

**Interim
Evaluation
Report**

IR-02-28

June 28, 2002

California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Year 3 Evaluation Report

Laress L. Wise
D. E. (Sunny) Sipes
Carolyn DeMeyer Harris
J. Patrick Ford
Shaobang Sun
Jennifer Dunn
Gail Lynn Goldberg

Prepared for:

California Department of Education
Sacramento, CA

Contract Number: 9234

Independent Evaluation of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Year 3 Evaluation Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California has just concluded the second year spring administration of its High School Exit Examination, which is part of the state's requirement that students pass a proficiency exam in mathematics and English-language arts (ELA) in order to graduate, beginning with the Class of 2004. California began this initiative in response to widespread support for high standards and the corresponding need for some mechanism that holds students to those standards. As a component of California's testing program, the exit examination is intended to ensure that all students graduating from high school demonstrate grade level competency in reading, writing, and mathematics. The California Education Code, Chapter 8, Section 60850, specifies requirements for the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)¹.

The legislation that mandates the requirements for the graduation exam also specifies an independent evaluation of the CAHSEE. The California Department of Education (CDE) awarded a contract for this evaluation to the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO). HumRRO's efforts focus on analyses of data from the field tests of questions on the CAHSEE, its operational administrations, and report on trends in pupil performance and retention, graduation, dropout, and college attendance rates. The legislation also specifies that the evaluation reports will include recommendations for improving the quality, fairness, validity, and reliability of the examination. The present report meets the contract requirement for a report of activities and findings during the third year of the evaluation. This report extends results beyond those reported in the legislatively mandated January 2002 report covering the 2001 CAHSEE administration (Wise, Sipes, Harris, George, Ford, & Sun, 2002).

Test Development, Administration and Scoring

A considerable part of our Year 3 effort involved monitoring and analyzing the development, administration, and scoring of the March 2002 CAHSEE. Three things made this an important process to watch: the change in the test development contractor, the very tight timeline for the assembly of the March 2002 form, and the implementation of revised administration procedures. A complete description of our review processes and resulting findings are presented in Chapter 2.

Our review of test development focused on the quality of new CAHSEE test questions. Activities included monitoring several different types of item reviews conducted by the development contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), including traditional reviews by content experts and the use of cognitive labs as an alternative way of identifying possible flaws in test questions. We also conducted an independent review of the quality of the test questions.

¹ As specified in the Education Code, the CAHSEE consists of two separately timed and scored sections, referred to in this report as the ELA test and the mathematics test.

The processes used by ETS were both thoughtful and thorough. Results from our independent item review workshops suggest that the general quality of the test questions remains high. Nonetheless our panelists did identify a number of issues that could limit the validity of some test questions; they also raised some issues about specific questions.

HumRRO researchers observed workshops that prepared district and school personnel for the 2002 test administrations and observed the March and May administrations at six sites. We also surveyed testing coordinators from our longitudinal sample of schools about their experiences with the 2002 CAHSEE administration. Finally, we reviewed the accommodations and modifications used in the March 2002 administration.

We noted a number of improvements in the preparation and logistics for the 2002 administrations and did not observe any significant problems. Procedures were much more clearly specified than they were in the 2001 administration. A significant number of students (nearly 10,000) were given accommodations or modifications. It was particularly noteworthy that more than 4,000 students used calculators for the mathematics exam, a modification that invalidated their scores. For the most part, passing rates were still very low for students who were allowed accommodations and would have been for students receiving modifications, had their scores counted.

We reviewed the process for training scorers for the essay questions and analyzed the consistency of the scores that resulted from their efforts. The process ETS used for scoring the essays was new and innovative. Scoring consistency results from this first application of the process were similar to those in the 2001 administrations.

To verify ETS' proposed equating of the March 2002 test form to the base form used in the March 2001 administration, we conducted analyses of preliminary data from the March 2002 administration. Though we used a divergent approach to test a number of the assumptions underlying ETS' methods, our results were highly consistent with the results from the operational equating developed by ETS.

We also examined the accuracy of the March 2002 test form. As in the past, we looked at the accuracy with which scores from this form classified students as passing or not passing. Our results showed that more of the March 2002 examinees were very near the minimum passing level than in either of the 2001 administrations. The March 2002 form had a slightly wider "zone of uncertainty" but we estimated that there were fewer misclassifications of students who were significantly below or above the minimum passing level.

Test Results

Our analyses of results from the 2002 CAHSEE administration are summarized in Chapter 3. Passing rates for students taking the CAHSEE for the first time in 2002 were very similar to passing rates for the 9th graders who took the CAHSEE in 2001. Overall, 65 percent of first-time test takers passed the ELA portion of the CAHSEE while 44 percent of those taking the mathematics portion for the first time passed it. Passing rates for different demographic groups also closely matched the 2001 passing rates.

Roughly half of the students tested in March 2002 were making a second attempt to pass. A significant proportion (42 percent) of the students who did not pass the ELA exam on the first try have now passed that part of the CAHSEE. The proportion of students converted from not passing to passing the mathematics portion of the test was lower (25 percent), but still a sizeable number. Cumulative success rates were significantly lower for students with disabilities and, in mathematics, for African American students and English learners.

ELA passing rates for English learners who had been redesignated as fluent English proficient (R-FEP) were comparable to other student groups, raising hope that the lower passing rates for English learners will be erased once they achieve English proficiency. For math, passing levels for English learners (EL) were closely related to level of coursework completed.

With the exception of students with disabilities, average score gains were relatively consistent across demographic groups—about 17 points for ELA and 10 points for mathematics.

Student Questionnaire

Responses to the student questionnaire administered at the end of each section of the test are presented in Chapter 4. An overwhelming majority of students thought that the test was very important or somewhat important to them and believed they would graduate from high school. However, more than 50 percent of students indicated that a requirement to pass a test like the CAHSEE would make it “a lot harder” or “somewhat harder” to graduate from high school. A large majority of respondents reported that they did as well as they could on the test. The most common reasons reported for not doing as well as they could were that some topics covered in the test had not been taught or that they could not recall the correct answers.

Principal and Teacher Reactions

A discussion of results from our third survey of teachers, principals, and test administrators is presented in Chapter 5. As in prior surveys, key topics were: familiarity with the CAHSEE, preparation of students for the exam, an assessment of current preparedness, and estimates of potential impact.

Familiarity

Principals’ ratings of student and parent familiarity with CAHSEE increased from last year. Most principals and teachers relied primarily upon official channels such as state and district sources and the California Department of Education Web site to learn about the CAHSEE; education organizations and newspapers were also common sources.

Preparation

Preparatory activities continue and have increased, across the board, since last year. Nearly all principals reported that districts encourage the use of content standards and approximately three quarters indicated that their district is in the process of aligning curriculum with the

standards across grade levels and has adopted algebra as a graduation requirement. Over two thirds of mathematics teachers indicate that almost all the CAHSEE mathematics standards are covered by their curriculum; just over half of ELA teachers report full coverage.

Activities to prepare for CAHSEE administrations increased notably from 2001 to 2002. In particular, most principals reported (a) encouraging students to work hard and prepare, (b) adoption of California Content Standards, and (c) teaching test-taking skills. Teacher-reported activities were more consistent with their 2001 estimates; the most frequently-indicated activities were (a) talking with students, (b) teaching test-taking skills, (c) encouraging students to work hard, and (d) increased classroom attention to content standards.

Student Preparedness

Teacher and principal estimates of student preparedness continued to be somewhat pessimistic. Fewer teachers indicated that 10th grade students were well prepared for the test than had made this estimate the previous year. However, a third of principals and a quarter of teachers reported that students performed better on the spring 2001 CAHSEE than they had expected. Spring 2002 results were not available at the time of survey administration.

Impact

Teachers and principals were again in basic agreement about the impact of the test on students and their parents in various situations: prior to the first test, after passing the test, and after not passing the test. This year, more principals and more teachers expected an increase in student motivation and parental involvement both preceding the exam and after failing the exam. Principals and teachers remained very consistent in their prediction that the CAHSEE would increase student dropout rates; predictions of impact on student retention rates were more mixed. Despite these concerns about the effects on student motivation and parental involvement, principals and teachers continued to expect that the impact of the CAHSEE on instructional practices would be positive, with greater improvement with time.

Findings and Recommendations

The main findings and recommendations stemming from Year 3 evaluation activities are presented in Chapter 6. In brief, the general findings were as follows:

General Finding 1: Available evidence suggests that the CAHSEE has not yet had any impact on retention, dropout rates, or expectations for graduation and post-high-school plans.

General Finding 2: Progress in developing the exam continues to be noteworthy. We found no significant problems with the development, administration, or scoring of the March 2002 exam.

General Finding 3: Students made significant progress in mastering the required ELA skills, but less progress in mathematics.

General Finding 4: For disadvantaged students, initial passing rates continued to be low and progress for repeat test takers was limited.

General Finding 5: Teachers and principals remain positive about the CAHSEE's impact on instruction. More of them now expect positive impact on student motivation and parental involvement.

General Finding 6: Teachers and principals report planning and/or implementing a number of constructive programs for helping students master the skills covered by the CAHSEE.

Based on information available to date, as summarized in our six general findings, we offer two main recommendations at this time:

General Recommendation 1: Schools need to focus attention on effective ways of helping students master the required skills in mathematics. CDE might consider a “what works” effort with respect to remedial programs, and disseminating information about effective programs and practices.

Initial passing rates for the mathematics portion of the CAHSEE were low. Fewer than half of those taking the test as 9th graders passed. Passing rates for those testing for the first time in March 2002 were equally low, and only one quarter of the repeat test takers in March 2002 passed on their second try. Unless more dramatic progress is made over the next two years, a significant number of students in the Class of 2004 may not pass the mathematics test and will be denied a diploma.

While the state already has a number of programs designed to help schools teach the California content standards, there is still considerable variation across schools in mathematics passing rates. Identification and dissemination of effective practices in schools with higher passing rates might be a significant aid to schools with lower passing rates.

General Recommendation 2: State policymakers need to engage in a continued discussion about reasonable options for students with disabilities who may not ever be likely to pass the test.

There is significant tension between the desire to have high expectations for all students, including students with disabilities, and the need to be realistic about what some students can accomplish. Initial and continuing low passing rates for students with disabilities suggest particular concern with the time it may take to help these students master the required standards.

Options to be considered include some form of alternative diploma for students who are physically or mentally unable to develop or demonstrate the required skills, alternate means of demonstrating competency for students who cannot meaningfully complete the CAHSEE, even with accommodation, and new work on special remedial courses targeted specifically to this population.

One final option for further discussion is deferring the CAHSEE requirement one or more years to give more time for students to update educational plans to cover not only the CAHSEE content areas, but all of the prerequisite or foundational skills as well. Last year, the California legislature passed a bill (AB-1609) calling for a study of whether standards-based instruction is sufficient to support the use of the CAHSEE for the Class of 2004 and authorizing the State Board of Education to decide, after reviewing this report (and also reviewing testing results through March 2003), whether the CAHSEE requirement should be deferred. It is likely that progress or lack of progress for students with disabilities will be a key concern in the required study and in the Board's decision.

Other Specific Recommendations

Based on activities and findings from the first three years of the evaluation, we also offer a number of more specific recommendations for improving the quality of the exam. These include:

Specific Recommendation 1: The score scale needs to be changed for students scoring below 300 (chance levels). A short-term solution is to simply recode scores below 300 to 299. Teachers, students, and parents need to be cautioned against interpreting differences below the 300 level.

Specific Recommendation 2: Districts and schools should be asked to supply more complete information on who has taken, is taking, and still needs to take the CAHSEE.

Specific Recommendation 3: The CDE should work with schools to collect more information on documentation of student needs for accommodations or modifications.

Specific Recommendation 4: ETS should follow up on (a) specific test question issues identified in our item review workshops and (b) specific suggestions for improving their new scoring process from our review of their current online training.

These recommendations are described in more detail in Chapter 6. In making each of the above recommendations, we recognize the provisional nature of the data available at this time. We also commend the CDE for the extensive efforts that have already been made to improve the program in response to these and earlier suggestions.

**Independent Evaluation
of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE):
Year 3 Evaluation Report
Table of Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
LIST OF TABLES.....	IX
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XI
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMINATION	1
<i>Summary of Year 1 Activities.....</i>	1
<i>District Baseline Survey Resulting from Year 1 Activities</i>	3
<i>Summary of Year 2 Activities.....</i>	4
ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS OF YEAR 3 EVALUATION REPORT	5
CHAPTER 2: TEST DEVELOPMENT, ADMINISTRATION, AND SCORING.....	7
INTRODUCTION	7
QUALITY OF THE TEST QUESTIONS.....	7
<i>Observation of Test Development.....</i>	7
<i>Cognitive Lab.....</i>	9
<i>HumRRO’s Independent Item Review Workshops</i>	10
TEST ADMINISTRATION	17
<i>Observation of the March 2002 Administration</i>	17
<i>Accommodations and Modifications.....</i>	20
SCORING.....	27
<i>Training Scoring Leaders for ELA Constructed-Response Items</i>	28
<i>Scoring Consistency.....</i>	28
<i>Review of Electronic Training for Online Scoring Process</i>	29
<i>Verification of Test Score Equating.....</i>	33
<i>Test Form Accuracy.....</i>	36
SUMMARY	38
CHAPTER 3: PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE MARCH 2002 ADMINISTRATION.....	41
INTRODUCTION	41
WHO PASSED?	42
WHO HAS COMPLETED THE CAHSEE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT?.....	45
SCHOOL LEVEL PASSING RATES	48
IMPROVEMENT FOR REPEAT TEST TAKERS.....	50
SUMMARY	57
CHAPTER 4: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	59
INTRODUCTION	59
SURVEY ITEMS.....	59

**Independent Evaluation
of the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE):
Year 3 Evaluation Report
Table of Contents (Continued)**

FINDINGS	60
<i>Number of Respondents</i>	60
<i>Test Preparation</i>	60
<i>Importance of the test</i>	62
<i>Plans for High School and Beyond</i>	63
<i>Perceived Test Performance and Influencing Factors</i>	69
SUMMARY	72
CHAPTER 5: PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER REACTIONS.....	73
INTRODUCTION	73
SURVEY DEVELOPMENT	73
SAMPLING AND ADMINISTRATION.....	74
FINDINGS	75
<i>Background</i>	75
<i>Knowledge</i>	77
<i>Preparation Thus Far</i>	80
<i>Future Plans</i>	86
<i>Expectations</i>	89
<i>Examination Results To Date</i>	99
<i>Standards Taught</i>	100
<i>Other</i>	101
SUMMARY	104
CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	107
GENERAL FINDINGS.....	107
RECOMMENDATIONS	110
OTHER SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS.....	111
REFERENCES.....	115
APPENDIX A CAHSEE SCHOOL SITE TESTING COORDINATOR SURVEY.....	A-1
APPENDIX B CAHSEE PRINCIPAL SURVEY—SPRING 2002	B-1
APPENDIX C CAHSEE TEACHER SURVEY—SPRING 2002	C-1
APPENDIX D STANDARDS TAUGHT	D-1
APPENDIX E PRINCIPAL COMMENTS—SPRING 2002	E-1
APPENDIX F TEACHER COMMENTS—SPRING 2002	F-1

List of Tables

TABLE 2.1 *Current Positions of Item Review Panelists*..... 10

TABLE 2.2 *Years of Experience of Item Review Panelists*..... 10

TABLE 2.3 *Questions Selected for Independent Review* 11

TABLE 2.4 *Average Alignment Ratings for Older and Newer Test Questions*..... 13

TABLE 2.5 *Percent of Test Questions Judged to be Strong Measures of Their Targeted Content Standard—English Language Arts*..... 14

TABLE 2.6 *Percentage of Test Questions Judged to be Strong Measures of Their Targeted Content Standard—Mathematics* 14

TABLE 2.7 *Average Alignment Ratings for the Target and Other Standards*..... 15

TABLE 2.8 *Reasons for Low Content Alignment Ratings – English Language Arts*..... 16

TABLE 2.9 *Reasons for Low Content Alignment Ratings – Mathematics*..... 16

TABLE 2.10 *Characteristics of Schools Observed* 18

TABLE 2.11 *Frequency of Accommodations and Modifications—ELA*..... 23

TABLE 2.12 *Frequency of Accommodations and Modifications—Mathematics* 24

TABLE 2.13 *Number of Students With Modifications or Accommodations* by Primary Disability—ELA* 25

TABLE 2.14 *Number of Students With Modifications or Accommodations* by Primary Disability—Math* 26

TABLE 2.15 *Percent Scoring 350 or Above by Primary Modification or Accommodation**..... 27

TABLE 2.16 *Level of Scorer Agreement for the Two Essays* 29

TABLE 2.17 *Percent of Students at Each Score Level for the Essays in Each CAHSEE Administration* 29

TABLE 2.18 *Distribution of Item Difficulty and Slope Parameter Estimates*..... 35

TABLE 2.19 *Estimated Scale Score Means and Standard Deviations for March 2002*..... 35

TABLE 2.20 *Estimated Classification Error Rates for the March 2002 Form*..... 36

TABLE 2.21 *Comparison of Accuracy Statistics for 2001 and 2002 Test Forms*..... 37

TABLE 2.22 *Standard Error of Measurement at Different March 2002 Score Levels* 38

TABLE 3.1 *Enrollment Declines from 9th to 10th Grade* 42

TABLE 3.2 *Passing Rates by Demographic Group—English-language Arts*..... 42

TABLE 3.3 *Passing Rates by Demographic Group—Mathematics*..... 43

TABLE 3.4 *March 2002 Math Passing Rates by Prior Test Status and Highest Math Course Taken*..... 45

TABLE 3.5 *Number of Students Completing the CAHSEE Requirement** 46

TABLE 3.6 *ELA Student Pass Rates by Number of Students Tested at Each School for First Time Test Takers*..... 48

TABLE 3.7 *ELA Student Pass Rates by Number of Students Tested at Each School for Repeat Test Takers* 49

TABLE 3.8 *Math Student Pass Rates by Number of Students Tested at Each School for First Time Test Takers*..... 49

TABLE 3.9 *Math Student Pass Rates by Number of Students Tested at Each School for Repeat Test Takers* 50

TABLE 3.10 *Percent of March 2002 Examinees with Matching 2001 Data—ELA*..... 50

TABLE 3.11 *Percent of March 2002 Examinees with Matching 2001 Data—Mathematics*..... 51

TABLE 3.12 *Average 2002 Score Level by 2001 Score Level—English Language Arts Using Official Scale Scores Reported to Students* 52

TABLE 3.13 *Average 2002 Score Level by 2001 Score Level—Mathematics Using Official Scale Scores Reported to Students*..... 52

TABLE 3.14 *Average 2001 Score Levels and Average 2002 Score Improvements by Demographic Group—English-language Arts*..... 56

TABLE 3.15 *Average 2001 Score Levels and Average 2002 Score Improvements by Demographic Group—Mathematics*..... 57

TABLE 4.1 *Number of Respondents to the Student Questionnaire After Taking Test in Different Cohorts*..... 60

TABLE 5.1 *Percentages of Principals and Teachers Familiar with CAHSEE, California Content Standards, and CAHSEE Score Reports*..... 78

TABLE 5.2 *Principals’ Ratings of State-Provided CAHSEE Information* 79

TABLE 5.3 Principals' Responses to Estimated Percentage of Students and Parents Familiar with CAHSEE.....	80
TABLE 5.4 Principals' Reported Percentages of Preparations for Alignment with California Content Standards.....	81
TABLE 5.5 Percentage of Principals Reporting Similarity between District and State Standards.....	81
TABLE 5.6a Percentage of Teachers Indicating Coverage of ELA Standards by Curriculum.....	82
TABLE 5.6b Percentage of Teachers Indicating Coverage of Mathematics Standards by Curriculum.....	82
TABLE 5.7 School or District Plans to Increase Coverage of California Content Standards, According to Teachers (in percentages).....	83
TABLE 5.8 Teacher Estimates of Time Spent on CAHSEE Activities (in percentages).....	83
TABLE 5.9 Percentage of Teachers Rating Quality of Professional Development Experiences	84
TABLE 5.10 Percentage of Principals Undertaking Activities to Prepare Faculty/Staff for CAHSEE Administration.....	85
TABLE 5.11 Percentage of Principals Indicating Plans for Activities to Assist High School Students Who Do Not Pass the Exit Exam Or Who Do Not Seem Prepared to Take It.....	87
TABLE 5.12 Principals' Estimated Percentages of Students Meeting ELA and Mathematics CAHSEE Standards.....	89
TABLE 5.13 Teachers' Ratings of Preparedness of Students in the 10 th Grade (in percentages)	90
TABLE 5.14 Principals' Predicted Impact of CAHSEE on Student Motivation and Parental Involvement (in percentages)	91
TABLE 5.15 Teachers' Predicted Impact of CAHSEE on Student Motivation and Parental Involvement (in percentages)	93
TABLE 5.16 Principals' and Teachers' Predicted Impact of CAHSEE on Student Retention and Dropout Rates	94
TABLE 5.17 Teachers' Predictions of Influence of CAHSEE on Instructional Practices Over Time (Percentages)	97
TABLE 5.18 Principals' 2001 and 2002 Estimates of the Percentage of Students with Instruction in Content Standards (in percentages)	99
TABLE 5.19 Percentage of Principals Indicating Factors Affecting Students Success on CAHSEE	101
TABLE 5.20 Percentage of Principals Indicating Actions to Promote Student Learning	102
TABLE 5.21 Principals' and Teachers Perceptions of Responsibility Felt by Teachers Other Than ELA and Math.....	103
TABLE 5.22 Surveyed Teachers' Own and Others' Opinions of the CAHSEE (in percentages).....	103
TABLE D.1 Percent of Raters Listing Each Course and Percent Saying Most Students Take the Course: Mathematics.....	D-2
TABLE D.2 Courses Where Specific Standards are Taught: Mathematics	D-2
TABLE D.3 Percent of Raters Listing Each Course and Percent Saying Most Students Take the Course: ELA.....	D-6
TABLE D.4 Courses Where Specific Standards are Taught: ELA.....	D-6

List of Figures

<i>Figure 2.1. Rating scale for the independent review of test questions.</i>	12
<i>Figure 3.1. CAHSEE Results After 2001 Testing.</i>	46
<i>Figure 3.2. Estimated CAHSEE Results After March 2002 Testing.</i>	47
<i>Figure 3.3. Average 2002 ELA Score by 2001 ELA Score Level—Original Coding.</i> Error! Bookmark not defined.	
<i>Figure 3.4. Average 2002 Mathematics Score by 2001 Score Level—Original Coding.</i>	53
<i>Figure 3.5. Average 2002 ELA Score by 2001 ELA Score Level—Revised Coding.</i>	55
<i>Figure 3.6. Average 2002 Mathematics Score by 2001 Score Level—Revised Coding.</i>	55
<i>Figure 4.1. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 1 after taking the ELA test.</i>	61
<i>Figure 4.2. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 1 after taking the math test.</i>	62
<i>Figure 4.3. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 2 after taking the ELA test.</i>	63
<i>Figure 4.4. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 2 after taking the math test.</i>	63
<i>Figure 4.5. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 3 after taking the ELA test.</i>	64
<i>Figure 4.6. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 3 after taking the math test.</i>	65
<i>Figure 4.7. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 4 after taking the ELA test.</i>	66
<i>Figure 4.8. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 4 after taking the math test.</i>	66
<i>Figure 4.9. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 5 after taking the ELA test.</i>	67
<i>Figure 4.10. Different Cohorts’ Responses to Question 5 after taking the math test.</i>	68
<i>Figure 4.11. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 6 after taking the ELA test.</i>	69
<i>Figure 4.12. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 6 after taking the math test.</i>	69
<i>Figure 4.13. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 7 after taking the ELA test.</i>	70
<i>Figure 4.14. Different cohorts’ responses to Question 7 after taking the math test.</i>	71
<i>Figure 4.15. Different cohorts of students’ responses to Question 8 after taking the ELA test.</i>	71
<i>Figure 4.16. Different cohorts of students’ responses to Question 8 after taking the math test.</i>	72
<i>Figure 5.1a. Percentage of principals reporting activities undertaken in preparation for the spring 2001 and 2002 administrations of the CAHSEE.</i>	85
<i>Figure 5.1b. Percentage of teachers reporting activities undertaken in preparation for the spring 2001 and 2002 administrations of the CAHSEE.</i>	86
<i>Figure 5.2. Percentage of principals in 2002 reporting plans for remediation of students who do not pass the CAHSEE.</i>	88
<i>Figure 5.3a. Percentage of principals predicting increased or strongly increased student motivation and parental involvement in 2000, 2001, and 2002.</i>	91
<i>Figure 5.3b. Percentage of teachers predicting increased or strongly increased student motivation and parental involvement in 2000, 2001, and 2002.</i>	92
<i>Figure 5.4a. Percentage of principals predicting increased or strongly increased student retention and dropout rates in 2000, 2001, and 2002.</i>	94
<i>Figure 5.4b. Percentage of teachers predicting increased or strongly increased student retention and dropout rates in 2000, 2001, and 2002.</i>	95
<i>Figure 5.5a. Principals’ prediction of influence of the CAHSEE on instructional practices over time.</i>	96
<i>Figure 5.5b. Teachers’ prediction of influence of the CAHSEE on instructional practices over time.</i>	96
<i>Figure 5.6a. Principals’ estimates of the percentage of students who have had instruction in ELA content standards (ordered by least instruction).</i>	98
<i>Figure 5.6b. Principals’ estimates of the percentage of students who have had instruction in mathematics content standards (ordered by least instruction).</i>	98
<i>Figure 5.7. Percentage of principals indicating the percentage of teachers who understand the difference between “teaching to the test” and “aligning the curriculum and instruction to the standards” in 2001 and 2002.</i>	102

