Appendix B: Full Review Findings for Assessments

	1	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
	Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
5 ESSENTIALS	⚠️ The developers reference how equity was considered in the development of the assessment, but it is not centered in the assessment or materials.	✔️ Almost all items are strength based.	⚠️ The survey includes items focused on student experiences, but largely focuses on academic experiences and does not include items about student belonging or cultural identity.	✔️ The developer clearly states the purpose of the assessment.	✔️ The assessment offers versions for students, teachers and staff, and families.	❌ The developer does not report conducting cognitive interviews.	⚠️ The developer has versions of the assessment adjusted for different age groups.	⚠️ The pilot included schools with diverse characteristics across IL. The pilot did not collect any information on whether students identify as LGBTQ+.	✔️ The developer provides Rasch analysis with mean square residual values indicating a good fit.	❌ The developer does not include information on how items are reliable across different groups.	✔️ The developer offers reports to participating schools. Student data can be disaggregated at the measure level rather than for individual questions.	⚠️ The reporting site includes resources for responding to results, but without access, it is unclear if they are research-based or rooted in equity. The developer offers support for practice changes through a professional learning program.

	1	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
	Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
CATALYZE	✔️ The developers clearly acknowledge how systemic inequities affect SEAD and center equity in the assessment.	✔️ All items are strength based.	⚠️ This assessment is for adults working in a school, and does include some items about student experiences, but does not include any focus on student belonging or cultural identity.	✔️ The developer clearly states the purpose of the assessment and the context in which it should be used.	❌ The assessment only offers a version for teachers and staff.	⚠️ The developer reports conducting cognitive interviews but does not report demographic information about the participants.	⚠️ The developer reports revising language after conducting interviews and Rasch analysis.	❌ Pilot testing has not yet been completed.	❌ The developer does not provide any information on the validation of latent variables.	❌ The assessment is still in the piloting stage and reliability for different groups has not been reported.	✔️ The developer offers a tool for subscribers that includes data visualization and disaggregation of data by student group.	✔️ The developer provides practice guides with equity-focused, research-based strategies to respond to results.

	1	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
	Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
CULTIVATE	✔️ The Cultivate landing page clearly highlights the purpose of the assessment being aimed at recognizing students' assets and eliminating structural barriers.	✔️ Almost all items are strength based.	✔️ The assessment items largely focus on student experiences that impact SEAD.	✔️ The developer provides detailed information about the purpose of the assessment and the context(s) in which it should be used.	❌ The assessment only has a version for students.	✔️ The developer reports conducting cognitive interviews with racially and ethnically diverse students.	✔️ The developers worked with a large panel of expert researchers and practitioners to develop items that are appropriate in both content and language for the intended respondents.	✔️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students and collected information about students' gender, eligibility for Free and Reduced Lunch, language spoken at home, and disability status.	⚠️ The developer describes Rasch analysis used to validate items but does not provide specific measures.	✔️ The developer analyzed Differential Item Functioning across grade levels, subjects, and demographic characteristics, with a high degree of fit. Several misfitting items were dropped in the most recent version of the survey.	✔️ The developer provides an easy-to-use tool that allows educators to disaggregate assessment data and generate data visualizations.	✔️ The developer provides practice guides with equity-focused, research-based strategies to respond to results.

	1	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
	Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
DESSA	❌ The assessment focuses on identifying students with skill deficits that need targeted support rather than recognizing and correcting systemic inequities.	✔️ All items are strength based.	❌ The assessment focuses on student behaviors and skills and does not focus on student experiences that impact SEAD.	❌ The developer states that the purpose of the assessment is to support students and cultivate a positive school climate, but the assessment includes a focus on the identification and diagnosis of students, which is not appropriate for a SEAD assessment.	⚠️ The assessment offers teacher and student versions, but no version for families.	✔️ In our conversations with the developer, they reported conducting cognitive interviews with diverse students, but this information is not included in their published documentation.	⚠️ The developer has versions of the assessment adjusted for different age groups.	⚠️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students and students from low-income backgrounds.	❌ The developer does not provide any information on the validation of latent variables, relying instead on correlation with other assessments and with students receiving special education services in the "seriously emotionally disturbed" category.	❌ The developer does not include information on how items are reliable across different groups.	✔️ The developer offers a platform that allows for the visualization and disaggregation of data.	⚠️ The developer provides research-based strategies for responding to results, but they are not fully rooted in equity as they focus on building student skills and do not include a focus on students' experiences or needed supports.

	1 Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	2. Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	3. Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	4. Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	5. Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	6. Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	7. Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	8. Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	9. Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	10. Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	11. Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	12. Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
ELEVATE	⚠️ The developers use equity framing, but there is no clear acknowledgement of systemic inequities or recognition of the assets of traditionally under-represented students.	✔️ Almost all items are strength based.	✔️ The assessment items largely focus on student experiences that impact SEAD.	✔️ The developer gives a clear purpose for the assessment and the context in which it should be used.	❌ The assessment only has a version for students.	⚠️ PERTS conducted cognitive interviews with some middle and high school students to test some, but not all, of their items.	✔️ Measures were developed with extensive input from teachers, students, and researchers to ensure that items were appropriate for students in grades 6-12.	✔️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students, and a further study also included students from low-income families, English Learners, and students with disabilities.	❌ The developer does not provide any information on the validation of latent variables.	❌ The developer does not include information on how items are reliable across different groups.	✔️ The developer offers a platform to help teachers understand and disaggregate data.	✔️ The assessment reports include research-based, equity-focused strategies and guides for each learning condition with resources and cited research.

	1	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
	Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
INVENTORY OF SCHOOL CLIMATE	⚠️ Equity is centered in the assessment and there is acknowledgement of systemic inequities that impact SEAD, but the developers do not highlight how the assessment can be used to address inequities.	⚠️ Many of the items are strength based.	✔️ The assessment largely focuses on student experiences that impact SEAD.	⚠️ The developer clearly states the purpose of the assessment and offers some suggestions on the contexts in which it should be used.	❌ The assessment only has a version for students.	❌ The developer does not report conducting cognitive interviews.	✔️ The developer reports using research-based items from literature and adjusting wording after pilot testing.	⚠️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students and students from low-income families, but the developer does not fully report the demographics of participants.	✔️ A further study of the assessment showed an RMSEA with a good fit at 0.03 (note that the study was conducted outside the US).[1]	✔️ The developers provide analysis showing that assessment items function similarly across groups of students.	❌ The developer does not offer a tool for understanding assessment data.	⚠️ The developer provides some general equity-focused suggestions of how the outcomes connect to policy and practice.

1. Kapıkıran-Acun, N., & Kapıkıran, Ş. (2010). School climate inventory: Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and reliability-validity. aEgitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 42, 117-134

	1 Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	2. Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	3. Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	4. Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	5. Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	6. Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	7. Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	8. Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	9. Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	10. Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	11. Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	12. Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
NJ SCHOOL CLIMATE IMPROVEMENT SURVEY	⚠️ Equity is strongly centered in the assessment and implementation guidance, including racial equity as well as equity for LGBTQ+ students, but there is no clear acknowledgement of how systemic inequities impact SEAD.	⚠️ Many of the items are strength based.	✔️ The assessment items largely focus on student experiences that impact SEAD.	✔️ The developer provides detailed information about the purpose of the assessment and the context(s) in which it should be used.	✔️ The assessment offers versions for students, teachers and staff, and families.	❌ The developer does not report conducting cognitive interviews.	⚠️ The developer reports revising language during validation and consulting experts on age-appropriate language only for the section on gender identity.	✔️ The pilot included school districts with diverse characteristics across the state of NJ. The pilot specifically included questions about whether students identified as transgender or nonbinary.	✔️ The developer provides an RMSEA with a good fit for each version of the survey.	❌ The developer does not include information on how items are reliable across different groups.	✔️ The developer offers a platform for NJ schools that allows for the disaggregation of data and embeds the data alongside school improvement goals and resources.	✔️ The developer provides a strategy guide with equity-focused, research-based resources, which are also embedded in the data platform.

	1 Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	2. Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	3. Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	4. Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	5. Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	6. Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	7. Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	8. Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	9. Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	10. Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	11. Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	12. Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
PANORAMA SEL SURVEY	⚠️ The developers center equity in some parts of the assessment, but there is no clear acknowledgement of systemic inequities or recognition of the assets of traditionally under-represented students.	⚠️ Many of the items are strength based.	✔️ The survey includes items about students' experiences, in addition to skills and competencies.	✔️ The developer includes the overall goals of the assessment but should be clearer about exactly who should use the results and for what specific purpose.	✔️ The assessment offers teacher and student versions, but no version for families.	❌ The developer reports conducting cognitive interviews with diverse students, but not all sections of the assessment were included.	⚠️ The developer reports that research and experts were consulted in developing age-appropriate language for items.	✔️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students, as well as English Learners and students from low-income families.	✔️ The developer provides an RMSEA for each category of the survey, with a good fit of 0.08 or below for all sections apart from one.	❌ The developer does not include information on how items are reliable across different groups.	✔️ The developer offers a tool for subscribers that includes data visualization and disaggregation of data by student group.	✔️ The openly accessible materials have minimal policy and practice connections. The developer reports that the subscription platform provides strategies and corresponding research based on assessment results, but without access, it is unclear whether they are rooted in equity.

	1 Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	2. Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	3. Does the assess-ment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	4. Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	5. Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	6. Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	7. Are the items written with lan-guage appropriate for the intended audience?	8. Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	9. Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	10. Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	11. Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	12. Have developers clearly identified how assess-ment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
SELF-ASSESSING SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL INSTRUCTION AND COMPETENCIES	✔️ The developers clearly acknowledge how systemic inequities affect SEAD and center equity in the assessment.	✔️ All items are strength based.	✔️ This assessment is for teachers, but the items focus on how teacher actions affect student experiences.	✔️ The developer provides detailed information about the purpose of the assessment and the context in which it should be used.	❌ The assessment only offers a version for teachers.	❌ The developer does not report conducting cognitive interviews.	❌ No information is provided on how the language was developed to be appropriate for the target audience.	❌ Pilot testing has not been conducted, but the developer encourages users to pilot-test the assessment in consultation with the developer.	❌ The assessment has not been validated.	❌ The assessment has not been piloted or validated.	⚠️ The developer offers a guide for teachers to manually self-score and reflect on their practice.	✔️ The developer provides detailed equity-focused and research-based resources and information about how each section of the assessment connects to policy and practice.

	1 Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	2. Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	3. Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	4. Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	5. Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	6. Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	7. Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	8. Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	9. Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	10. Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	11. Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	12. Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
SCHOOL CLIMATE FOR DIVERSITY	✔️ The developers clearly acknowledge how systemic inequities affect SEAD and center equity in the assessment.	⚠️ Many of the items are strength based.	✔️ The assessment items largely focus on student experiences and how race and ethnicity impact SEAD.	⚠️ The developer clearly states the purpose of the assessment but does not offer full guidance on who should use it or in which context(s) it should be used.	❌ The assessment only has a version for students.	✔️ The developer reports conducting interviews and focus groups with diverse students.	✔️ The developer reports consulting experts in developing age-appropriate language for items.	⚠️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students.	✔️ The assessment has an RMSEA with a good fit at 0.038.	❌ The developer does not include this information but suggests it as an area for further study.	❌ The developer does not offer a tool for understanding assessment data.	✔️ The developer provides some general equity-focused suggestions of how the outcomes connect to policy and practice.

	1 Do the developers center equity in the purpose and intended use of the assessment?	2. Do all or most items in the assessment use a strength-based lens?	3. Does the assessment include an array of items to capture the full picture of students' experiences?	4. Are developers clear about the context in which the assessment should be used?	5. Does the developer offer a set of assessments to capture multiple perspectives?	6. Were assessment items probed/validated via interviews with diverse groups of the intended respondent type?	7. Are the items written with language appropriate for the intended audience?	8. Was the assessment piloted with diverse participants?	9. Have latent variables been psychometrically validated with a statistical measure showing good fit?	10. Is the assessment reliable across diverse groups of respondents?	11. Do the developers offer a tool to easily interpret and understand the assessment data?	12. Have developers clearly identified how assessment results are connected to policy and practice decisions?
USED SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY	⚠️ Equity is not centered in the assessment, but the developer provides resources on how to use the results to address inequities.	⚠️ Many of the items are strength based.	✔️ The assessment items largely focus on student experiences that impact SEAD.	✔️ The developer provides detailed information about the purpose of the assessment and the context(s) in which it should be used.	✔️ The assessment offers versions for students, teachers and staff, and families.	⚠️ The developer reports conducting cognitive interviews but does not report demographic information about the participants.	⚠️ The developer reports eliminating linguistically challenging items after pilot testing.	⚠️ The pilot included racially and ethnically diverse students and students from low-income backgrounds.	✔️ The RMSEA for two of the three survey sections does not meet the standard for a good fit, but most survey items were within the standard for item fit using Rasch analysis.	✔️ The developers provide analyses showing that items function similarly across groups of students.	✔️ The developer offers data reports and data can be disaggregated by grade, race, and gender. They also provide a data interpretation guide.	✔️ The developer provides a data interpretation guide with equity-focused, research-based strategies to respond to results.