

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 ¹					
	Type	Format	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Instructional	Student Accountability	School Accountability	Staff Accountability	Other
Reading																				
Proficiency Assessments for State Students (PASS)	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
Proficiency Assessments for State Students- Alternate (PASS-Alt)	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
Writing																				
PASS	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
PASS-Alt	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
Mathematics																				
PASS	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
PASS-Alt	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		√		[2]
Science																				
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: http://www.k12.ss.us/PASS/docs/AccommodationsManual.pdf
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	Are the reported 2006–07 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2004–05 reported results?
	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	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
	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

Missouri

Missouri Assessment Program

Component	Test		Grades Tested												Test Purpose ¹					
	Type	Format	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Instructional	Student Accountability	School Accountability	Staff Accountability	Other
Language Arts																				
Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) Communication Arts	Regular	CRT/NRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√				
MAP Communication Arts Alternate	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√				
Mathematics																				
MAP Mathematics	Regular	CRT/NRT				√	√	√	√	√	√		√		√		√			
MAP Alternate	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√		√		√		√			
Science [2]																				
MAP Science	Regular	CRT/NRT				√				√			√		√		√			
MAP Science Alternate	Alternate	CRT				√				√			√		√		√			
Social Studies [2]																				
MAP Social Studies	Regular	CRT/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 Tests have not been funded by the Legislature since 2002; therefore, the assessments have not been required for districts/schools since that time. However, districts have had the option of voluntarily continuing the assessments at their expense and using the results to aid in meeting annual yearly progress (AYP).

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	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%
Grade 8 Test	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%

During the 2006–07 academic year:

a. When was the assessment administered?	In 2006-07, grades 4 and 8 Communication Arts were administered during the March 26 - May 4, 2007 testing window.
b. Did any of the assessments measure skills from the previous grade?	No. In the 2006-07 school year, the grade 4 Communication Arts assessment (administered in the spring of 2007) assessed grade 4 skills; the grade 8 Communication Arts assessment assessed grade 8 skills.

Performance Levels and AYP

Performance levels used during the 2006–07 year	Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced
Test used for AYP determination	Missouri Assessment Program Communication Arts
Performance level used for AYP	Proficient
Other tests used for AYP determination	MAP-Alternate in Communication Arts - Proficient
Test used for state accountability	Missouri Assessment Program Communication Arts and MAP-Alternate in Communication Arts
Performance level used for state accountability	Proficient
First implementation of performance standards for the 2006-07 assessments	Communication Arts standards were first implemented in the 1998-99 school year.
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2006–07 academic year	—

Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

Grade 4 Proficient: Students make simple inferences; recall relevant details; identify problem and/or solution; draw conclusions; explain figurative language; define figurative language using context clues; use context clues to select vocabulary; use relevant information; identify character traits; identify/explain main idea; distinguish between fact and opinion; identify simple cause and effect; write an organized letter for an intended audience and purpose; consistently use rules of standard English; and use a writing process to revise, edit, and proofread.

Grade 8 Proficient: Students make inferences; identify relevant details; summarize; infer vocabulary meaning; interpret figurative language; analyze text features; follow multi-step directions; author's technique; infer cause and effect; draw conclusions based on complex information; explain problem and/or solution; analyze text for author's purpose; analyze text for point of view; interpret the actions; make predictions; evaluate evidence; explain problem-solving processes; make complex comparisons; determine reliability of resources; use context clues to choose vocabulary; identify intended audience; edit for relevant details; write a paragraph for a specific audience and purpose; consistently use rules and conventions of standard English; and use a writing process to organize and edit a text.

Accommodation Differences between NAEP and the Main State Test

State accommodations not on NAEP	Administer test using more than allotted time periods (over several days); student (audio) taped response; paraphrasing test questions (invalidates test scores for state accountability purposes); use of scribe for writing; respond in sign language for writing; use of dictionary or thesaurus
NAEP accommodations not on state assessment	—

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: Missouri changed from a grade-span Communication Arts assessment in 2005 (assessing at grades 3, 7 and 11) to a grade-level assessment in 2007 (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11); changed cut scores as a result; changed from five reporting categories (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced) in 2005 to four reporting categories (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) in 2007; changed accommodation policy to invalidate student scores for accountability purposes if oral reading of Communication Arts test or paraphrasing test questions used. In addition, the MAP-Alternate assessment (used to assess severely cognitively disabled students) changed from assessing in grades 4, 8 and 11 in 2005 to assessing in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 in Communication Arts.

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

No. Missouri changed from a grade-span Communication Arts assessment in 2005 (assessing at grades 3, 7 and 11) to a grade-level assessment in 2007 (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11); changed cut scores as a result; changed from five reporting categories (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced) in 2005 to four reporting categories (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) in 2007; changed accommodation policy to invalidate student scores for accountability purposes if oral reading of Communication Arts test or paraphrasing test questions used. In addition, the MAP-Alternate Communication Arts assessment (used to assess severely cognitively disabled students) changed from assessing in grades 4, 8 and 11 in 2005 to assessing in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 in 2007.

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

Following No Child Left Behind legislation, the state changed from grade-span assessments in 2005 to grade-level assessments in 2007. As a result of state legislation requiring that state standards meet but not exceed NAEP standards, new cut scores were established using four reporting categories in 2007 (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient and Advanced) rather than the five reporting categories used in 2005 (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced). The accommodation policy for oral reading of the Communication Arts assessment and paraphrasing test questions changed between 2005 and 2007 to invalidate student scores for state accountability purposes if used. In addition, the MAP-Alternate assessment (used to assess severely cognitively disabled students) changed from 2005 to 2007 from assessing students in grades 4, 8 and 11 to assessing grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 in Communication Arts. As a result of the noted changes, the outcomes from the 2004-05 and 2006-07 school years are not comparable because they are based on different assessments, different cut scores and reporting categories, and different populations of students 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	72%	23%	0%	5%	0%
Grade 8 Test	72%	23%	0%	5%	0%

During the 2006–07 academic year:

a. When was the assessment administered?	In 2006-07, grades 4 and 8 Mathematics were administered during the March 26 - May 4, 2007 testing window.
b. Did any of the assessments measure skills from the previous grade?	No. In the 2006-07 school year, the grade 4 Mathematics assessment (administered in the spring of 2007) assessed grade 4 skills; the grade 8 Mathematics assessment assessed grade 8 skills.

Performance Levels and AYP

Performance levels used during the 2006–07 year	Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced
Test used for AYP determination	Missouri Assessment Program Mathematics
Performance level used for AYP	Proficient
Other tests used for AYP determination	MAP-Alternate in Mathematics - Proficient
Test used for state accountability	MAP Mathematics and MAP-Alternate in Mathematics
Performance level used for state accountability	Proficient
First implementation of performance standards for the 2006-07 assessments	Mathematics performance standards were first implemented in the 1997-98 school year.
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2006–07 academic year	—

Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

Grade 4 Proficient: Students propose and justify conclusions based on data; compare parts of a whole as a fraction and justify the answer; identify place value (up to 6 digit whole numbers); read and interpret data on a line plot; add/subtract money values up to \$10.00; describe movement on a grid, using common language north, south, east, west, right, left, up, down; recognize equivalent representations for the same number by decomposing and composing whole numbers, using multiple operations; identify the correct number sentence for a mathematical situation; analyze, interpret and explain data in a multi-step problem; find the value of combinations of quarters, nickels, dimes, and pennies; identify lines of symmetry; subtract money involving dollars and cents; describe the results of transforming shapes; write a number sentence to represent a mathematical situation; identify a 3-dimensional shape given its attributes; describe and analyze data in a multi-step problem; measure and compare, using standard and metric units; determine the area of a figure on a rectangular grid, using standard units; represent multiplication using sets and arrays; identify repeated addition as a way to express multiplication; identify the missing operation in a number sentence; demonstrate fluency with basic operations; apply estimation in multiplication of numbers; analyze, interpret, and explain data; write a number sentence to represent a mathematical situation; use and apply estimation to add and subtract money; divide three-digit by one-digit numbers; and describe and evaluate attributes of 2 and 3 dimensional shapes.

Grade 8 Proficient: Students solve multi-step equations; identify formal transformations; solve problems involving area; calculate measures of center for a given data set; given a diagram, identify and classify angles; identify appropriate units of measure; interpret graphic organizers; identify equivalent representations of a number; convert equivalent units of measure within the same system of measurement; generalize a symbolic pattern; apply all operations on rational numbers; identify 2-dimensional objects by analyzing their properties; use area and perimeter to solve problems; use symbolic algebra to represent and solve problems that involve linear relationships, including recursive notation; create similar polygons by applying the relationships of corresponding sides and angles; identify the probability of an event; identify problems that can be solved using similar mental strategies; estimate and justify the results of all operations on rational numbers convert standard units within a system of measurement; analyze the relationship of two variables in a table; use coordinate geometry to determine the area of quadrilaterals; identify a repositioned object after formal transformations; analyze the probability for a specific outcome of an event; identify the appropriate multi-step linear equation to represent a given situation; identify missing terms of a pattern; and use and interpret measures of central tendency for a given data set.

Accommodation Differences between NAEP and the Main State Test

State accommodations not on NAEP	Administer test using more than allotted time periods (over several days); student (audio) taped response; paraphrasing test questions (invalidates test scores for state accountability purposes); oral reading of directions and test items in native language; use calculator, mathematics table, or abacus
NAEP accommodations not on state assessment	Spanish version of the 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: Missouri changed from a grade-span Mathematics assessment in 2005 (assessing at grades 4, 8 and 10) to a grade-level assessment in 2007 (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10); changed cut scores as a result; changed from five reporting categories (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced) in 2005 to four reporting categories (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) in 2007; changed accommodation policy to invalidate student scores for accountability purposes if paraphrasing test questions used. In addition, the MAP-Alternate assessment (used to assess severely cognitively disabled students) changed from assessing in grades 4, 8 and 11 in 2005 to assessing in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 in Mathematics.

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

No. Missouri changed from a grade-span Mathematics assessment in 2005 (assessing at grades 4, 8 and 10) to a grade-level assessment in 2007 (grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10). Changed cut scores as a result; changed from five reporting categories (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced) in 2005 to four reporting categories (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced) in 2007. In addition, the MAP-Alternate assessment (used to assess severely cognitively disabled students) changed from assessing in grades 4, 8 and 11 in 2005 to assessing in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 in Mathematics in 2007.

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

Following No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, the state changed from grade span assessments in 2005 to grade level assessments in 2007. As a result of state legislation requiring that state standards meet but not exceed NAEP standards, new cut scores were established using four reporting categories in 2007 (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient and Advanced) rather than the five reporting categories used in 2005 (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficient, Proficient and Advanced). The accommodation policy for oral reading of the Communication Arts assessment and paraphrasing test questions changed between 2005 and 2007 to invalidate student scores for state accountability purposes if used. In addition, the MAP-Alternate assessment (used to assess severely cognitively disabled students) changed from 2005 to 2007 from assessing students in grades 4, 8 and 11 to assessing grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 in Mathematics. As a result of the noted changes, the outcomes from the 2004-05 and 2006-07 school years are not comparable because they are based on different assessments, different cut scores and reporting categories, and different populations of students across years.