

## A Profile of State Assessment Programs

Since 2003, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has been sponsoring research which focuses on comparing the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state proficiency standards. Documents which discuss the research on NAEP and state proficiency standards are available at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping.asp>. As part of this research, NCES developed methodology to show where states' Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards fit on the NAEP scale. This methodology offers an approximate, but credible, indication of the relative stringency of the states' AYP standards. While the mapped NAEP equivalent scores are useful in determining the relative rigor of state proficiency standards, the results of the studies should be interpreted with caution. Variations among states can be due to many factors, including differences in assessment frameworks, test specifications, the psychometric properties of the tests, the definition of AYP standards, and the standard-setting process.

In collaboration with the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC)—Task Force on Assessment, of the Council of Chief State School Officers, and in conjunction with the release of the 2007 results of the mapping study, NCES conducted a survey of state assessment programs to provide contextual information to document general state assessment program information. The NAEP State Coordinator in every state was asked to gather information from relevant sources about the state's unique testing program and to input this information into an online system for analysis and summary. Information regarding the grades and subjects tested during the 2006-07 year, state performance levels and performance level descriptors, the composition of main state assessments, and changes to the state assessments between 2004-05 and 2006-07 was compiled. After this information was verified and confirmed by the NAEP State Coordinator of each state, it was summarized in individual state profiles and tabulated in the eight-block format described below. The first block combines all subjects. The remaining blocks (2-8) are presented twice, first for Reading/Language Arts and then for Mathematics. The example that follows is for Reading/Language Arts only.

**Block 1** summarizes information about each state’s testing program: the name of the program, the different assessments, the type and format of each assessment, the grades and subjects tested, and the purpose of each assessment. With regard to the assessment purpose, response options were: instructional, student accountability, school accountability, staff accountability, and other. Additional information provided by NAEP State Coordinators summarizing their states’ testing programs and the purposes of the assessments is included at the end of the block.

## State

### Proficiency Assessments for State Students

1

Component	Test		Grades Tested												Test Purpose <sup>1</sup>					
	Type	Format	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Instructional	Student Accountability	School Accountability	Staff Accountability	Other
<b>Reading</b>																				
Proficiency Assessments for State Students (PASS)	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
Proficiency Assessments for State Students- Alternate (PASS-Alt)	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
<b>Writing</b>																				
PASS	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
PASS-Alt	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
<b>Mathematics</b>																				
PASS	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
PASS-Alt	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
<b>Science</b>																				
PASS	Regular	CRT					√							√		√				[2]
PASS-Alt	Alternate	CRT					√							√		√				[2]

1 Example purposes: Instructional: student diagnosis, student placement, instructional planning, program evaluation, improvement of instruction for groups of students, etc.  
 Student Accountability: student awards/recognition, honors diploma, student promotion/retention, required remediation, exit requirement, etc.  
 School Accountability: monetary awards/penalties, school accreditation, school performance reporting, high school skills guarantee, school improvement plans, etc.  
 Staff Accountability: staff awards/recognition, salary increases, staff dismissal, staff evaluation or certification, staff monetary penalties, etc.

2 LEAs have the option and discretion on whether or not to include state assessment results as input to their secondary level body of evidence systems, diploma endorsements, etc.

**Block 2** summarizes information about the composition of the main state assessments in 2006-07 for grades 4 and 8 in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. The percentages displayed are based on the types of items, unless otherwise noted. Additional information about the timing of the assessments and whether assessments measured skills acquired only in prior grades is included in this section.

**Block 3** summarizes information about the assessment(s) and performance levels used by the state in 2006-07 for state accountability in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics in grades 4 and 8, as well as the assessment(s) and performance levels used to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

**State**

**Reading/Language Arts**

**2**

**Composition and Administration of the Main Reading/Language Arts Test in 2006-07**

	Multiple Choice	Short Constructed Response	Extended Constructed Response	Performance Tasks	Other
Grade 4 Test	85%	10%	5%	0%	0%
Grade 8 Test	85%	10%	5%	0%	0%
During the 2006-07 academic year:					
a. When was the assessment administered?		Spring 2007			
b. Did any of the assessments measure skills from the previous grade?		No.			

**3**

**Performance Levels and AYP**

Performance levels used during the 2006-07 year	Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced
Test used for AYP determination	State CRTs (PASS and PASS-Alt)
Performance level used for AYP	Proficient
Other tests used for AYP determination	PASS-Alt results. The Proficient performance level is determined by alternate achievement standards.
Test used for state accountability	State CRTs (PASS and PASS-Alt)
Performance level used for state accountability	Proficient
First implementation of performance standards for the 2006-07 assessments	July 2003
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2006-07 academic year	—

**Block 4** provides the performance level descriptors used for meeting AYP in 2006-07 for the main Reading and Mathematics assessments in grades 4 and 8. The descriptors correspond to the *proficient* performance level as it is defined by each state.

**Block 5** summarizes differences in testing accommodations between the state’s assessment and NAEP during the 2006-07 testing year. The first section of this block lists accommodations allowed on the state assessment but not on NAEP, and the second section lists accommodations allowed on NAEP which were not allowed on the state assessment.

**Block 6** presents changes to the main state assessment in Reading and Mathematics between the 2004-05 and 2006-07 school years. For many states, additional information about these changes is included in a note below the block.

**State** **Reading/Language Arts**

**Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress**

**4**

Grade 4 Proficient: Students at the proficient level read a variety of grade-appropriate texts; make relevant connections within texts; cite appropriate evidence for inferences; and demonstrate the ability to extend connections beyond the obvious. Students read a variety of grade-appropriate text; show an accurate understanding of the text; explain the relevance of ideas and details to commonly understood concepts; explain the relevance of literary elements to a story’s plot; select sufficient examples to support claims about main idea; select sufficient examples to support claims about a story’s use of literary elements; explain a conclusion with a sufficient amount of information drawn from the text.

Grade 8 Proficient: Students at the proficient level read a variety of texts; demonstrate understanding of organization; make complex connections between the text and themselves, the text and the world, and between other sources; provide explanations regarding an author’s purpose; explains how story elements are utilized in text; predict outcomes; and cites appropriate evidence as it relates to consequences. Students read a variety of grade-appropriate text; demonstrate an accurate understanding of the text; explain author’s purpose; explain the relevance of ideas and details to the text’s organization; explain the relevance of ideas and details to commonly understood concepts; explain the relevance of literary elements to a story’s plot and theme; select sufficient examples to support claims about the relevance and importance of information; select sufficient examples to support claims about main idea and organization; select sufficient examples to support claims about a story’s use of literary elements and structure; explain a conclusion with a sufficient amount of information drawn from the text.

**Accommodation Differences between NAEP and the Main State Test**

**5**

State accommodations not on NAEP	Student uses color overlays to reduce glare or enhance text. Student uses a computer monitor screen cover. Student uses tactile graphics. Student uses audio amplification devices including and/or in addition to hearing aids to increase clarity. Student uses speech-to-text conversion or voice recognition during the Reading, Mathematics, or Science subtests. Student uses a tape recorder to record test responses rather than writing on a paper during the Reading, Mathematics, or Science subtests. Student takes the tests at the time of day when he or she is most likely to demonstrate peak performance. A subtest must be completed in single testing session. URL: <a href="http://www.k12.ss.us/PASS/docs/AccommodationsManual.pdf">http://www.k12.ss.us/PASS/docs/AccommodationsManual.pdf</a>
NAEP accommodations not on state assessment	—

**Changes to State Assessments between 2005 and 2007**

**6**

Added grades	Eliminated grades	Changed cut scores	Changed the time of administration	Changed assessment items	Used entirely different assessment	Realigned to new content standards	Changed proficiency standards	Changed accommodation policy	Changed re-test policy	Changed test contractors	No significant changes
√		√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	

**Block 7** provides information about the comparability of the state assessments between 2004-05 and 2006-07. Specifically, it is the answer given to the survey question “Are the reported 2006-07 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 Reading or Mathematics directly comparable with the 2004-05 reported results?”

**Block 8** provides additional information about changes to the state assessment, inclusion policies, or administration of the state assessment between 2004-05 and 2006-07 that would have an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time.

State	Reading/Language Arts
7	<b>Are the reported 2006–07 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2004–05 reported results?</b>
	No, because the 2004-05 test was a matrix sampling design and the 2006-07 test was a single core-form design administered to each student.
8	<b>Differences in the administration of assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2004–05 and 2006–07 due to policy or legislative changes having an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time</b>
	The state assessments changed significantly between the 2004-05 and 2006-07 administrations. The 2004-05 assessment employed a matrix sampling scheme to assess students for school accountability decisions and produce school, district and state results. However, individual student results were not comparable to each other. In contrast, the PASS 2006-07 administration forms were each built to the same specifications, ensuring the comparability of individual student scores. The single core-form design was an intentional design to facilitate the technical work (psychometrics) necessary to generate results that can be compared from year to year.

A panel of NAEP State Coordinators, under the guidance of NCES and in collaboration with the American Institutes for Research (AIR), developed the format and content of these profiles, which were then revised in collaboration with state assessment directors and NAEP State Coordinators from each state. Some answers may have been edited for consistency or for space limitations. All web addresses in these profiles were verified on July 1, 2008.

## Source

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 2007 Survey of State Assessment Program Characteristics.

## Glossary

AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
CRT	Criterion-Referenced Test
CTBS/5	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills – Fifth Edition
ECA	End-of-Course Assessments
ELA	English Language Arts
EOC	End-of-Course exams
EOG	End-of-Grade exams
IEP	Individualized Education Program
LEA	Local Education Agency
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCLB	No Child Left Behind
NRT	Norm-Referenced Test
PLD	Performance Level Descriptor
SAT/9	Stanford Achievement Test – Ninth Edition
SAT/10	Stanford Achievement Test – Tenth Edition
SEA	State Education Agency

# Alabama

## Alabama Student Assessment Program

Component	Test		Grades Tested												Test Purpose <sup>1</sup>					
	Type	Format	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Instructional	Student Accountability	School Accountability	Staff Accountability	Other
<b>Reading [2]</b>																				
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Literacy Skills (DIBELS)	Regular	CRT	√	√	√											√		√		
Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT)	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√					√		√		
Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA)	Alternate	CRT	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		
Alabama High School Graduation Exam (AHSGE)	Regular	CRT												√		√	√	√		
<b>Writing</b>																				
Writing Assessments	Regular	CRT						√		√			√			√		√		
<b>Language Arts</b>																				
Alabama High School Graduation Exam (AHSGE)	Regular	CRT												√		√	√	√		
Stanford Achievement Test (Stanford 10)	Regular	NRT				√	√	√	√	√	√					√		√		
ACCESS for English Language Learners	Regular	CRT	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√		
<b>Mathematics</b>																				
Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT)	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√					√		√		
Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA)	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		
Alabama High School Graduation Exam (AHSGE)	Regular	CRT												√		√	√	√		
Stanford Achievement Test (Stanford 10)	Regular	NRT				√	√	√	√	√	√					√		√		

(Continued)

# Alabama

## Alabama Student Assessment Program

Component	Test		Grades Tested												Test Purpose <sup>1</sup>					
	Type	Format	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Instructional	Student Accountability	School Accountability	Staff Accountability	Other
<b>Science</b>																				
Alabama High School Graduation Exam (AHSGE)	Regular	CRT												√		√	√	√		
Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA)	Alternate	CRT						√		√				√		√		√		
Alabama Science Assessment (ASA)	Regular	CRT						√		√					√			√		
Stanford Achievement Test (Stanford 10)	Regular	NRT						√		√					√			√		
<b>Social Studies</b>																				
Alabama High School Graduation Exam (AHSGE)	Regular	CRT												√		√	√	√		
Stanford Achievement Test (Stanford 10)	Regular	NRT							√						√			√		

1 Example purposes: Instructional: student diagnosis, student placement, instructional planning, program evaluation, improvement of instruction for groups of students, etc.  
 Student Accountability: student awards/recognition, honors diploma, student promotion/retention, required remediation, exit requirement, etc.  
 School Accountability: monetary awards/penalties, school accreditation, school performance reporting, high school skills guarantee, school improvement plans, etc.  
 Staff Accountability: staff awards/recognition, salary increases, staff dismissal, staff evaluation or certification, staff monetary penalties, etc.

2 Additional test: Stanford Achievement Test (Stanford 10), Regular, NRT, Grades 3-8, Instructional and School Accountability

## Composition and Administration of the Main Reading/Language Arts Test in 2006–07

	Multiple Choice	Short Constructed Response	Extended Constructed Response	Performance Tasks	Other
Grade 4 Test	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Grade 8 Test	82%	0%	18%	0%	0%

During the 2006–07 academic year:

a. When was the assessment administered?	In 2006-07, both grades 4 and 8 Reading tests were administered in April 2007.
b. Did any of the assessments measure skills from the previous grade?	No.

## Performance Levels and AYP

Performance levels used during the 2006–07 year	Level I (Does not Meet Academic Content Standards), Level II (Partially Meets Academic Content Standards), Level III (Meets Academic Content Standards), and Level IV (Exceeds Academic Content Standards).
Test used for AYP determination	ARMT, AAA, and AHSGE
Performance level used for AYP	Level III
Other tests used for AYP determination	—
Test used for state accountability	—
Performance level used for state accountability	—
First implementation of performance standards for the 2006-07 assessments	Reading performance standards were first used in the 2003-04 school year.
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2006–07 academic year	—

### Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

<p>Grade 4 Level III: Fourth-grade students performing at Level III demonstrate a fundamental understanding of what they read by applying various strategies when reading textual/informational, functional, and literary/recreational materials. To some degree, these students use various skills and strategies, including demonstrating knowledge of sentence structure, making inferences, and distinguishing fiction from non-fiction. They recognize some literary elements and devices including characters, similes, and important details as they read literary/recreational text. As part of understanding informational/textual and functional materials, Level III readers are beginning to locate information, identify important details, use sentence structure, and distinguish fact from fiction. Their vocabulary knowledge includes recognition of some antonyms, synonyms, and some use of structural analysis skills.</p>	<p>Grade 8 Level III: Eighth-grade students performing at Level III utilize strategies to make inferences to determine bias or theme and use specific context clues to determine some word meanings. They can distinguish among characteristics of some types of poetry such as ballads, epics, haiku, limericks, and lyrics. They often identify literary elements and can describe their impact on setting, mood, characterization, or theme. These students also are able to identify the elements of plot.</p>
---	--

### Accommodation Differences between NAEP and the Main State Test

State accommodations not on NAEP	Student's home, electronic native language translator (word-to-word), communication device.
NAEP accommodations not on state assessment	None

### Changes to State Assessments between 2005 and 2007

Added grades	Eliminated grades	Changed cut scores	Changed the time of administration	Changed assessment items	Used entirely different assessment	Realigned to new content standards	Changed proficiency standards	Changed accommodation policy	Changed re test policy	Changed test contractors	No significant changes
				√							√

Note: Items are changed but forms are equated and are comparable from year to year.

Are the reported 2006–07 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2004–05 reported results?

---

Yes.

---

Differences in the administration of assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2004–05 and 2006–07 due to policy or legislative changes having an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time

---

There were no differences in the administration of the Reading assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2004-05 and 2006-07 that would have an impact on the interpretation of school- or state-level results when comparing across years.

---

## Composition and Administration of the Main Mathematics Test in 2006–07

	Multiple Choice	Short Constructed Response	Extended Constructed Response	Performance Tasks	Other
Grade 4 Test	78%	0%	17%	0%	6%[1]
Grade 8 Test	64%	0%	21%	0%	14%[1]

During the 2006–07 academic year:

a. When was the assessment administered?	In 2006-07, both grades 4 and 8 Mathematics tests were administered in April 2007.
b. Did any of the assessments measure skills from the previous grade?	No.

1 Gridded

Note: Detail may not sum to 100% because of rounding.

## Performance Levels and AYP

Performance levels used during the 2006–07 year	Level I (Does not Meet Academic Content Standards), Level II (Partially Meets Academic Content Standards), Level III (Meets Academic Content Standards), and Level IV (Exceeds Academic Content Standards).
Test used for AYP determination	ARMT, AAA, and AHSGE
Performance level used for AYP	Level III
Other tests used for AYP determination	—
Test used for state accountability	—
Performance level used for state accountability	—
First implementation of performance standards for the 2006-07 assessments	Mathematics performance standards were first used in the 2003-04 school year for Grades 4 and 6 and in the 2004-05 school year for Grade 8.
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2006–07 academic year	—

### Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

Grade 4 Level III: Fourth-grade students performing at Level III demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of number sense by comparing and ordering decimals and writing money amounts in words and dollar-and-cents notation. These students often rename improper fractions and mixed numbers, add and subtract fractions with common denominators, round whole numbers and decimals, and recognize equivalent forms of common fractions and decimals. These students frequently solve word problems that involve addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division of whole numbers. Students performing at Level III write number sentences for word problems and complete addition and subtraction number sentences with a missing addend or subtrahend. These students identify geometric shapes based on their characteristics and find locations on a map or grid using ordered pairs. They usually calculate elapsed time and measure length, width, weight, and capacity using both metric and customary units as well as temperature in degrees Fahrenheit and Celsius. Fourth-grade students at Level III represent categorical data using tables and graphs; determine if outcomes of simple events are likely, unlikely, certain, equally likely, or impossible; and represent numerical data using tables and graphs.

Grade 8 Level III: Eighth-grade students performing at Level III demonstrate a fundamental ability to apply various strategies and operations to solve problems with real numbers, simplify expressions containing natural number exponents, and use order of operations to evaluate and simplify algebraic expressions. These students are able to graph linear relations by plotting points, solve problems involving linear functions, and solve multi-step linear equations. They solve problems using the Pythagorean Theorem and can compare some quadrilaterals, triangles, and solids using their properties and characteristics. Students at Level III determine the measures of special angle pairs; find the perimeter and area of regular and irregular plane figures; calculate the surface area and volume of rectangular prisms, cylinders, and pyramids; and determine the lengths of missing sides and measures of angles in similar figures. Students performing at Level III interpret data from populations and determine the theoretical probability of an event.

### Accommodation Differences between NAEP and the Main State Test

State accommodations not on NAEP	Student's home, electronic native language translator (word-to-word), communication device.
NAEP accommodations not on state assessment	Alabama does not allow bilingual assessment booklets in Mathematics, test items read aloud in native language, read aloud most or all of tests, or items signed for most or all of test.

### Changes to State Assessments between 2005 and 2007

Added grades	Eliminated grades	Changed cut scores	Changed the time of administration	Changed assessment items	Used entirely different assessment	Realigned to new content standards	Changed proficiency standards	Changed accommodation policy	Changed re test policy	Changed test contractors	No significant changes
				√							√

Note: Items are changed but forms are equated and are comparable from year to year.

Are the reported 2006–07 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2004–05 reported results?

---

Yes.

---

Differences in the administration of assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2004–05 and 2006–07 due to policy or legislative changes having an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time

---

There were no differences in the administration of the Mathematics assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2004-05 and 2006-07 that would have an impact on the interpretation of school- or state-level results when comparing across years.

---