

A Profile of State Assessment Programs 2009

Since 2003, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has supported research that compares the proficiency standards of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) with those of individual states. State assessments are placed onto a common scale defined by NAEP, which allows states' proficiency standards to be compared not only to NAEP, but also to each other.¹ While the mapped NAEP equivalent scores of state standards are useful in determining the relative rigor of states' 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 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards, and the standard-setting process.

In 2007, in collaboration with the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC)—Task Force on Assessment of the Council of Chief State School Officers—NCES conducted a survey of state assessment programs to gain contextual information about the states' assessment programs in 2006–07 and to note changes in their assessments between the 2004–05 and 2006–07 school years that could affect the interpretation of the mapping results. The NAEP State Coordinator in every state was asked to provide information about the state's testing program through an online survey. After this information was verified and confirmed by the NAEP State Coordinator of each state, it was summarized in individual state profiles.² These profiles were designed in collaboration with a panel of NAEP State Coordinators.

In support of the 2009 Mapping Study, NAEP State Coordinators were asked by NCES to update the information collected on their state assessment program in 2007. Following similar verification steps, the information was summarized into profiles to provide a concise snapshot of all state assessment programs in the 2008–09 school year. Each profile presents information on the grades and subjects tested during the 2008–09 year, state performance levels and performance level descriptors, the composition of main state assessments, and changes to the state assessments between 2006–07 and 2008–09.

A sample profile is shown below. Information on the state assessment programs is presented in nine blocks. The first block combines all subjects. The remaining blocks (2–9) are presented twice, once for Reading/Language Arts and then for Mathematics. The example that follows is for Reading/Language Arts only. Some answers may have been edited for consistency or for space limitations; however, the substance of all answers is unchanged from what states provided to the NAEP State Coordinators. All web addresses in these profiles were verified on May 15, 2011. In any block, the symbol “—” indicates that a state's information was either not provided (for example, if there is no information on performance level descriptors of an alternate assessment for meeting AYP) or not applicable (for example, if the information relates to the proportion of the test score from short constructed response items, but the test does not use short constructed response items).

¹ Documents that discuss the research on NAEP and state proficiency standards are available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/>.

² The 2007 State Profiles are available at: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/profile_standards_2007.asp.

Block 1 summarizes information about each state’s testing program: the name of the program, the different tests, the type and format of each test, the grades and subjects tested, and the tests’ purpose. States were asked to enter up to four tests in Mathematics, English Language Arts, Reading, and Science. Response options for test type were: regular, alternate, modified, and portfolio assessments.³ Response options for test format were: criterion-referenced (CRT), norm-referenced (NRT), combination CRT/NRT, and other formats. Response options for test purpose were: instructional, student accountability, school accountability, staff accountability, and other. Additional information provided by NAEP State Coordinators summarizing their states’ tests and test purposes is included at the end of the block. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block1.asp>.

Block 1		Example State																			
		State Assessment and Accountability Program (SAAP)																			
		Test		Grades Tested												Test Purpose ¹					
Component		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																					
Comprehensive Assessments of State Students (CASS)		Regular	CRT		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		
CASS - Alternate (CASS-Alt)		Alternate	CRT	√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		
Mathematics																					
CASS		Regular	CRT		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		
CASS-Alt		Alternate	CRT	√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√			√		√		
Science																					
CASS		Regular	CRT						√		√				√		√		√		
CASS-Alt		Alternate	CRT						√		√				√		√		√		

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.

³ For reference, definitions of different types of assessments are available at the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) website, at: <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/NCEO/TopicAreas/AlternateAssessments/altAssessTopic.htm>.

Block 2 summarizes information about the composition of the main state assessments in 2008–09 for grades 4 and 8 in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. It shows the number of items for each type of question and each type’s respective weight in the final score. If the state indicated that an item type was not used, the type’s weight is indicated by “—.” An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at:

<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block2.asp> .

Block 3 includes additional information about the timing of the assessments and whether assessments measured skills acquired only in prior grades. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block3.asp>.

Block 4 summarizes information about the assessments and performance levels used by the state in 2008–09 for state accountability for grades 4 and 8 in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as the assessments and performance levels used to determine AYP. The symbol “—” indicates that the information was not provided (e.g., if the state did not provide additional information about performance levels used during the 2008–09 academic year). An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block4.asp>.

Example State		Reading/Language Arts									
Block 2	Composition of the Main Reading/Language Arts Test in 2008–09										
	Multiple Choice		Short Constructed Response		Extended Constructed Response		Performance Tasks		Other		
	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	
Grade 4	24	50%	0	—	3	50%	0	—	0	—	
Grade 8	24	50%	0	—	3	50%	0	—	0	—	
Block 3	Administration of the Main Reading/Language Arts Test in 2008–09										
	Were any of the 2008–09 assessments used for AYP reporting for grades 4 or 8 administered in the fall 2008?						No.				
Block 4	Performance Levels and AYP										
	Performance levels used during the 2008–09 year						Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced				
	Test used for AYP determination						Comprehensive Assessments of State Students (CASS)				
	Performance level used for AYP						Proficient				
	Other tests used for AYP determination						CASS-Alt assessments are used in AYP determination.				
	Test used for state accountability						CASS				
	Performance level used for state accountability						Proficient				
	First implementation of performance standards for the 2008–09 assessments						2005–06 school year				
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2008–09 academic year						—					

Block 5 provides the performance level descriptors used for meeting AYP in 2008–09 assessments for grades 4 and 8 in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. The descriptors correspond to the proficient performance level as it is defined by each state. A web address is included if the state provided a link. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block5.asp>.

Block 6 lists the performance level descriptors used for meeting AYP in 2008–09 alternate assessments for grades 4 and 8 in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics. The descriptors correspond to the proficient performance level as it is defined by each state. A “—” indicates that the state did not provide performance level descriptors. A web address is included if the state provided a link. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block6.asp>.

	Example State	Reading/Language Arts
Block 5	<p>Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress</p> <p>Grade 4: Students performing at the Proficient level 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 a knowledge of sentence structure, making inferences, and distinguishing fiction from nonfiction. They recognize some literary elements and devices including characters, similes, and important details as they read literary/recreational text. As a part of understanding informational/textual and functional materials, students at this level 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>Performance level descriptors are available online at http://www.STDOE.st.gov/pdf/AchievementLevelsGrade4.pdf</p>	<p>Grade 8: Students performing at the Proficient level 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, haikus, 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>
Block 6	<p>Performance Level Descriptors of Alternate Assessment for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress</p> <p>Grade 4: A fourth-grade student performing at the Proficient level on the Example State Extended Standards in Reading demonstrates fundamental knowledge that meets the extended standards in multiple phoneme words, reading simple sentences, synonyms, literary elements (main characters and details), and letter blends. This knowledge might be demonstrated at different complexity levels and with varying degrees of assistance.</p> <p>Performance level descriptors are available online at: http://www.STDOE.st.gov/pdf/AchievementLevels.pdf</p>	<p>Grade 8: —</p>

Block 7 presents changes to the main state assessment in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics between the 2006–07 and 2008–09 school years. Each state self-reported whether the changes to its assessment were significant or not. For many states, additional information about the changes is included in a note below the block. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block7.asp>.

Block 8 provides information about the comparability of the state assessments between 2006–07 and 2008–09. Specifically, it is the answer given to the survey question “Are the reported 2008–09 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 Reading or Mathematics directly comparable with the 2006–07 reported results?” Each state self-reported whether its 2006–07 and 2008–09 assessments were comparable or not. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block8.asp>.

Block 9 provides additional information about changes to the state assessment, inclusion policies, or administration of the state assessment between 2006–07 and 2008–09 that would have an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time. An accessible table containing the information in this block can be found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/block9.asp>.

Example State
Reading/Language Arts

Block 7

Changes to State Assessments Between 2006–07 and 2008–09

	No Significant Changes	Changed Cut Scores	Changed The Period 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	Other Changes
Grade 4	√									•	
Grade 8	√									•	

Block 8

Are the reported 2008–09 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2006–07 reported results?

Yes, they can be compared. The testing contractors changed but the test and scales did not change.

Block 9

Are there differences in the administration of assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2006–07 and 2008–09 due to policy or legislative changes having an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time?

None.

Source

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 Survey of State Assessment Program Characteristics.

Glossary

AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
CRT	Criterion-Referenced Test
ECA	End-of-Course Assessments
ELA	English Language Arts
ELP	English Language Proficiency
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/10	Stanford Achievement Test – Tenth Edition
SEA	State Education Agency

Washington

Washington Assessment of Student Learning

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 [2]																				
Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√		
Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) Portfolio	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√		
WAAS - Developmentally Appropriate WASL [3]	Alternate	CRT												√	√	√	√			
Locally Determined Assessments (LDAs) [4]	Alternate	CRT												√	√	√	√			
Mathematics [5]																				
Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)	Regular	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√		
Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) Portfolio	Alternate	CRT				√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√	√	√		
WAAS - Developmentally Appropriate WASL [3]	Alternate	CRT												√	√	√	√			
Locally Determined Assessments (LDAs) [4]	Alternate	CRT												√	√	√	√			

(continued)

Washington

Washington Assessment of Student Learning

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
Science																				
Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)	Regular	CRT						√			√		√			√				
Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) Portfolio	Alternate	CRT						√			√		√			√	√			

- 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 Certificate of Academic Achievement - Collection of Evidence (COE): Alternative Assessment; CRT; student accountability; grades tested: 11 and 12. Students compile a set of classroom work samples with the help of a teacher. Students must have taken the WASL once and not met standard. Each collection is scored by a panel of educators selected and trained by the state. Collections must show a student has the skills that are tested on the WASL.
 Certificate of Academic Achievement - GPA Comparison: Alternative Assessment, CRT, Student Accountability, grades tested: 12. Students' grades in English courses are compared with the grades of students who took the same courses and passed the WASL. The student must have a cumulative GPA of 3.2 or higher.
 Certificate of Academic Achievement - Advanced Placement and College Admission Test - Alternative Assessment; CRT: Student Accountability; grades tested: 11, 12. Students may use their scores on the SAT Reading Test, the ACT Reading Test and specified Advanced Placement Examinations to show they have key scores. The SAT score must be 350 or higher; the ACT score must be 13 or higher; and the AP test score must be 3 or higher. Students must have taken the WASL at least once and not met standard.
- ³ Used only for meeting graduation requirements. Each assessment is constructed to determine student's skill level at either the elementary- or middle-school level.
- ⁴ A series of state prescribed assessments available for 11th and 12th grade students only to meet the graduation requirement in Reading. Meeting standard is scoring at or above the minimum grade equivalency for the prescribed test.
- ⁵ Certificate of Academic Achievement - Collection of Evidence (COE): Alternative Assessment; CRT; student accountability; grades tested: 11 and 12. Students compile a set of classroom work samples with the help of a teacher. Students must have taken the WASL once and not met standard. Each collection is scored by a panel of educators selected and trained by the state. Collections must show a student has the skills that are tested on the WASL.
 Certificate of Academic Achievement - GPA Comparison: Alternative Assessment, CRT, Student Accountability; grades tested: 12. Students' grades in Mathematics courses are compared with the grades of students who took the same courses and passed the WASL. The student must have a cumulative GPA of 3.2 or higher.
 Certificate of Academic Achievement - Advanced Placement and College Admission Test - Alternative Assessment; CRT: Student Accountability; grades tested: 11, 12. Students may use their scores on the SAT Mathematics Test, the ACT Mathematics Test and specified Advanced Placement Examinations to show they have key scores. The SAT score must be 470 or higher; the ACT score must be 19 or higher; and the AP test score must be 3 or higher. Students must have taken the WASL at least once and not met standard.

Composition of the Main Reading/Language Arts Test in 2008–09

	Multiple Choice		Short Constructed Response		Extended Constructed Response		Performance Tasks		Other	
	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score
Grade 4	24	67%	6	33%	0	—	0	—	0	—
Grade 8	26	54%	7	29%	2	17%	0	—	0	—

Administration of the Main Reading/Language Arts Test in 2008–09

Were any of the 2008–09 assessments used for AYP reporting for grades 4 or 8 administered in the fall of 2008?	No.
--	-----

Performance Levels and AYP

Performance levels used during the 2008–09 year	Basic, Proficient, and Advanced
Test used for AYP determination	State CRT
Performance level used for AYP	Proficient
Other tests used for AYP determination	WAAS Portfolio: Per federal regulations, for district AYP calculations, the percentage of students considered proficient via the WAAS (based on alternate achievement standards) cannot exceed 1% of the district's total enrollment in the tested grades, unless an exception is granted using an appeal process. As part of setting standards on the WAAS assessments in January 2003, student results were categorized into four levels of performance (based on alternate academic achievement standards). The percentage of students with disabilities in each of the four achievement levels on the WASL and WAAS will be reported to the public upon completion of data verification. For accountability purposes, performance assessment data for students with disabilities will be included in the state's accountability system in the following manner: Advanced WASL Level 4 and WAAS Level 4; Proficient WASL Level 3 and WAAS Level 3; Basic WASL Level 2 and WAAS Level 2; Below Basic WASL Level 1 and WAAS Level 1.
Test used for state accountability	State CRT
Performance level used for state accountability	Weighted index using 4 performance levels.
First implementation of performance standards for the 2008–09 assessments	Grade 4: 1997 (revised in 2004); Grade 8: 2006
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2008–09 academic year	—

Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

Grade 4: Reading Behavioral Characteristics: Students are confident, proficient readers. Students apply strategies like graphic organizers to help them understand more than one text at a time. Students use a variety of metacognitive strategies to be aware of their thinking and make connections. Students visually pinpoint or verbally explain where comprehension breaks down in reading a text. Students are able to read and follow directions. Students can use a variety of strategies such as highlighting to discern the necessary information from unimportant information to perform a task. Students understand the common language of assessment and literacy. Reading Skill Characteristics: Students appropriately read for comprehension, analysis, and evaluation. Students read fluently, with accuracy, expression, and at an appropriate rate. Students demonstrate understanding of themes, main ideas, and details by using documented evidence from text. Students have multiple strategies for understanding unknown words. Students can read a variety of materials including charts, graphs, and captions to deepen or confirm their knowledge. Students are able to use text features such as headings to quickly find the answer to a question or a specific spot in the text. Students can retell a story explaining characters and plot, emphasizing the most important parts without getting lost in the details. Students can give opinions about the story and support those opinions with details. Students can identify and understand important facts and organize them into meaning. Students know and use the way a book is organized by using the table of contents, index, glossary, headings, captions, and additional text features. Students can use information from their reading to explain what they have learned or what new thing they would do. Students refer to text as a resource to help them find answers, analyze, make inferences, and use their knowledge to construct their own meaning. Students can summarize appropriately to a given text by using text-based examples to support an answer or opinion.

Performance level descriptors are available online at:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/assessment/StateTesting/PLD/default.aspx>

Grade 8: Reading Behavioral Characteristics: Students perform solidly when working with appropriate grade-level material. Students read fluently with expression for greater comprehension. Students show evidence of higher thinking through generalizations, conclusion, and inferences. Students actively engage with text while employing various reading strategies. Students frequently skim, reread, and check for understanding without prompting. Students participate openly in discussions and ask questions for clarification. Student often automatically form "mind-movies" to aide in the visualization of the text. Students are able to read and follow directions with consistency and understand the common language of assessment and literacy. Students performing on the proficient level readily make the connection between self, the text, and the world in general. Students select appropriate materials for a variety of purposes and read for both information and pleasure. Reading Skill Characteristics: Students are able to comprehend, analyze, and evaluate both literary and information text written on an eighth grade level. Students identify main ideas/themes and are able to supply supporting information. Students consistently and sequentially summarize a selection by providing details; however they may struggle with producing a cohesive summary statement. Students are capable of making predictions and inferences while citing textual evidence. Students readily use context clues and other strategies to interpret vocabulary and can differentiate between multiple meanings. Students are able to transfer vocabulary meaning to other content areas. Students employ various text features to gain meaning. Students analyze literary elements and stylistic devices for a deeper level of understanding with the support of minimal scaffolding. Students accomplish compare/contrast and cause/effect within and between texts while synthesizing to a broader level. Students identify author's purpose with ease; however evaluating effectiveness for different audiences proves challenging. Students accomplish evaluating reasoning and ideas/themes, but these students may use prior knowledge as opposed to providing text-based evidence to support their answers. Students are able to extend information beyond the text to solve problems and make generalizations.

Performance level descriptors are available online at:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/assessment/StateTesting/PLD/default.aspx>

Performance Level Descriptors of Alternate Assessment for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

Grade 4: —

Grade 8: —

Changes to State Assessments Between 2007 and 2009

	No Significant Changes	Changed Cut Scores	Changed The Period 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	Other Changes
Grade 4										√	[1]
Grade 8										√	[1]

¹ Shortened assessment.

Are the reported 2008–09 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2006–07 reported results?

Yes. Test items used in 2009 from same item bank as 2008. 2009 assessment equated to 2008 scale. Technical Advisory Committee approved the equating.

Are there differences in the administration of assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2006–07 and 2008–09 due to policy or legislative changes having an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time?

In 2007 the legislature postponed the graduation requirement in Mathematics until the Class of 2013. 2008 legislation included: Revision of Mathematics standards. Requires the State Board of Education to retain a consultant to review the February 2008 version of revised Mathematics standards; hold a public hearing and consult with the Mathematics Advisory Panel by May 15, 2008; and forward final recommendations to SPI. Directs the SPI to revise the standards by July 1, 2008. Authorizes the SBE, by July 31, 2008, to either approve adoption of the final revised standards or develop a plan for ensuring the recommendations are implemented so that final standards can be adopted by September 25, 2008.

Composition of the Main Mathematics Test in 2008–09

	Multiple Choice		Short Constructed Response		Extended Constructed Response		Performance Tasks		Other	
	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score	Number of Items	Proportion of Score
Grade 4	22	58%	8	42%	0	—	0	—	0	—
Grade 8	32	57%	8	29%	2	14%	0	—	0	—

Administration of the Main Mathematics Test in 2008–09

Were any of the 2008–09 assessments used for AYP reporting for grades 4 or 8 administered in the fall of 2008?	No.
--	-----

Performance Levels and AYP

Performance levels used during the 2008–09 year	Basic, Proficient, and Advanced
Test used for AYP determination	State CRT
Performance level used for AYP	Proficient
Other tests used for AYP determination	WAAS Portfolio: Per federal regulations, for district AYP calculations, the percentage of students considered proficient via the WAAS (based on alternate achievement standards) cannot exceed 1% of the district's total enrollment in the tested grades, unless an exception is granted using an appeal process. As part of setting standards on the WAAS assessments in January 2003, student results were categorized into four levels of performance (based on alternate academic achievement standards). The percentage of students with disabilities in each of the four achievement levels on the WASL and WAAS will be reported to the public upon completion of data verification. For accountability purposes, performance assessment data for students with disabilities will be included in the state's accountability system in the following manner: Advanced WASL Level 4 and WAAS Level 4; Proficient WASL Level 3 and WAAS Level 3; Basic WASL Level 2 and WAAS Level 2; Below Basic WASL Level 1 and WAAS Level 1.
Test used for state accountability	State CRT
Performance level used for state accountability	Weighted index using 4 performance levels
First implementation of performance standards for the 2008–09 assessments	Grade 4: 1997 (revised in 2004); Grade 8: 2006
Additional information about performance levels used during the 2008–09 academic year	—

Performance Level Descriptors for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

<p>Grade 4: Proficient students consistently choose efficient and accurate methods of computation for given situations using whole numbers or decimals when using monetary units. Students consistently select, use, and defend the use of appropriate tools for measuring in a given situation. Students choose between standard and non-standard units and approximate vs. precise measurement. Students measure objects with appropriate tools. Students create a given type of graph with appropriate title and labels. Students identify shapes and their attributes. Students recognize and extend a pattern from a group. Students select and use an appropriate strategy to solve a one- or two-step problem and show work. Students select an appropriate solution to a problem and explain the steps used in the solution. Students recognize an unreasonable or inappropriate answer to a mathematical problem and explain their rationale. Students move beyond memorization of mathematical formulas by applying effective strategies and reasoning to real-life situations. Students collect and organize data.</p> <p>Performance level descriptors are available online at: http://www.k12.wa.us/assessment/StateTesting/PLD/default.aspx</p>	<p>Grade 8: Proficient students classify and describe two-dimensional and three-dimensional figures. Students demonstrate understanding of similarity with two-dimensional figures. Students draw nets of cylinders, prisms, and pyramids. Students use Pythagorean Theorem to identify right triangles. Students plot or draw combinations of two transformations with or without a coordinate grid. Students determine the possible outcomes and/or probabilities for compound events. Students describe how different samples of populations may effect the data collected. Students determine whether claims made about results are based on biased representations of data. Students identify clusters and outliers in a set of data and determine how they affect mean, median, or mode. Students make predictions and/or conclusions based on data and/or graphs and tables. Students communicate mathematical ideas clearly and effectively. Students can extract, explain, or describe mathematical information from various sources. Students organize mathematical data in tables, charts, and graphs for a given purpose and audience. Students can use concepts and procedures from two or more content strands.</p> <p>Performance level descriptors are available online at: http://www.k12.wa.us/assessment/StateTesting/PLD/default.aspx</p>
---	---

Performance Level Descriptors of Alternate Assessment for Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress

<p>Grade 4: —</p>	<p>Grade 8: —</p>
--------------------------	--------------------------

Changes to State Assessments Between 2007 and 2009

	No Significant Changes	Changed Cut Scores	Changed The Period 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	Other Changes
Grade 4								√		√	[1]
Grade 8								√		√	[1]

¹ Shortened assessment.

Are the reported 2008–09 state assessment results for grades 4 and 8 directly comparable with the 2006–07 reported results?

Yes. Test items used in 2009 from same item bank as 2008. 2009 assessment equated to 2008 scale. Technical Advisory Committee approved the equating.

Are there differences in the administration of assessments or in the reporting of outcomes between 2006–07 and 2008–09 due to policy or legislative changes having an impact on the ability to compare outcomes over time?

In 2007 the legislature postponed the graduation requirement in Mathematics until the Class of 2013. 2008 legislation included: Revision of Mathematics standards. Requires the State Board of Education to retain a consultant to review the February 2008 version of revised Mathematics standards; hold a public hearing and consult with the Mathematics Advisory Panel by May 15, 2008; and forward final recommendations to SPI. Directs the SPI to revise the standards by July 1, 2008. Authorizes the SBE, by July 31, 2008, to either approve adoption of the final revised standards or develop a plan for ensuring the recommendations are implemented so that final standards can be adopted by September 25, 2008.