59	0.74
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.65	0.57	0.72
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.55	0.45	0.64
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.53	0.42	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.57	0.47	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.45	0.34	0.56
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.48	0.37	0.57

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.53	0.61	0.51	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.65	0.56	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.62	0.53	0.70
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.23	0.10	0.35
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.46	0.49	0.38	0.58
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.55	0.44	0.63
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.54	0.44	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.42	0.30	0.53
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.66	0.57	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.43	0.32	0.54
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.53	0.43	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.53	0.42	0.62
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.52	0.41	0.61
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.47	0.35	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.50	0.39	0.59
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.44	0.33	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.47	0.35	0.56
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.42	0.42	0.31	0.53
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.31	0.32	0.20	0.44
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.28	0.28	0.15	0.40
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.33	0.31	0.19	0.43
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.49	0.38	0.58
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.35	0.35	0.23	0.46
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.33	0.34	0.21	0.45
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.31	0.31	0.18	0.43
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.20	0.21	0.08	0.34
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.42	0.30	0.52
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.36	0.39	0.27	0.50
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.37	0.38	0.26	0.49

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.77	0.77	0.54	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.50	0.14	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.77	0.54	0.89
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.67	0.70	0.44	0.86
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.62	0.75	0.52	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.73	0.76	0.54	0.89
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.60	0.27	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.71	0.63	0.31	0.82
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.65	0.35	0.83
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.68	0.40	0.85
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.58	0.25	0.79
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.73	0.47	0.87
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.68	0.40	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.51	0.16	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.63	0.33	0.82
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.53	0.71	0.45	0.86
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.66	0.36	0.83
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.71	0.56	0.22	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.71	0.58	0.24	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.62	0.29	0.81
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.20	-0.21	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.67	0.70	0.43	0.86
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.60	0.28	0.80
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.73	0.49	0.87
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.39	0.00	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.22	-0.19	0.56
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.66	0.36	0.83
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.40	0.01	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.35	-0.04	0.65

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.53	0.48	0.10	0.73
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.53	0.46	0.07	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.48	0.11	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.24	-0.17	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.48	0.11	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.46	0.46	0.09	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.44	0.06	0.71
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.76	0.54	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.54	0.20	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.62	0.31	0.81
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.67	0.38	0.84
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.45	0.70	0.43	0.86
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.57	0.22	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.58	0.23	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.57	0.22	0.79
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.27	-0.14	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.71	0.44	0.86
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.66	0.36	0.83
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.70	0.43	0.86
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.42	0.43	0.05	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.31	0.19	-0.22	0.54
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.28	0.33	-0.06	0.64
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.33	0.56	0.22	0.78
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.53	0.18	0.76
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.35	0.29	-0.11	0.62
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.33	0.26	-0.15	0.59
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.31	0.35	-0.05	0.66
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.20	-0.21	-0.56	0.20
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.27	-0.13	0.60
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.36	0.18	-0.22	0.53
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.37	0.34	-0.05	0.64

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Females

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.82	0.75	0.87
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.68	0.58	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.62	0.51	0.72
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.63	0.65	0.54	0.74
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.72	0.74	0.65	0.81
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.64	0.65	0.53	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.61	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.63	0.52	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.49	0.53	0.39	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.74	0.65	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.68	0.58	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.71	0.61	0.78
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.67	0.47	0.81
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.61	0.72	0.58	0.81
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.61	-0.16	0.92
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.75	0.66	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.67	0.56	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.59	0.61	0.49	0.71
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.60	0.48	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.55	0.60	0.48	0.70
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.65	0.53	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.60	0.64	0.53	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.46	0.47	0.32	0.59
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.66	0.56	0.75
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.56	0.43	0.67
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.65	0.54	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.53	0.27	0.72
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.61	0.45	0.73
	PARCC Reading	0.76	0.42	-0.41	0.87

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.59	0.47
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.54	0.41
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.57	0.62	0.51
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.46	0.47	0.33
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.55	0.42
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.64	0.53
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.66	0.55
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.67	0.57
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.45	0.30
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.56	0.43
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.43	0.49	0.35
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.58	0.45
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.57	0.33
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.67	0.40
	PARCC Reading	0.77	0.36	-0.46
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.67	0.56
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.53	0.40
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.41	0.26
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.63	0.52
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.54	0.56	0.43
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.45	0.30
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.45	0.42	0.27
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.45	0.44	0.29
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.42	0.27
	APR3-Composite	0.48	0.49	0.35
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.45	0.44	0.29
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.48	0.34
	STAAR English Reading	0.43	0.50	0.23
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.48	0.29
	PARCC Reading	0.41	0.45	-0.37
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.61	0.49
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.47	0.32

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.49	0.35	0.61
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.43	0.28	0.56
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.67	0.56	0.75
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.43	0.45	0.30	0.58
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.40	0.44	0.29	0.57
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.42	0.44	0.29	0.57
FB-Median Accuracy	0.31	0.38	0.22	0.52
APR3-Composite	0.59	0.63	0.51	0.72
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.60	0.48	0.70
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.60	0.47	0.70
STAAR English Reading	0.38	0.48	0.21	0.68
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.67	0.52	0.78
PARCC Reading	0.26	0.37	-0.46	0.85

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Males

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Lower	Upper	
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.74	0.64	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.63	0.49	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.65	0.52	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.63	0.61	0.47	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.72	0.69	0.58	0.78
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.64	0.60	0.46	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.61	0.59	0.44	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.60	0.46	0.71
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.49	0.48	0.32	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.67	0.54	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.63	0.50	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.59	0.45	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.51	0.25	0.70
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.61	0.44	0.19	0.64
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.79	0.20	0.96
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.59	0.45	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.68	0.55	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.59	0.53	0.37	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.52	0.36	0.65
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.55	0.47	0.30	0.61
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.55	0.40	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.55	0.39	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.60	0.54	0.39	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.46	0.46	0.29	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.57	0.42	0.69
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.49	0.33	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.52	0.36	0.65
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.56	0.32	0.74
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.38	0.12	0.60
	PARCC Reading	0.76	0.87	0.41	0.98

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.43	0.25
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.37	0.19
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.57	0.48	0.32
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.46	0.42	0.25
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.32	0.13
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.50	0.33
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.50	0.33
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.53	0.38
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.40	0.22
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.35	0.17
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.43	0.32	0.14
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.33	0.15
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.26	-0.04
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.12	-0.16
	PARCC Reading	0.77	0.96	0.77
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.53	0.38
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.39	0.21
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.47	0.30
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.45	0.28
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.54	0.50	0.34
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.42	0.25
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.45	0.46	0.29
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.45	0.46	0.29
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.33	0.14
	APR3-Composite	0.48	0.43	0.26
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.45	0.43	0.26
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.36	0.18
	STAAR English Reading	0.43	0.33	0.03
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.27	-0.01
	PARCC Reading	0.41	0.26	-0.54
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.58	0.44
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.41	0.23

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.52	0.35	0.65
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.48	0.31	0.62
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.64	0.51	0.74
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.43	0.36	0.18	0.52
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.40	0.32	0.13	0.48
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.42	0.37	0.19	0.53
FB-Median Accuracy	0.31	0.28	0.09	0.45
APR3-Composite	0.59	0.51	0.36	0.64
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.50	0.34	0.63
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.46	0.29	0.60
STAAR English Reading	0.38	0.23	-0.08	0.49
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.40	0.14	0.61
PARCC Reading	0.26	0.21	-0.58	0.80

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.78	0.72	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.63	0.54	0.71
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.63	0.64	0.56	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.72	0.73	0.66	0.79
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.64	0.63	0.55	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.49	0.48	0.37	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.71	0.64	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.66	0.58	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.66	0.58	0.73
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.60	0.44	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.61	0.61	0.48	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.74	0.39	0.91
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.55	0.45	0.64
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.59	0.59	0.49	0.67
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.56	0.46	0.65
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.55	0.56	0.46	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.60	0.59	0.49	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.46	0.45	0.33	0.55
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.64	0.55	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.56	0.45	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.58	0.41	0.71
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.53	0.38	0.65
	PARCC Reading	0.76	0.76	0.42	0.91

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.55	0.44
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.47	0.35
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.57	0.57	0.48
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.46	0.48	0.36
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.48	0.37
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.57	0.47
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.59	0.49
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.61	0.52
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.39	0.27
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.49	0.38
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.43	0.43	0.32
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.49	0.38
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.49	0.38
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.43	0.27
	PARCC Reading	0.77	0.77	0.44
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.61	0.51
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.47	0.35
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.43	0.31
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.57	0.47
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.54	0.54	0.43
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.43	0.31
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.45	0.43	0.31
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.45	0.45	0.33
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.35	0.23
	APR3-Composite	0.48	0.46	0.34
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.45	0.43	0.32
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.43	0.31
	STAAR English Reading	0.43	0.40	0.20
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.40	0.24
	PARCC Reading	0.41	0.41	-0.10
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.60	0.51
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.46	0.35

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.50	0.39	0.60
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.46	0.34	0.56
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.66	0.58	0.73
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.43	0.44	0.32	0.54
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.40	0.40	0.28	0.51
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.42	0.43	0.31	0.54
FB-Median Accuracy	0.31	0.31	0.18	0.43
APR3-Composite	0.59	0.58	0.49	0.67
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.57	0.47	0.65
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.55	0.44	0.63
STAAR English Reading	0.38	0.35	0.14	0.53
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.56	0.42	0.67
PARCC Reading	0.26	0.26	-0.27	0.67

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.89	0.74	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.79	0.55	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.79	0.54	0.91
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.63	0.43	0.01	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.72	0.66	0.33	0.85
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.64	0.69	0.37	0.86
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.61	0.68	0.36	0.86
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.62	0.25	0.83
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.49	0.62	0.25	0.83
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.88	0.72	0.95
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.77	0.51	0.90
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.67	0.83	0.63	0.93
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.77	0.28	0.94
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.61	0.58	-0.02	0.88
	PARCC Reading	0.74	NA	NA	NA
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.70	0.39	0.87
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.89	0.75	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.59	0.64	0.29	0.83
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.41	-0.01	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.55	0.41	-0.02	0.71
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.73	0.43	0.88
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.73	0.44	0.88
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.60	0.81	0.59	0.92
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.46	0.58	0.20	0.81
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.76	0.49	0.89
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.56	0.62	0.28	0.83
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.62	0.53	0.13	0.78
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.60	-0.06	0.89
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.41	-0.26	0.81
	PARCC Reading	0.76	NA	NA	NA

Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.53	0.41	-0.02
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.61	0.26
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.57	0.55	0.16
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.46	0.22	-0.22
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.29	-0.16
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.83	0.61
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.70	0.39
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.62	0.68	0.35
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.67	0.33
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.51	0.11
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.43	0.41	-0.01
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.59	0.22
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.81	0.38
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	-0.22	-0.73
	PARCC Reading	0.77	NA	NA
Phonemic Awareness				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.75	0.48
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.48	0.62	0.27
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.58	0.21
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.56	0.45	0.03
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.54	0.58	0.21
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.45	0.66	0.32
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.45	0.67	0.34
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.45	0.51	0.10
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.47	0.05
	APR3-Composite	0.48	0.67	0.35
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.45	0.62	0.27
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.63	0.28
	STAAR English Reading	0.43	0.66	0.05
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.40	0.30	-0.37
	PARCC Reading	0.41	NA	NA
Vocabulary				
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.67	0.34
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.44	0.02

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.60	0.24	0.82
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.45	0.26	-0.19	0.61
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.63	0.28	0.83
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.43	0.25	-0.21	0.61
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.40	0.25	-0.20	0.62
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.42	0.18	-0.27	0.57
FB-Median Accuracy	0.31	0.43	0.00	0.73
APR3-Composite	0.59	0.67	0.35	0.85
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.57	0.20	0.80
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.70	0.38	0.87
STAAR English Reading	0.38	0.86	0.51	0.91
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.63	0.06	0.89
PARCC Reading	0.26	NA	NA	NA

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Females

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.78	0.78	0.67	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.61	0.45	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.58	0.42	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.66	0.52	0.77
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.70	0.57	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.75	0.65	0.83
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.72	0.60	0.80
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.45	0.27	0.60
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.73	0.62	0.82
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.67	0.54	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.69	0.56	0.78
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.57	0.33	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.70	0.48	0.84
	PARCC Reading	0.45	0.28	-0.60	0.85
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.62	0.47	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.68	0.55	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.52	0.35	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.61	0.46	0.73
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.56	0.40	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.59	0.44	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.52	0.36	0.66
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.24	0.04	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.73	0.62	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.63	0.49	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.70	0.58	0.79
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.63	0.43	0.77
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.53	0.64	0.40	0.80
	PARCC Reading	0.39	0.33	-0.56	0.87
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.64	0.64	0.49	0.76

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.63	0.48	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.65	0.50	0.76
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.53	0.36	0.67
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.73	0.62	0.81
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.77	0.68	0.85
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.75	0.64	0.83
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.41	0.23	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.60	0.45	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.55	0.39	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.56	0.40	0.69
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.44	0.17	0.64
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.38	0.52	0.23	0.72
	PARCC Reading	-0.08	0.25	-0.62	0.84
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.57	0.52	0.35	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.44	0.26	0.59
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.43	0.25	0.59
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.76	0.66	0.53	0.76
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.57	0.42	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.47	0.60	0.46	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.55	0.40	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.35	0.17	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.62	0.48	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.66	0.53	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.54	0.38	0.66
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.49	0.25	0.68
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.53	0.26	0.72
	PARCC Reading	-0.19	-0.46	-0.90	0.45

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Males

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.78	0.78	0.65	0.86
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.42	0.18	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.51	0.28	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.66	0.49	0.79
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.63	0.47	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.56	0.38	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.64	0.48	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.27	0.04	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.62	0.45	0.74
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.64	0.48	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.54	0.35	0.69
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.67	0.40	0.84
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.46	0.16	0.68
	PARCC Reading	0.45	0.54	-0.49	0.94
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.69	0.53	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.52	0.30	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.47	0.25	0.65
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.62	0.43	0.75
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.61	0.44	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.58	0.40	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.28	0.06	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.64	0.48	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.60	0.43	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.59	0.42	0.72
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.60	0.31	0.79
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.53	0.44	0.14	0.66
	PARCC Reading	0.39	0.13	-0.69	0.81
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.64	0.61	0.41	0.75

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.46	0.22	0.64
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.53	0.31	0.69
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.41	0.17	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.56	0.38	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.51	0.31	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.55	0.36	0.69
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.30	0.08	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.52	0.33	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.46	0.26	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.50	0.31	0.66
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.61	0.30	0.80
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.38	0.28	-0.04	0.55
	PARCC Reading	-0.08	-0.42	-0.92	0.59
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.57	0.67	0.50	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.45	0.23	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.48	0.26	0.65
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.76	0.87	0.79	0.92
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.42	0.21	0.59
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.47	0.31	0.09	0.51
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.38	0.17	0.56
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.10	-0.13	0.32
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.65	0.49	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.70	0.56	0.80
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.55	0.37	0.69
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.68	0.43	0.83
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.60	0.35	0.77
	PARCC Reading	-0.19	0.61	-0.40	0.95

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.78	0.77	0.69	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.54	0.40	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.55	0.42	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.67	0.56	0.75
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.67	0.57	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.68	0.58	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.69	0.59	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.33	0.18	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.69	0.59	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.66	0.56	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.63	0.52	0.72
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.63	0.46	0.75
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.56	0.38	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.45	0.45	-0.14	0.80
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.65	0.54	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.62	0.50	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.51	0.38	0.62
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.63	0.52	0.72
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.60	0.49	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.60	0.50	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.58	0.47	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.29	0.14	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.69	0.61	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.62	0.51	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.66	0.56	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.62	0.45	0.74
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.53	0.52	0.34	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.39	0.39	-0.18	0.76
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.64	0.63	0.51	0.72

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.59	0.47	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.61	0.49	0.71
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.48	0.33	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.68	0.59	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.69	0.60	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.69	0.59	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.37	0.22	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.58	0.46	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.51	0.39	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.55	0.43	0.65
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	0.47	0.26	0.63
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.38	0.38	0.17	0.56
	PARCC Reading	-0.08	-0.08	-0.60	0.49
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.57	0.57	0.44	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.45	0.31	0.57
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.44	0.29	0.56
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.76	0.77	0.70	0.83
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.50	0.38	0.61
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.47	0.48	0.36	0.59
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.47	0.35	0.58
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.20	0.05	0.34
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.64	0.54	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.69	0.60	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.56	0.44	0.65
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.61	0.45	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.59	0.42	0.72
	PARCC Reading	-0.19	-0.19	-0.67	0.40

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.78	0.97	0.63	1.00
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.62	-0.57	0.97
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.78	-0.33	0.98
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.66	0.77	-0.10	0.97
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.69	-0.28	0.96
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.79	-0.05	0.98
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.69	0.76	-0.13	0.97
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.82	0.03	0.98
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.89	0.28	0.99
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.66	0.68	-0.29	0.96
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.91	0.40	0.99
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	-0.24	-0.93	0.81
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.53	0.38	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.45	NA	NA	NA
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.67	-0.52	0.98
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.26	-0.81	0.93
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.51	0.41	-0.74	0.95
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.31	-0.67	0.90
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.59	0.13	-0.76	0.85
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.23	-0.71	0.88
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.27	-0.69	0.89
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.20	-0.73	0.87
	APR3-Composite	0.69	0.40	-0.61	0.92
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.28	-0.69	0.89
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.44	-0.58	0.92
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.51	-0.68	0.96
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.53	0.51	0.34	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.39	NA	NA	NA
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.64	0.94	0.32	1.00

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.17	-0.84	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.47	-0.70	0.96
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.68	-0.29	0.96
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.67	0.41	-0.60	0.92
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.54	-0.49	0.94
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.56	-0.46	0.94
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.67	-0.30	0.96
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.71	-0.25	0.96
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.66	-0.33	0.96
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.68	-0.30	0.96
	STAAR English Reading	0.45	-0.23	-0.92	0.82
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.38	0.37	0.17	0.56
	PARCC Reading	-0.08	NA	NA	NA
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.57	0.82	0.02	0.98
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.60	-0.42	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.44	0.93	0.51	0.99
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.76	0.81	0.13	0.97
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.55	-0.35	0.92
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.47	0.57	-0.32	0.93
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.47	0.66	-0.18	0.94
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.23	0.76	0.02	0.96
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.78	0.07	0.97
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.53	-0.37	0.92
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.84	0.25	0.98
	STAAR English Reading	0.59	0.24	-0.71	0.88
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.57	0.42	0.72
	PARCC Reading	-0.19	NA	NA	NA

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5 Females

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.82	0.83	0.65	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.62	0.31	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49	0.27	-0.13	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.64	0.76	0.53	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.48	0.15	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.49	0.17	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.64	0.51	0.20	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.41	0.51	0.20	0.73
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.51	0.20	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.52	0.22	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.40	0.06	0.66
	STAAR English Reading	-0.13	0.26	-0.91	0.85
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.58	0.19	0.81
	PARCC Reading	0.43	0.34	-0.48	0.84
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.64	0.34	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.82	0.64	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47	0.43	0.05	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.54	0.20	0.76
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.49	0.17	0.72
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.58	0.29	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59	0.56	0.26	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.24	-0.12	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.59	0.30	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.44	0.44	0.11	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.54	0.23	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.15	-0.47	-0.75	0.86
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.45	0.33	-0.12	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.57	0.45	-0.37	0.88
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.43	0.06	0.70

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.39	0.25	-0.15	0.57
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.40	0.29	-0.11	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.32	0.24	-0.15	0.56
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.15	-0.21	0.47
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.20	-0.16	0.50
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.13	-0.23	0.45
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.30	0.02	-0.33	0.36
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.13	-0.22	0.46
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.19	0.03	-0.31	0.37
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.26	0.10	-0.25	0.43
	STAAR English Reading	-0.04	0.81	-0.89	0.87
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.28	0.19	-0.27	0.57
	PARCC Reading	0.32	0.04	-0.64	0.68
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.78	0.56	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.55	0.21	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.30	-0.10	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.90	0.79	0.95
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.49	0.49	0.17	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.42	0.48	0.17	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.46	0.51	0.05	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.62	0.21	0.73
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.55	0.35	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.54	0.25	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.54	0.24	0.75
	STAAR English Reading	0.27	0.24	-0.53	0.82
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.51	0.12	0.77
	PARCC Reading	0.26	0.25	-0.55	0.81

Predictive-related evidence for validity BOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5 Males

BOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.82	0.83	0.64	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.68	0.39	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49	0.67	0.38	0.84
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.64	0.55	0.21	0.77
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.62	0.74	0.52	0.86
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.63	0.72	0.49	0.86
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.64	0.73	0.51	0.86
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.41	0.38	0.03	0.65
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.55	0.24	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.41	0.35	-0.01	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.60	0.31	0.79
	STAAR English Reading	-0.13	NA	NA	NA
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.55	0.18	0.78
	PARCC Reading	0.43	0.70	-0.47	0.98
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.74	0.49	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.69	0.61	0.29	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47	0.50	0.14	0.74
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.46	0.10	0.72
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.57	0.27	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.61	0.33	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59	0.59	0.30	0.78
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.38	0.04	0.65
	APR3-Composite	0.63	0.64	0.38	0.81
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.44	0.40	0.06	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.71	0.47	0.85
	STAAR English Reading	0.15	NA	NA	NA
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.45	0.52	0.15	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.57	0.91	0.11	0.99
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.55	0.62	0.29	0.81

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.39	0.53	0.17	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.40	0.50	0.13	0.75
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.32	0.34	-0.05	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.75	0.54	0.87
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.71	0.48	0.85
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.73	0.51	0.86
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.30	0.41	0.07	0.67
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.42	0.08	0.68
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.19	0.19	-0.18	0.51
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.26	0.40	0.05	0.67
	STAAR English Reading	-0.04	NA	NA	NA
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.28	0.35	-0.06	0.66
	PARCC Reading	0.32	0.76	-0.36	0.98
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.78	0.56	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.55	0.21	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.78	0.56	0.89
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.60	0.28	0.80
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.49	0.76	0.54	0.88
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.42	0.54	0.26	0.74
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.46	0.44	0.13	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.26	0.47	0.16	0.69
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.50	0.20	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.50	0.19	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.55	0.26	0.75
	STAAR English Reading	0.27	NA	NA	NA
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.52	0.53	0.17	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.26	0.65	-0.54	0.97

Middle of Year to End of Year

<i>Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Kindergarten Females</i>					
MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Coefficient	Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.70	0.59	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.47	0.30	0.61
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.33	0.27	0.08	0.44
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.66	0.53	0.76
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.44	0.27	0.58
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.66	0.54	0.76
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.40	0.52	0.36	0.65
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.59	0.45	0.71
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.51	0.54	0.39	0.67
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.39	0.21	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.61	0.61	0.47	0.72
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.48	0.48	0.32	0.62
	APR3-Word Reading	0.55	0.56	0.41	0.68
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.52	0.36	0.65
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.48	0.49	0.33	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.29	0.11	0.46
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.15	-0.05	0.33
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.40	0.36	0.18	0.52
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.26	0.34	0.16	0.50
	FB-Composite	0.40	0.36	0.18	0.52
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.27	0.30	0.11	0.47
	FB-Sight Words	0.37	0.32	0.13	0.48
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.31	0.28	0.09	0.45
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.23	0.04	0.41
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.38	0.20	0.53
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.31	0.27	0.08	0.44
	APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.39	0.21	0.54
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.29	0.10	0.46

Listening Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.29	0.22	0.03	0.39
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.19	0.18	-0.02	0.36
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.54	0.49	0.33	0.63
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.37	0.35	0.17	0.51
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.14	-0.05	0.33
	FB-Composite	0.26	0.28	0.10	0.45
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.23	0.30	0.11	0.46
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.21	0.02	0.39
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.27	0.08	0.44
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.26	0.26	0.07	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.34	0.15	0.50
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.29	0.33	0.15	0.49
	APR3-Word Reading	0.25	0.29	0.10	0.46
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.29	0.22	0.02	0.39
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.59	0.58	0.44	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.47	0.30	0.60
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.31	0.24	0.05	0.42
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.67	0.55	0.77
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.34	0.16	0.50
	FB-Composite	0.58	0.67	0.54	0.76
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.43	0.54	0.39	0.67
	FB-Sight Words	0.55	0.59	0.45	0.71
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.50	0.61	0.47	0.72
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.41	0.24	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.58	0.43	0.70
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.43	0.45	0.28	0.59
	APR3-Word Reading	0.48	0.51	0.35	0.64
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.51	0.55	0.40	0.67
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.56	0.52	0.37	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.38	0.37	0.19	0.53
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.18	-0.01	0.36
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.51	0.47	0.31	0.61

ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.34	0.15	0.50
FB-Composite	0.47	0.50	0.33	0.63
FB-Letter Sounds	0.26	0.36	0.18	0.52
FB-Sight Words	0.47	0.48	0.32	0.62
FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.39	0.21	0.55
FB-Word Segmenting	0.29	0.31	0.12	0.48
APR3-Composite	0.47	0.48	0.31	0.62
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.39	0.42	0.24	0.57
APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.44	0.27	0.59
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.42	0.40	0.22	0.55

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Kindergarten Males

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.68	0.55	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.46	0.27	0.61
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.33	0.39	0.19	0.56
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.70	0.57	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.33	0.13	0.51
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.55	0.37	0.68
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.40	0.33	0.12	0.51
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.54	0.36	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.51	0.48	0.30	0.64
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.39	0.19	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.61	0.56	0.39	0.69
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.48	0.42	0.23	0.58
	APR3-Word Reading	0.55	0.47	0.29	0.63
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.52	0.34	0.66
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.48	0.44	0.25	0.60
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.33	0.13	0.51
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.24	0.03	0.43
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.40	0.45	0.26	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.26	0.12	-0.10	0.33
	FB-Composite	0.40	0.44	0.24	0.60
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.27	0.28	0.07	0.47
	FB-Sight Words	0.37	0.41	0.21	0.58
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.31	0.40	0.19	0.57
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.34	0.13	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.41	0.21	0.57
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.31	0.34	0.13	0.51
	APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.43	0.24	0.59
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.33	0.12	0.51
Listening Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.29	0.38	0.18	0.55

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.19	0.19	-0.02	0.39
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.54	0.62	0.47	0.74
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.37	0.40	0.20	0.57
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.32	0.11	0.50
	FB-Composite	0.26	0.19	-0.03	0.40
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.23	0.11	-0.11	0.32
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.16	-0.06	0.36
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.22	0.00	0.42
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.26	0.21	-0.01	0.41
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.30	0.09	0.49
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.29	0.22	0.00	0.42
	APR3-Word Reading	0.25	0.21	-0.01	0.41
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.29	0.35	0.14	0.52
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.59	0.56	0.39	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.36	0.16	0.54
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.31	0.36	0.15	0.53
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.64	0.49	0.75
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.31	0.10	0.49
	FB-Composite	0.58	0.46	0.27	0.62
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.43	0.33	0.13	0.52
	FB-Sight Words	0.55	0.46	0.26	0.61
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.50	0.37	0.16	0.54
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.37	0.16	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.47	0.28	0.62
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.43	0.36	0.16	0.53
	APR3-Word Reading	0.48	0.39	0.20	0.56
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.51	0.42	0.23	0.59
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.56	0.58	0.42	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.38	0.40	0.21	0.57
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.30	0.09	0.48
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.51	0.54	0.37	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.32	0.11	0.50
	FB-Composite	0.47	0.44	0.24	0.60

FB-Letter Sounds	0.26	0.19	-0.03	0.39
FB-Sight Words	0.47	0.45	0.25	0.61
FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.44	0.25	0.60
FB-Word Segmenting	0.29	0.26	0.04	0.45
APR3-Composite	0.47	0.49	0.31	0.64
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.39	0.38	0.18	0.55
APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.36	0.16	0.53
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.42	0.47	0.28	0.62

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Kindergarten Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.72	0.63	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.50	0.36	0.61
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.33	0.30	0.15	0.45
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.68	0.58	0.76
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.42	0.27	0.55
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.63	0.52	0.72
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.40	0.49	0.36	0.61
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.59	0.46	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.51	0.52	0.39	0.64
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.39	0.24	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.61	0.58	0.46	0.68
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.48	0.43	0.28	0.56
	APR3-Word Reading	0.55	0.56	0.44	0.67
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.53	0.40	0.64
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.48	0.51	0.37	0.62
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.34	0.18	0.48
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.21	0.05	0.36
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.40	0.42	0.28	0.55
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.26	0.28	0.12	0.42
	FB-Composite	0.40	0.43	0.29	0.56
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.27	0.32	0.16	0.46
	FB-Sight Words	0.37	0.39	0.24	0.52
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.31	0.35	0.19	0.48
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	0.34	0.18	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.42	0.27	0.55
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.31	0.31	0.15	0.46
	APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.43	0.28	0.56
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.37	0.22	0.51
Listening Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.29	0.33	0.17	0.47

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.19	0.26	0.10	0.41
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.54	0.49	0.36	0.61
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.37	0.38	0.23	0.51
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.24	0.08	0.39
	FB-Composite	0.26	0.28	0.12	0.43
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.23	0.24	0.08	0.39
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	0.25	0.08	0.40
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	0.30	0.14	0.45
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.26	0.20	0.03	0.35
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.34	0.18	0.48
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.29	0.29	0.13	0.44
	APR3-Word Reading	0.25	0.30	0.14	0.44
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.29	0.29	0.13	0.43
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.59	0.58	0.45	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.46	0.32	0.58
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.31	0.31	0.15	0.45
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.68	0.58	0.76
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.31	0.15	0.45
	FB-Composite	0.58	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.43	0.55	0.42	0.65
	FB-Sight Words	0.55	0.58	0.45	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.50	0.53	0.40	0.64
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.38	0.23	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.54	0.41	0.65
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.43	0.39	0.23	0.52
	APR3-Word Reading	0.48	0.51	0.37	0.62
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.51	0.50	0.37	0.62
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.56	0.58	0.46	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.38	0.39	0.24	0.53
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.19	0.03	0.35
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.51	0.50	0.37	0.62
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.37	0.22	0.50
	FB-Composite	0.47	0.47	0.33	0.59

FB-Letter Sounds	0.26	0.28	0.12	0.43
FB-Sight Words	0.47	0.47	0.33	0.59
FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.40	0.25	0.53
FB-Word Segmenting	0.29	0.28	0.12	0.43
APR3-Composite	0.47	0.48	0.34	0.60
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.39	0.39	0.24	0.52
APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.45	0.30	0.57
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.42	0.42	0.27	0.55

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Kindergarten Not Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.71	0.67	0.11	0.90
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.47	0.20	-0.45	0.72
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.33	0.47	-0.18	0.83
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.58	-0.03	0.88
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.43	0.13	-0.51	0.68
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.32	-0.44	0.81
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.40	-0.33	-0.82	0.43
	FB-Sight Words	0.58	0.32	-0.44	0.81
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.51	0.36	-0.40	0.83
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	-0.26	-0.79	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.61	0.58	-0.08	0.88
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.48	0.47	-0.22	0.85
	APR3-Word Reading	0.55	0.39	-0.32	0.82
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.54	-0.13	0.87
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.48	0.27	-0.39	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.30	0.07	-0.55	0.64
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.68	0.14	0.91
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.40	0.12	-0.51	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.26	-0.13	-0.68	0.51
	FB-Composite	0.40	0.28	-0.47	0.80
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.27	-0.13	-0.73	0.58
	FB-Sight Words	0.37	0.40	-0.36	0.84
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.31	0.32	-0.43	0.81
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.31	-0.68	-0.93	-0.04
	APR3-Composite	0.40	0.25	-0.45	0.76
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.31	0.31	-0.39	0.79
	APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.15	-0.53	0.71
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.31	0.12	-0.55	0.69
Listening Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.29	0.25	-0.41	0.74

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.19	-0.14	-0.68	0.50
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.54	-0.08	-0.65	0.54
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.37	0.36	-0.30	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.24	0.24	-0.42	0.73
	FB-Composite	0.26	-0.28	-0.80	0.47
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.23	0.39	-0.37	0.84
	FB-Sight Words	0.20	-0.40	-0.84	0.36
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.26	-0.41	-0.85	0.35
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.26	0.56	-0.16	0.89
	APR3-Composite	0.32	0.36	-0.35	0.81
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.29	0.10	-0.56	0.69
	APR3-Word Reading	0.25	0.56	-0.11	0.88
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.29	0.49	-0.20	0.86
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.59	0.53	-0.10	0.86
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.44	0.15	-0.50	0.69
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.31	0.32	-0.35	0.77
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.35	-0.32	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.29	-0.38	0.76
	FB-Composite	0.58	-0.03	-0.68	0.64
	FB-Letter Sounds	0.43	-0.39	-0.84	0.37
	FB-Sight Words	0.55	0.02	-0.65	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.50	0.07	-0.62	0.70
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.40	0.06	-0.63	0.69
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.36	-0.34	0.81
	APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.43	0.25	-0.45	0.76
	APR3-Word Reading	0.48	0.23	-0.46	0.75
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.51	0.37	-0.34	0.81
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.56	0.69	0.16	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.38	0.40	-0.27	0.80
	ISIP-Listening Comprehension	0.23	0.18	-0.47	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.51	0.74	0.26	0.93
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.36	0.17	-0.48	0.70
	FB-Composite	0.47	0.51	-0.24	0.88

FB-Letter Sounds	0.26	-0.04	-0.69	0.64
FB-Sight Words	0.47	0.37	-0.39	0.83
FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.43	-0.33	0.85
FB-Word Segmenting	0.29	-0.21	-0.77	0.53
APR3-Composite	0.47	0.67	0.06	0.91
APR3-Sounds & Letters	0.39	0.46	-0.24	0.84
APR3-Word Reading	0.42	0.51	-0.18	0.86
APR3-Sentence Reading	0.42	0.79	0.33	0.95

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Females

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.90	0.85	0.93
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.75	0.64	0.83
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.79	0.70	0.86
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.63	0.63	0.48	0.75
	FB-Composite	0.78	0.84	0.76	0.90
	FB-Sight Words	0.76	0.81	0.72	0.88
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.64	0.74	0.62	0.83
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.50	0.31	0.66
	FB-CBM WRC	0.78	0.81	0.71	0.88
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.53	0.59	0.42	0.72
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.81	0.72	0.88
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.75	0.63	0.83
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.62	0.72	0.60	0.81
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.73	0.75	0.64	0.84
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.70	0.56	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.66	0.51	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.60	0.44	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.49	0.46	0.27	0.62
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.66	0.51	0.77
	FB-Sight Words	0.61	0.67	0.52	0.78
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.50	0.31	0.65
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.32	0.35	0.13	0.54
	FB-CBM WRC	0.64	0.68	0.53	0.78
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.30	0.34	0.12	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.61	0.45	0.73
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.52	0.34	0.66
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.52	0.34	0.67
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.59	0.42	0.72
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.83	0.83	0.75	0.89

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.66	0.51	0.77
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.79	0.70	0.86
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.58	0.55	0.37	0.68
	FB-Composite	0.71	0.77	0.65	0.85
	FB-Sight Words	0.66	0.71	0.57	0.81
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.62	0.70	0.57	0.80
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.39	0.52	0.33	0.67
	FB-CBM WRC	0.70	0.73	0.61	0.82
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.59	0.42	0.72
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.77	0.66	0.84
	APR3-Word Reading	0.64	0.69	0.55	0.79
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.60	0.66	0.51	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.71	0.57	0.80
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.74	0.62	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.61	0.45	0.73
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.57	0.59	0.43	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.60	0.64	0.49	0.76
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.65	0.49	0.76
	FB-Sight Words	0.57	0.56	0.38	0.70
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.44	0.52	0.33	0.67
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.37	0.15	0.55
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.60	0.44	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.39	0.18	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.63	0.47	0.75
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.61	0.45	0.73
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.60	0.44	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.53	0.34	0.67

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1Males

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Lower	Upper	
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.87	0.80	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.74	0.62	0.83
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.73	0.61	0.82
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.63	0.61	0.45	0.74
	FB-Composite	0.78	0.68	0.54	0.79
	FB-Sight Words	0.76	0.69	0.55	0.79
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.64	0.51	0.32	0.66
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.34	0.12	0.53
	FB-CBM WRC	0.78	0.74	0.62	0.83
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.53	0.44	0.24	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.67	0.52	0.78
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.58	0.41	0.71
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.62	0.47	0.27	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.73	0.69	0.55	0.79
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.70	0.56	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.61	0.44	0.74
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.56	0.39	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.49	0.52	0.34	0.67
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.52	0.34	0.67
	FB-Sight Words	0.61	0.54	0.36	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.30	0.08	0.50
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.32	0.27	0.05	0.47
	FB-CBM WRC	0.64	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.30	0.25	0.02	0.45
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.44	0.23	0.60
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.39	0.18	0.57
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.21	-0.02	0.42
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.48	0.29	0.64
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.83	0.82	0.72	0.88

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.69	0.54	0.79
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.73	0.60	0.82
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.58	0.57	0.40	0.71
	FB-Composite	0.71	0.61	0.45	0.74
	FB-Sight Words	0.66	0.58	0.40	0.71
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.62	0.52	0.34	0.67
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.39	0.24	0.02	0.45
	FB-CBM WRC	0.70	0.65	0.50	0.76
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.39	0.18	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.68	0.53	0.79
	APR3-Word Reading	0.64	0.61	0.45	0.74
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.60	0.52	0.34	0.67
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.65	0.50	0.77
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.70	0.56	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.57	0.39	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.57	0.55	0.36	0.69
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.60	0.57	0.40	0.71
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.59	0.42	0.72
	FB-Sight Words	0.57	0.60	0.43	0.73
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.44	0.39	0.18	0.57
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.32	0.10	0.51
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.59	0.41	0.72
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.32	0.11	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.53	0.35	0.68
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.41	0.20	0.58
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.44	0.23	0.61
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.53	0.35	0.68

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.89	0.84	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.76	0.68	0.82
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.76	0.68	0.82
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.63	0.61	0.49	0.70
	FB-Composite	0.78	0.79	0.71	0.84
	FB-Sight Words	0.76	0.78	0.70	0.84
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.64	0.63	0.51	0.72
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.42	0.27	0.55
	FB-CBM WRC	0.78	0.79	0.72	0.85
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.53	0.52	0.39	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.74	0.65	0.81
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.66	0.56	0.75
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.62	0.62	0.50	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.73	0.72	0.62	0.79
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.70	0.60	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.66	0.55	0.74
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.58	0.46	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.49	0.48	0.34	0.60
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.60	0.48	0.70
	FB-Sight Words	0.61	0.62	0.50	0.72
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.40	0.25	0.54
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.32	0.32	0.16	0.46
	FB-CBM WRC	0.64	0.65	0.54	0.74
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.30	0.29	0.13	0.44
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.52	0.38	0.63
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.45	0.31	0.58
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.39	0.24	0.52
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.53	0.40	0.64
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.83	0.82	0.76	0.87

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.67	0.57	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.76	0.69	0.83
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.58	0.54	0.41	0.65
	FB-Composite	0.71	0.71	0.62	0.79
	FB-Sight Words	0.66	0.68	0.57	0.76
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.62	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.39	0.37	0.22	0.51
	FB-CBM WRC	0.70	0.71	0.61	0.79
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.51	0.37	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.73	0.64	0.80
	APR3-Word Reading	0.64	0.64	0.54	0.73
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.60	0.61	0.49	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.70	0.60	0.77
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.71	0.62	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.59	0.48	0.69
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.57	0.56	0.44	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.60	0.61	0.49	0.70
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-Sight Words	0.57	0.57	0.45	0.68
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.44	0.43	0.28	0.56
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.35	0.19	0.49
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.60	0.47	0.69
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.34	0.18	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.56	0.43	0.66
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.50	0.36	0.61
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.52	0.39	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.50	0.37	0.62

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 1 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient	Lower	Upper	
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.92	0.76	0.97
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.64	0.20	0.87
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.86	0.61	0.95
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.63	0.79	0.47	0.93
	FB-Composite	0.78	0.59	0.11	0.85
	FB-Sight Words	0.76	0.53	0.02	0.82
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.64	0.63	0.17	0.86
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.43	0.44	-0.09	0.78
	FB-CBM WRC	0.78	0.65	0.20	0.87
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.53	0.55	0.05	0.83
	APR3-Composite	0.75	0.84	0.58	0.95
	APR3-Word Reading	0.67	0.73	0.36	0.91
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.62	0.61	0.15	0.86
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.73	0.83	0.54	0.94
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.71	0.31	0.90
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.46	-0.07	0.79
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.73	0.34	0.90
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.49	0.65	0.20	0.87
	FB-Composite	0.59	0.40	-0.14	0.76
	FB-Sight Words	0.61	0.40	-0.15	0.76
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.40	0.30	-0.26	0.70
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.32	0.31	-0.24	0.71
	FB-CBM WRC	0.64	0.51	0.00	0.81
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.30	0.30	-0.25	0.70
	APR3-Composite	0.53	0.70	0.29	0.89
	APR3-Word Reading	0.45	0.48	-0.04	0.80
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.39	0.43	-0.10	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.76	0.40	0.92
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.83	0.87	0.65	0.96

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.69	0.28	0.89
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.77	0.83	0.56	0.94
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.58	0.77	0.42	0.92
	FB-Composite	0.71	0.53	0.02	0.82
	FB-Sight Words	0.66	0.34	-0.20	0.73
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.62	0.52	0.01	0.82
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.39	0.57	0.08	0.84
	FB-CBM WRC	0.70	0.54	0.03	0.82
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.51	0.45	-0.08	0.78
	APR3-Composite	0.72	0.65	0.21	0.87
	APR3-Word Reading	0.64	0.63	0.17	0.86
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.60	0.56	0.06	0.83
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.56	0.07	0.83
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.79	0.47	0.93
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.53	0.02	0.82
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.57	0.71	0.31	0.90
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.60	0.67	0.25	0.88
	FB-Composite	0.61	0.62	0.16	0.86
	FB-Sight Words	0.57	0.62	0.16	0.86
	FB-Syllable Reading	0.44	0.67	0.25	0.88
	FB-Word Segmenting	0.34	0.30	-0.25	0.70
	FB-CBM WRC	0.59	0.58	0.09	0.84
	FB-CBM Median Accuracy	0.35	0.51	0.00	0.81
	APR3-Composite	0.58	0.83	0.56	0.94
	APR3-Word Reading	0.51	0.70	0.29	0.89
	APR3-Sentence Reading	0.53	0.60	0.13	0.85
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.53	0.84	0.58	0.95

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Females

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.89	0.84	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.74	0.64	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.54	0.39	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.74	0.72	0.61	0.80
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.69	0.68	0.56	0.77
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.67	0.56	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.64	0.51	0.74
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.64	0.52	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.50	0.54	0.39	0.66
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.72	0.62	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.60	0.47	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.68	0.57	0.77
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.73	0.77	0.68	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.80	0.84	0.77	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.51	0.35	0.63
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.58	0.44	0.69
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.48	0.32	0.61
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.67	0.55	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.57	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.66	0.66	0.54	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.40	0.23	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.69	0.58	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.54	0.40	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.69	0.58	0.78
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.63	0.58	0.44	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.55	0.41	0.67
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.66	0.66	0.55	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.52	0.40	0.23	0.55
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.51	0.36	0.64

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.66	0.54	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.66	0.54	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.66	0.54	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.32	0.14	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.62	0.57	0.43	0.68
Phonemic Awareness	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.51	0.45	0.28	0.58
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.57	0.43	0.68
	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.77	0.68	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.61	0.48	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.50	0.46	0.30	0.59
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.73	0.73	0.64	0.81
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.53	0.38	0.65
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.55	0.41	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.49	0.34	0.62
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.53	0.38	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.42	0.26	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.62	0.49	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.50	0.35	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.61	0.48	0.71
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.58	0.44	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.33	0.16	0.49
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.35	0.18	0.50
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.47	0.37	0.20	0.52
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.75	0.69	0.58	0.78
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.48	0.37	0.20	0.52
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.34	0.17	0.50
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.34	0.16	0.49
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.31	0.13	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.50	0.34	0.62
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.42	0.26	0.56
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.51	0.46	0.31	0.60

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Males

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.89	0.84	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.77	0.68	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.67	0.57	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.74	0.76	0.68	0.83
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.69	0.71	0.61	0.79
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.76	0.68	0.83
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.80	0.73	0.86
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.78	0.70	0.84
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.50	0.49	0.34	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.75	0.67	0.82
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.69	0.59	0.77
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.70	0.60	0.78
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.73	0.72	0.63	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.80	0.76	0.67	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.63	0.51	0.72
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.62	0.50	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.52	0.38	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.68	0.58	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.68	0.71	0.61	0.78
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.66	0.68	0.58	0.77
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.35	0.19	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.72	0.62	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.64	0.53	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.68	0.58	0.77
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.63	0.67	0.57	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.60	0.48	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.66	0.66	0.55	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.52	0.62	0.50	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.54	0.40	0.65

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.70	0.60	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.72	0.63	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.70	0.59	0.78
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.28	0.11	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.62	0.67	0.56	0.76
Phonemic Awareness	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.51	0.60	0.47	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.65	0.53	0.74
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.72	0.63	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.57	0.44	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.50	0.55	0.42	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.73	0.73	0.64	0.81
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.52	0.38	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.66	0.55	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.68	0.58	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.67	0.56	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.39	0.23	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.58	0.45	0.69
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.51	0.37	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.56	0.42	0.67
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.76	0.67	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.62	0.50	0.71
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.54	0.41	0.65
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.47	0.55	0.42	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.75	0.78	0.71	0.84
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.48	0.56	0.42	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.61	0.49	0.71
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.58	0.45	0.69
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.35	0.19	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.58	0.46	0.69
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.53	0.39	0.64
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.51	0.55	0.41	0.66

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.89	0.86	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.76	0.70	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.61	0.51	0.69
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.74	0.73	0.67	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.69	0.68	0.60	0.75
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.73	0.65	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.73	0.66	0.79
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.50	0.52	0.42	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.74	0.68	0.80
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.65	0.57	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.70	0.62	0.76
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.73	0.73	0.66	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.80	0.81	0.75	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.58	0.49	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.59	0.50	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.46	0.35	0.56
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.67	0.59	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.68	0.69	0.61	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.66	0.67	0.59	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.38	0.25	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.69	0.62	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.68	0.61	0.75
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.63	0.63	0.54	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.58	0.48	0.66
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.66	0.65	0.56	0.72
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.52	0.51	0.40	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.52	0.41	0.61

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.70	0.62	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.31	0.18	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.62	0.63	0.54	0.71
Phonemic Awareness	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.51	0.53	0.43	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.62	0.53	0.69
	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.74	0.67	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.58	0.48	0.66
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.50	0.50	0.39	0.59
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.73	0.72	0.65	0.78
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.51	0.40	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.60	0.50	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.60	0.51	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.41	0.30	0.52
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.59	0.49	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.50	0.39	0.59
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.57	0.47	0.65
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.69	0.62	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.50	0.40	0.60
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.45	0.34	0.55
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.47	0.47	0.36	0.57
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.75	0.75	0.69	0.81
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.48	0.48	0.37	0.58
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.51	0.40	0.60
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.49	0.38	0.59
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.34	0.21	0.45
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.57	0.47	0.65
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.50	0.39	0.59
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.51	0.52	0.42	0.62

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 2 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.89	0.88	0.75	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.75	0.70	0.42	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.61	0.67	0.38	0.84
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.74	0.84	0.67	0.93
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.69	0.79	0.58	0.90
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.68	0.38	0.85
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.73	0.74	0.48	0.88
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.72	0.69	0.40	0.85
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.50	0.24	-0.17	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.70	0.43	0.86
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.67	0.37	0.84
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.70	0.68	0.40	0.84
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.73	0.76	0.53	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.80	0.74	0.49	0.87
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.58	0.25	0.79
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.59	0.64	0.34	0.83
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.48	0.63	0.33	0.82
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.59	0.25	0.80
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.68	0.61	0.28	0.81
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.66	0.59	0.26	0.80
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.36	0.16	-0.25	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.70	0.71	0.45	0.86
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.59	0.74	0.50	0.88
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.63	0.33	0.82
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.63	0.71	0.44	0.86
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.56	0.23	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.66	0.79	0.58	0.90
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.52	0.69	0.42	0.85
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.57	0.23	0.78

	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.69	0.40	0.85
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.68	0.39	0.85
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.39	0.85
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.29	0.06	-0.34	0.45
	APR3-Composite	0.62	0.62	0.31	0.81
Phonemic Awareness	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.51	0.58	0.25	0.79
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.61	0.30	0.81
Phonemic Awareness	ISIP-Overall	0.74	0.84	0.66	0.92
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.57	0.65	0.35	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.50	0.62	0.30	0.81
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.73	0.87	0.73	0.94
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.72	0.47	0.87
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.61	0.67	0.37	0.84
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.71	0.44	0.86
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.69	0.41	0.85
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.40	0.23	-0.18	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.59	0.72	0.45	0.86
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.63	0.33	0.82
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.73	0.48	0.87
Vocabulary	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.61	0.29	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.40	0.02	0.68
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.45	0.43	0.05	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.47	0.65	0.35	0.83
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.75	0.64	0.34	0.83
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.48	0.43	0.04	0.70
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.51	0.50	0.13	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.49	0.44	0.06	0.71
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.19	-0.22	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.55	0.35	-0.04	0.65
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.32	-0.08	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.51	0.35	-0.04	0.65

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Females

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.86	0.88	0.83	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.73	0.64	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.67	0.56	0.75
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.69	0.72	0.63	0.79
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.78	0.80	0.73	0.85
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.57	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.66	0.56	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.67	0.68	0.57	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.55	0.50	0.36	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.72	0.63	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.64	0.53	0.73
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.70	0.61	0.78
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.66	0.46	0.79
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.70	0.57	0.80
	PARCC Reading	0.59	0.50	-0.53	0.93
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.72	0.63	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.79	0.78	0.71	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.58	0.46	0.69
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.58	0.46	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.53	0.40	0.64
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.60	0.48	0.70
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.57	0.45	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.61	0.49	0.70
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.52	0.46	0.32	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.62	0.50	0.71
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.55	0.42	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.61	0.49	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.41	0.14	0.61
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.62	0.46	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.75	0.51	-0.51	0.94

Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.66	0.55	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.59	0.47	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.72	0.74	0.66	0.81
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.49	0.35	0.61
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.57	0.62	0.50	0.71
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.74	0.65	0.81
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.73	0.64	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.73	0.64	0.80
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.50	0.37	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.65	0.55	0.74
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.58	0.46	0.68
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.65	0.54	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.57	0.35	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.59	0.61	0.44	0.73
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.92	0.41	0.99
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.69	0.59	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.54	0.41	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.48	0.44	0.30	0.57
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.67	0.56	0.75
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.56	0.58	0.46	0.68
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.48	0.34	0.60
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.49	0.48	0.34	0.60
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.50	0.48	0.33	0.60
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.36	0.21	0.50
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.52	0.38	0.63
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.44	0.29	0.57
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.51	0.38	0.63
	STAAR English Reading	0.51	0.53	0.29	0.70
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.41	0.52	0.33	0.67
	PARCC Reading	0.25	0.10	-0.77	0.84
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.72	0.63	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.53	0.40	0.64

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.63	0.52	0.72
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.54	0.41	0.65
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.82	0.76	0.87
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.60	0.48	0.70
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.61	0.49	0.70
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.61	0.49	0.70
FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.37	0.22	0.51
APR3-Composite	0.62	0.66	0.56	0.75
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.58	0.58	0.46	0.68
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.65	0.55	0.74
STAAR English Reading	0.48	0.53	0.30	0.71
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.72	0.59	0.81
PARCC Reading	0.12	0.53	-0.50	0.94

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Males

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.86	0.84	0.77	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.71	0.60	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.58	0.44	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.69	0.66	0.54	0.76
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.78	0.74	0.64	0.82
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.67	0.55	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.65	0.52	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.67	0.67	0.55	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.55	0.62	0.49	0.73
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.61	0.48	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.59	0.45	0.70
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.53	0.38	0.66
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.58	0.36	0.74
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.36	0.09	0.58
	PARCC Reading	0.59	0.61	-0.27	0.93
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.66	0.54	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.79	0.77	0.68	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.57	0.42	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.54	0.39	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.49	0.33	0.63
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.66	0.53	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.62	0.48	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.63	0.50	0.73
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.52	0.56	0.42	0.68
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.54	0.40	0.66
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.46	0.30	0.60
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.53	0.38	0.65
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.61	0.40	0.76
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.53	0.30	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.75	0.88	0.37	0.98

Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.62	0.49	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.65	0.53	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.72	0.67	0.55	0.76
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.49	0.33	0.62
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.57	0.50	0.34	0.63
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.69	0.57	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.66	0.54	0.76
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.67	0.55	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.44	0.27	0.58
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.61	0.48	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.52	0.37	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.61	0.47	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.57	0.36	0.73
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.59	0.59	0.37	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.58	-0.31	0.93
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.67	0.55	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.57	0.42	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.48	0.52	0.36	0.65
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.64	0.51	0.74
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.56	0.53	0.38	0.66
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.51	0.35	0.64
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.49	0.50	0.34	0.63
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.50	0.54	0.39	0.66
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.41	0.24	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.46	0.30	0.60
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.51	0.35	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.34	0.16	0.50
	STAAR English Reading	0.51	0.49	0.25	0.67
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.41	0.23	-0.04	0.48
	PARCC Reading	0.25	0.46	-0.44	0.90
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.67	0.54	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.45	0.28	0.59

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.46	0.29	0.60
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.41	0.24	0.56
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.80	0.72	0.86
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.51	0.36	0.64
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.51	0.36	0.64
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.51	0.36	0.64
FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.41	0.24	0.55
APR3-Composite	0.62	0.56	0.42	0.68
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.58	0.57	0.43	0.68
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.49	0.33	0.62
STAAR English Reading	0.48	0.42	0.16	0.62
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.39	0.13	0.60
PARCC Reading	0.12	-0.38	-0.86	0.44

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.86	0.86	0.82	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.72	0.65	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.63	0.54	0.70
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.69	0.71	0.64	0.77
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.78	0.78	0.72	0.83
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.66	0.57	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.67	0.68	0.60	0.74
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.55	0.56	0.46	0.64
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.66	0.58	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.69
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.63	0.54	0.70
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.61	0.46	0.72
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.57	0.44	0.68
	PARCC Reading	0.59	0.59	0.05	0.86
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.70	0.63	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.79	0.80	0.74	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.60	0.51	0.68
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.56	0.47	0.65
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.54	0.43	0.62
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.64	0.56	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.61	0.52	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.63	0.54	0.70
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.52	0.52	0.42	0.61
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.60	0.51	0.68
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.53	0.43	0.62
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.59	0.50	0.67
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.55	0.39	0.68
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.59	0.46	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.75	0.75	0.33	0.92

Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.66	0.58	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.63	0.54	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.72	0.72	0.65	0.78
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.50	0.40	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.57	0.59	0.50	0.67
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.73	0.66	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.71	0.64	0.77
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.44	0.32	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.66	0.57	0.72
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.58	0.48	0.66
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.65	0.57	0.72
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.58	0.43	0.71
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.59	0.63	0.51	0.73
	PARCC Reading	0.74	0.74	0.31	0.92
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.54	0.44	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.48	0.46	0.35	0.56
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.67	0.59	0.74
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.56	0.57	0.47	0.65
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.48	0.37	0.58
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.49	0.47	0.36	0.57
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.50	0.49	0.39	0.59
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.36	0.24	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.47	0.37	0.57
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.46	0.35	0.55
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.43	0.32	0.53
	STAAR English Reading	0.51	0.49	0.32	0.64
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.41	0.40	0.24	0.54
	PARCC Reading	0.25	0.25	-0.35	0.70
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.70	0.62	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.50	0.39	0.59

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.55	0.45	0.64
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.51	0.41	0.60
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.81	0.76	0.85
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.58	0.48	0.66
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.57	0.47	0.65
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.57	0.48	0.66
FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.38	0.26	0.49
APR3-Composite	0.62	0.62	0.53	0.70
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.58	0.58	0.49	0.66
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.59	0.49	0.67
STAAR English Reading	0.48	0.45	0.27	0.60
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.60	0.47	0.71
PARCC Reading	0.12	0.12	-0.44	0.61

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 3 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.86	0.91	0.79	0.96
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.76	0.51	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.64	0.72	0.44	0.87
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.69	0.41	0.00	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.78	0.74	0.47	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.68	0.68	0.36	0.85
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.66	0.72	0.43	0.87
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.67	0.61	0.25	0.82
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.55	0.52	0.12	0.77
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.84	0.66	0.93
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.62	0.75	0.48	0.89
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.82	0.61	0.92
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.86	0.54	0.96
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.51	-0.14	0.85
	PARCC Reading	0.59	NA	NA	NA
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.69	0.51	0.12	0.76
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.79	0.78	0.54	0.90
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.35	-0.08	0.66
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.54	0.25	-0.18	0.60
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.51	0.25	-0.19	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.63	0.51	0.11	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.60	0.45	0.03	0.73
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.61	0.41	-0.02	0.71
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.52	0.55	0.17	0.79
	APR3-Composite	0.60	0.55	0.18	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.52	0.48	0.08	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.51	0.11	0.77
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.59	-0.02	0.88
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.57	0.26	-0.40	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.75	NA	NA	NA

Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.65	0.44	0.04	0.72
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.61	0.26	0.81
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.72	0.69	0.39	0.86
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.23	-0.20	0.59
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.57	0.28	-0.15	0.62
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.72	0.68	0.36	0.86
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.70	0.59	0.22	0.81
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.61	0.26	0.82
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.45	0.61	0.25	0.82
	APR3-Composite	0.65	0.61	0.26	0.82
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.57	0.54	0.17	0.78
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.50	0.10	0.76
	STAAR English Reading	0.58	0.58	-0.03	0.88
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.59	-0.10	-0.66	0.53
	PARCC Reading	0.74	NA	NA	NA
Phonemic Awareness					
	ISIP-Overall	0.68	0.76	0.51	0.89
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.65	0.32	0.84
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.48	0.67	0.36	0.85
	ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.66	0.46	0.05	0.73
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.56	0.47	0.08	0.74
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.71	0.41	0.87
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.49	0.78	0.54	0.90
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.50	0.67	0.35	0.85
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.53	0.14	0.78
	APR3-Composite	0.49	0.75	0.48	0.89
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.47	0.67	0.35	0.85
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.45	0.65	0.31	0.84
	STAAR English Reading	0.51	0.73	0.23	0.93
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.41	0.49	-0.15	0.84
	PARCC Reading	0.25	NA	NA	NA
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.70	0.79	0.56	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.49	0.47	0.07	0.74

ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.56	0.65	0.33	0.84
ISIP-Phonemic Awareness	0.49	0.18	-0.25	0.55
ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.93	0.84	0.97
FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.39	-0.04	0.69
FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.57	0.46	0.05	0.74
FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.56	0.42	0.00	0.72
FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.24	-0.21	0.60
APR3-Composite	0.62	0.66	0.34	0.84
APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.58	0.56	0.19	0.79
APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.65	0.31	0.84
STAAR English Reading	0.48	0.91	0.69	0.98
STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.43	-0.23	0.82
PARCC Reading	0.12	NA	NA	NA

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Females

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.84	0.81	0.74	0.87
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.62	0.49	0.72
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.55	0.55	0.40	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.68	0.68	0.56	0.77
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.68	0.56	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.66	0.54	0.75
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.69	0.58	0.78
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.47	0.51	0.36	0.63
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.70	0.59	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.67	0.56	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.64	0.52	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.46	0.24	0.63
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.59	0.35	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.21	0.08	-0.72	0.78
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.71	0.60	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.76	0.67	0.83
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.54	0.50	0.34	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.69	0.58	0.78
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.56	0.42	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.56	0.42	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.57	0.56	0.42	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.32	0.32	0.15	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.75	0.66	0.82
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.64	0.67	0.56	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.72	0.62	0.80
	STAAR English Reading	0.53	0.58	0.39	0.72
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.56	0.32	0.74
	PARCC Reading	0.15	0.05	-0.73	0.77
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.57	0.43	0.69

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.53	0.38	0.65
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.59	0.46	0.70
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.47	0.31	0.60
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.61	0.47	0.71
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.62	0.49	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.61	0.48	0.71
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.37	0.19	0.51
	APR3-Composite	0.56	0.55	0.40	0.66
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.56	0.42	0.67
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.50	0.35	0.63
	STAAR English Reading	0.47	0.42	0.20	0.61
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.30	0.27	-0.03	0.53
	PARCC Reading	0.23	0.39	-0.52	0.88
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.65	0.52	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.59	0.45	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.38	0.42	0.26	0.56
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.82	0.75	0.87
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.52	0.37	0.64
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.49	0.34	0.62
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.50	0.35	0.62
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.24	0.31	0.13	0.46
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.69	0.59	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.70	0.59	0.78
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.63	0.50	0.73
	STAAR English Reading	0.57	0.56	0.36	0.71
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.50	0.24	0.70
	PARCC Reading	0.16	-0.08	-0.79	0.72

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Males

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall	ISIP-Overall	0.84	0.86	0.80	0.90
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.58	0.42	0.70
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.55	0.55	0.39	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.68	0.68	0.56	0.77
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.71	0.60	0.79
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.61	0.48	0.72
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.69	0.58	0.78
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.47	0.42	0.25	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.70	0.59	0.79
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.67	0.55	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.64	0.52	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.64	0.48	0.77
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.52	0.23	0.72
	PARCC Reading	0.21	0.20	-0.65	0.83
Reading Comprehension	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.60	0.46	0.72
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.65	0.51	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.54	0.57	0.42	0.69
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.52	0.36	0.65
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.55	0.40	0.67
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.53	0.38	0.65
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.57	0.55	0.40	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.32	0.31	0.13	0.47
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.70	0.59	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.64	0.60	0.47	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.67	0.56	0.77
	STAAR English Reading	0.53	0.49	0.28	0.66
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.63	0.38	0.79
	PARCC Reading	0.15	-0.19	-0.83	0.65
Reading Fluency	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.61	0.47	0.72

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.50	0.33	0.64
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.56	0.40	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.44	0.27	0.59
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.57	0.42	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.54	0.39	0.66
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.53	0.38	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.38	0.20	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.56	0.56	0.41	0.67
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.39	0.22	0.54
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.57	0.43	0.69
	STAAR English Reading	0.47	0.53	0.33	0.69
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.30	0.31	-0.01	0.58
	PARCC Reading	0.23	-0.22	-0.84	0.64
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.71	0.59	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.49	0.32	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.38	0.34	0.15	0.50
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.81	0.73	0.87
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.47	0.31	0.61
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.39	0.22	0.54
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.46	0.30	0.60
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.24	0.17	-0.02	0.34
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.63	0.50	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.65	0.52	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.55	0.41	0.67
	STAAR English Reading	0.57	0.58	0.39	0.72
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.59	0.35	0.76
	PARCC Reading	0.16	0.80	0.13	0.97

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.84	0.84	0.79	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.55	0.53	0.42	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.68	0.67	0.59	0.74
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.68	0.60	0.75
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.62	0.53	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.68	0.60	0.75
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.47	0.42	0.30	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.70	0.63	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.68	0.60	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.65	0.56	0.72
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.56	0.42	0.67
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.56	0.38	0.69
	PARCC Reading	0.21	0.21	-0.36	0.67
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.67	0.58	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.71	0.64	0.78
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.54	0.53	0.42	0.63
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.61	0.51	0.69
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.55	0.45	0.64
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.54	0.43	0.63
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.57	0.56	0.45	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.32	0.31	0.18	0.43
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.72	0.65	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.64	0.64	0.55	0.71
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.69	0.61	0.76
	STAAR English Reading	0.53	0.51	0.36	0.63
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	0.61	0.45	0.73
	PARCC Reading	0.15	0.15	-0.41	0.63
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.57	0.47	0.66

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.52	0.40	0.61
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.57	0.46	0.65
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.42	0.30	0.53
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.58	0.48	0.66
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.58	0.49	0.67
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.56	0.46	0.65
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.37	0.24	0.48
	APR3-Composite	0.56	0.54	0.44	0.63
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.48	0.37	0.58
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.53	0.42	0.62
	STAAR English Reading	0.47	0.43	0.27	0.57
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.30	0.29	0.07	0.48
	PARCC Reading	0.23	0.23	-0.34	0.68
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.66	0.57	0.73
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.54	0.43	0.63
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.38	0.36	0.23	0.48
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.82	0.77	0.86
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.48	0.37	0.58
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.43	0.31	0.53
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.46	0.35	0.56
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.24	0.18	0.04	0.31
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.67	0.58	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.68	0.60	0.74
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.59	0.50	0.68
	STAAR English Reading	0.57	0.58	0.44	0.69
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	0.58	0.41	0.71
	PARCC Reading	0.16	0.16	-0.41	0.63

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 4 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.84	0.85	0.58	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.64	0.17	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.55	0.83	0.53	0.94
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.68	0.76	0.41	0.92
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.70	0.82	0.56	0.93
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.64	0.81	0.55	0.93
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.70	0.83	0.57	0.94
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.47	0.72	0.37	0.89
	APR3-Composite	0.71	0.82	0.56	0.93
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.68	0.68	0.30	0.88
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.65	0.79	0.49	0.92
	STAAR English Reading	0.55	0.62	0.16	0.86
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	NA	NA	NA
	PARCC Reading	0.21	NA	NA	NA
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.79	0.45	0.93
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.72	0.79	0.44	0.93
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.54	0.77	0.40	0.92
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.61	0.74	0.37	0.91
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.56	0.75	0.43	0.91
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.74	0.41	0.90
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.57	0.74	0.41	0.90
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.32	0.57	0.13	0.83
	APR3-Composite	0.74	0.86	0.65	0.95
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.64	0.74	0.41	0.90
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.71	0.83	0.59	0.94
	STAAR English Reading	0.53	0.69	0.28	0.89
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.60	NA	NA	NA
	PARCC Reading	0.15	NA	NA	NA
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.60	0.92	0.76	0.97

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.81	0.50	0.94
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.58	0.81	0.48	0.94
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.46	0.86	0.62	0.95
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.83	0.58	0.94
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.75	0.42	0.91
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.58	0.77	0.47	0.91
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.37	0.45	-0.03	0.77
	APR3-Composite	0.56	0.87	0.66	0.95
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.49	0.69	0.32	0.88
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.87	0.67	0.95
	STAAR English Reading	0.47	0.81	0.51	0.93
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.30	NA	NA	NA
	PARCC Reading	0.23	NA	NA	NA
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.84	0.56	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.54	0.67	0.21	0.88
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.38	0.76	0.39	0.92
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.82	0.79	0.47	0.93
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.50	0.65	0.25	0.86
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.44	0.64	0.24	0.86
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.48	0.67	0.28	0.87
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.24	0.60	0.16	0.84
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.80	0.52	0.93
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.67	0.70	0.32	0.88
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.59	0.78	0.47	0.91
	STAAR English Reading	0.57	0.68	0.25	0.88
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.55	NA	NA	NA
	PARCC Reading	0.16	NA	NA	NA

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5 Females

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.92	0.91	0.85	0.95
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.70	0.53	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47	0.49	0.24	0.67
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.80	0.80	0.68	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.64	0.47	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.69	0.54	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.65	0.48	0.77
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.48	0.27	0.65
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.63	0.46	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.58	0.39	0.72
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.57	0.38	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.68	0.40	0.85
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.63	0.71	0.47	0.85
	PARCC Reading	0.41	0.16	-0.56	0.75
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.75	0.60	0.85
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.71	0.54	0.82
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.43	0.34	0.07	0.57
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.70	0.75	0.60	0.85
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.63	0.46	0.76
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.69	0.54	0.80
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59	0.70	0.55	0.81
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.27	0.37	0.14	0.56
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.60	0.42	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.46	0.25	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.57	0.38	0.71
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.81	0.61	0.91
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.68	0.67	0.41	0.83
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.33	-0.43	0.82
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.53	0.29	0.70

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.60	0.38	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49	0.44	0.18	0.64
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.50	0.36	0.10	0.57
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55	0.39	0.16	0.58
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.48	0.27	0.65
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.41	0.19	0.60
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.34	0.11	0.54
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.40	0.17	0.58
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.42	0.29	0.05	0.50
Vocabulary	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.37	0.14	0.56
	STAAR English Reading	0.35	0.42	0.04	0.70
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.54	0.23	0.75
	PARCC Reading	0.25	0.05	-0.63	0.69
	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.77	0.63	0.86
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.68	0.50	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.46	0.41	0.15	0.62
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.88	0.85	0.76	0.91
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.53	0.33	0.68
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.54	0.53	0.33	0.68
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.54	0.52	0.32	0.67
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.38	0.16	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.63	0.47	0.76
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.63	0.46	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.55	0.36	0.70
	STAAR English Reading	0.65	0.71	0.45	0.85
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.65	0.73	0.51	0.86
	PARCC Reading	0.12	-0.07	-0.70	0.62

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5 Males

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall	Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
		Coefficient		Lower	Upper
Overall					
	ISIP-Overall	0.92	0.93	0.88	0.96
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68	0.68	0.49	0.80
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47	0.47	0.21	0.66
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.80	0.79	0.67	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66	0.68	0.53	0.78
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67	0.65	0.49	0.77
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65	0.64	0.48	0.76
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.39	0.17	0.57
	APR3-Composite	0.66	0.67	0.53	0.78
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61	0.62	0.45	0.75
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.66	0.50	0.77
	STAAR English Reading	0.61	0.55	0.26	0.75
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.63	0.58	0.29	0.77
	PARCC Reading	0.41	0.64	-0.36	0.95
Reading Comprehension					
	ISIP-Overall	0.67	0.62	0.41	0.77
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64	0.60	0.38	0.75
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.43	0.50	0.26	0.69
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.70	0.66	0.47	0.79
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60	0.59	0.42	0.73
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59	0.55	0.37	0.69
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59	0.53	0.34	0.68
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.27	0.30	0.07	0.49
	APR3-Composite	0.68	0.74	0.61	0.83
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55	0.64	0.48	0.76
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66	0.75	0.62	0.83
	STAAR English Reading	0.62	0.50	0.19	0.72
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.68	0.71	0.48	0.84
	PARCC Reading	0.56	0.90	0.35	0.99
Reading Fluency					
	ISIP-Overall	0.62	0.68	0.49	0.81

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55	0.51	0.27	0.69
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49	0.55	0.32	0.72
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.50	0.61	0.40	0.76
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55	0.66	0.50	0.77
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56	0.61	0.44	0.74
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52	0.58	0.41	0.72
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42	0.46	0.25	0.62
	APR3-Composite	0.52	0.60	0.43	0.73
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.42	0.47	0.27	0.63
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50	0.61	0.44	0.74
	STAAR English Reading	0.35	0.30	-0.05	0.58
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56	0.59	0.31	0.78
	PARCC Reading	0.25	0.28	-0.69	0.89
Vocabulary					
	ISIP-Overall	0.79	0.84	0.73	0.91
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61	0.58	0.36	0.74
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.46	0.50	0.25	0.68
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.88	0.91	0.85	0.95
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57	0.62	0.45	0.74
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.54	0.56	0.38	0.70
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.54	0.57	0.39	0.71
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33	0.34	0.12	0.53
	APR3-Composite	0.64	0.66	0.51	0.77
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65	0.68	0.53	0.78
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58	0.63	0.46	0.75
	STAAR English Reading	0.65	0.60	0.33	0.79
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.65	0.58	0.30	0.77
	PARCC Reading	0.12	0.35	-0.64	0.90

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5 Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.92		
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68		
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47		
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.80		
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66		
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67		
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65		
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42		
	APR3-Composite	0.66		
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61		
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61		
	STAAR English Reading	0.61		
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.63		
	PARCC Reading	0.41		
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.67		
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64		
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.43		
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.70		
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60		
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59		
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59		
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.27		
	APR3-Composite	0.68		
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55		
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66		
	STAAR English Reading	0.62		
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.68		
	PARCC Reading	0.56		
Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62		

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.50
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.52
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.42
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50
	STAAR English Reading	0.35
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56
	PARCC Reading	0.25
Vocabulary		
	ISIP-Overall	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.46
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.54
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.54
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33
	APR3-Composite	0.64
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58
	STAAR English Reading	0.65
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.65
	PARCC Reading	0.12

Predictive-related evidence for validity MOY ISIP to EOY Assessment Grade 5 Not Free/Reduced Lunch

MOY ISIP Español	EOY Assessment	Overall Coefficient	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Overall				
	ISIP-Overall	0.92		
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.68		
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.47		
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.80		
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.66		
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.67		
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.65		
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42		
	APR3-Composite	0.66		
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.61		
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.61		
	STAAR English Reading	0.61		
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.63		
	PARCC Reading	0.41		
Reading Comprehension				
	ISIP-Overall	0.67		
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.64		
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.43		
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.70		
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.60		
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.59		
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.59		
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.27		
	APR3-Composite	0.68		
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.55		
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.66		
	STAAR English Reading	0.62		
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.68		
	PARCC Reading	0.56		
Reading Fluency				
	ISIP-Overall	0.62		

	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.55
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.49
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.50
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.55
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.56
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.52
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.42
	APR3-Composite	0.52
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.42
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.50
	STAAR English Reading	0.35
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.56
	PARCC Reading	0.25
Vocabulary		
	ISIP-Overall	0.79
	ISIP-Reading Comprehension	0.61
	ISIP-Reading Fluency	0.46
	ISIP-Vocabulary	0.88
	FB-Passage 1 WRC	0.57
	FB-Passage 2 WRC	0.54
	FB-Passage 3 WRC	0.54
	FB-Median Accuracy	0.33
	APR3-Composite	0.64
	APR3-Reading Vocabulary	0.65
	APR3-Reading Comprehension	0.58
	STAAR English Reading	0.65
	STAAR Spanish Reading	0.65
	PARCC Reading	0.12
