

**California Department of Education Assessment Development & Administration Division**



# Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2021–22 Technical Report

**Submitted July 12, 2023**

**By ETS**



**Contract #CN150012**

Table of Contents

[Chapter 1: Introduction 1](#_Toc140043232)

[1.1. ELPAC Overview 1](#_Toc140043233)

[1.2. Purposes of the Assessment 1](#_Toc140043234)

[1.3. Test Content 2](#_Toc140043235)

[1.4. Intended Population 3](#_Toc140043236)

[1.5. Testing Windows and Times 3](#_Toc140043237)

[1.6. Test Scores 4](#_Toc140043238)

[1.7. Significant Developments in 2021–22 5](#_Toc140043239)

[1.7.1. Accessibility Resources 5](#_Toc140043240)

[1.8. Groups and Organizations Involved with the ELPAC 5](#_Toc140043241)

[1.8.1. California State Board of Education 5](#_Toc140043242)

[1.8.2. California Department of Education 5](#_Toc140043243)

[1.8.3. California Educators 6](#_Toc140043244)

[1.8.4. Contractors 6](#_Toc140043245)

[1.9. Systems Overview and Functionality 7](#_Toc140043246)

[1.9.1. Test Operations Management System 7](#_Toc140043247)

[1.9.2. Test Delivery System 8](#_Toc140043248)

[1.9.3. Test Results for California’s Assessments Website 8](#_Toc140043249)

[1.9.4. Constructed-Response Scoring Systems for ETS 9](#_Toc140043250)

[1.10. Overview of the Technical Report 9](#_Toc140043251)

[References 10](#_Toc140043252)

[Chapter 2: Overview of Initial ELPAC Processes 11](#_Toc140043253)

[2.1. Item Development 11](#_Toc140043254)

[2.1.1. Item Format 11](#_Toc140043255)

[2.1.2. Item Specifications 11](#_Toc140043256)

[2.2. Test Assembly 11](#_Toc140043257)

[2.2.1. Test Length 11](#_Toc140043258)

[2.2.2. Test Blueprints 12](#_Toc140043259)

[2.2.3. Item Selection 12](#_Toc140043260)

[2.3. Test Administration 12](#_Toc140043261)

[2.3.1. Test Security and Confidentiality 12](#_Toc140043262)

[2.3.2. Procedures to Maintain Standardization 13](#_Toc140043263)

[2.4. Fairness and Accessibility 13](#_Toc140043264)

[2.4.1. Overview 13](#_Toc140043265)

[2.4.2. Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations 14](#_Toc140043266)

[2.4.3. Description of Differential Item Functioning Analyses 14](#_Toc140043267)

[2.5. Scores 14](#_Toc140043268)

[2.5.1. Score Reporting 14](#_Toc140043269)

[2.5.2. Aggregation Procedures 15](#_Toc140043270)

[2.6. Calibration and Scaling 15](#_Toc140043271)

[2.7. Psychometric Analyses 15](#_Toc140043272)

[2.7.1. Description of Classical Item Analyses 16](#_Toc140043273)

[References 17](#_Toc140043274)

[Chapter 3: Item Development and Review 18](#_Toc140043275)

[3.1. Overview 18](#_Toc140043276)

[3.2. Initial ELPAC Test Blueprints 18](#_Toc140043277)

[3.3. Item Development 19](#_Toc140043278)

[3.4. Task Types and Features 19](#_Toc140043279)

[3.4.1. Task Types 19](#_Toc140043280)

[3.4.2. Listening 20](#_Toc140043281)

[3.4.3. Speaking 20](#_Toc140043282)

[3.4.4. Reading 20](#_Toc140043283)

[3.4.5. Writing 20](#_Toc140043284)

[3.5. ETS Item Review Process 20](#_Toc140043285)

[3.5.1. Overview 20](#_Toc140043286)

[3.5.2. ETS Content Review 21](#_Toc140043287)

[3.5.3. ETS Accessibility Review 21](#_Toc140043288)

[3.5.4. ETS Editorial Review 21](#_Toc140043289)

[3.5.5. ETS Sensitivity and Fairness Review 22](#_Toc140043290)

[3.6. California Department of Education Review 22](#_Toc140043291)

[3.7. California Educator Review 22](#_Toc140043292)

[References 24](#_Toc140043293)

[Chapter 4: Test Assembly 25](#_Toc140043294)

[4.1. Overview 25](#_Toc140043295)

[4.2. Test Forms 25](#_Toc140043296)

[4.3. Special Version Forms 26](#_Toc140043297)

[4.3.1. Braille Form 26](#_Toc140043298)

[4.3.2. Emergency Paper–Pencil Form 26](#_Toc140043299)

[4.4. Psychometric Criteria and Identification of Eligible Items 27](#_Toc140043300)

[4.5. California Department of Education Forms Review 27](#_Toc140043301)

[4.6. Configuration of the Test Delivery System 28](#_Toc140043302)

[References 29](#_Toc140043303)

[Chapter 5: Test Administration 30](#_Toc140043304)

[5.1. Overview 30](#_Toc140043305)

[5.1.1. In-Person and Remote Testing 30](#_Toc140043306)

[5.1.2. Platform 30](#_Toc140043307)

[5.1.3. Materials 30](#_Toc140043308)

[5.1.4. Means 31](#_Toc140043309)

[5.1.5. Score Reporting 31](#_Toc140043310)

[5.2. Administration and Scoring Training 32](#_Toc140043311)

[5.2.1. Goals 33](#_Toc140043312)

[5.2.2. Local Educational Agency Training Requirement 33](#_Toc140043313)

[5.3. Local Educational Agency Training 45](#_Toc140043314)

[5.3.1. Synchronous and Asynchronous Training 45](#_Toc140043315)

[5.3.2. Videos and Guides 46](#_Toc140043316)

[5.3.3. Training for Proper Identification and Assignment of Designated Supports and Accommodations 46](#_Toc140043317)

[5.3.4. Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey 47](#_Toc140043318)

[5.4. User Roles and Standardization 48](#_Toc140043319)

[5.4.1. Local Educational Agency ELPAC Coordinator 48](#_Toc140043320)

[5.4.2. Site ELPAC Coordinator 49](#_Toc140043321)

[5.4.3. Test Examiner 49](#_Toc140043322)

[5.4.4. Local Scoring Correspondence Administrator 50](#_Toc140043323)

[5.4.5. Local Scoring Data Entry Staff 50](#_Toc140043324)

[5.4.6. Instructions for Test Administration 50](#_Toc140043325)

[5.5. Student Participation Requirement 52](#_Toc140043326)

[5.6. Accessibility Resources 52](#_Toc140043327)

[5.6.1. Domain Exemptions 52](#_Toc140043328)

[5.6.2. Accessibility Resource Categories 53](#_Toc140043329)

[5.6.3. Identification and Selection 58](#_Toc140043330)

[5.6.4. Assignment 58](#_Toc140043331)

[5.6.5. Delivery 59](#_Toc140043332)

[5.6.6. Usage of Designated Supports and Accommodations 59](#_Toc140043333)

[5.7. Test Security and Confidentiality 60](#_Toc140043334)

[5.7.1. ETS’ Office of Testing Integrity 60](#_Toc140043335)

[5.7.2. Procedures to Maintain Standardization of Test Security 61](#_Toc140043336)

[5.7.3. Test Security Monitoring 62](#_Toc140043337)

[5.7.4. Test Delivery 62](#_Toc140043338)

[5.7.5. Security of Electronic Files Using a Firewall 63](#_Toc140043339)

[5.7.6. Transfer of Scores via Secure Data Exchange 63](#_Toc140043340)

[5.7.7. Data Management in the Secure Database 64](#_Toc140043341)

[5.7.8. Statistical Analysis on Secure Servers 64](#_Toc140043342)

[5.7.9. Student Confidentiality 64](#_Toc140043343)

[5.7.10. Student Test Results 64](#_Toc140043344)

[5.7.11. Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System Process 65](#_Toc140043345)

[5.7.12. Appeals 67](#_Toc140043346)

[5.8. Technology Readiness 69](#_Toc140043347)

[References 70](#_Toc140043348)

[Appendix 5.A: Accessibility Resource Assignment 71](#_Toc140043349)

[Chapter 6: Standard Setting 79](#_Toc140043350)

[6.1. Description 79](#_Toc140043351)

[Reference 80](#_Toc140043352)

[Chapter 7: Scoring and Reporting 81](#_Toc140043353)

[7.1. Rotating Score Validation Process 81](#_Toc140043354)

[7.2. Human Scoring for Speaking Constructed-Response Items 82](#_Toc140043355)

[7.3. Machine Scoring for Selected-Response Items 83](#_Toc140043356)

[7.4. Student Test Scores 83](#_Toc140043357)

[7.4.1. Raw Scores 83](#_Toc140043358)

[7.4.2. Scale Scores 83](#_Toc140043359)

[7.4.3. Performance Levels 87](#_Toc140043360)

[7.5. Overview of Score Aggregation Procedures 87](#_Toc140043361)

[7.5.1. Score Distributions and Summary Statistics 88](#_Toc140043362)

[7.5.2. Performance Levels 88](#_Toc140043363)

[7.5.3. Demographic Student Group Summaries 95](#_Toc140043364)

[7.6. Reports Produced and Scores for Each Report 96](#_Toc140043365)

[7.6.1. Online Reporting 96](#_Toc140043366)

[7.6.2. Special Cases 97](#_Toc140043367)

[7.6.3. Types of Score Reports 97](#_Toc140043368)

[7.6.4. Score Report Applications 99](#_Toc140043369)

[7.6.5. Criteria for Interpreting Test Scores 99](#_Toc140043370)

[7.6.6. Criteria for Interpreting Score Reports 99](#_Toc140043371)

[References 100](#_Toc140043372)

[Accessibility Information 101](#_Toc140043373)

[Alternative Text for Equation 7.1 101](#_Toc140043374)

[Alternative Text for Equation 7.2 101](#_Toc140043375)

[Alternative Text for Equation 7.3 101](#_Toc140043376)

[Appendix 7.A: Initial ELPAC Participation 102](#_Toc140043377)

[Appendix 7.B: Raw Score Frequency Distributions 110](#_Toc140043378)

[Appendix 7.C: Raw Score, Scale Score, and Performance Level Distributions for Each Composite 133](#_Toc140043379)

[Appendix 7.D: Overall Scale Scores and Performance Level Distribution 159](#_Toc140043380)

[Appendix 7.E: Means and Standard Deviations of Scale Scores by Demographic Student Group 248](#_Toc140043381)

[Chapter 8: Psychometric Analyses 288](#_Toc140043382)

[8.1. Overview 288](#_Toc140043383)

[8.1.1. Summary of the Analyses 288](#_Toc140043384)

[8.1.2. Rotating Score Validation Process for the Initial ELPAC 289](#_Toc140043385)

[8.1.3. Samples Used for Analyses 289](#_Toc140043386)

[8.2. Classical Item Analyses 290](#_Toc140043387)

[8.2.1. Classical Item Difficulty Indices (*p*-value and Average Item Score) 290](#_Toc140043388)

[8.2.2. Item-Total Correlation 291](#_Toc140043389)

[8.2.3. Distribution of Item Scores 292](#_Toc140043390)

[8.2.4. Omit Rates 292](#_Toc140043391)

[8.2.5. Classical Item Analysis Results 293](#_Toc140043402)

[8.3. Testing Time Analyses 295](#_Toc140043403)

[8.4. Reliability Analyses 296](#_Toc140043404)

[8.4.1. Sample for Reliability Analyses 296](#_Toc140043405)

[8.4.2. Reliability Measures 296](#_Toc140043406)

[8.4.3. Reliability Estimates 297](#_Toc140043407)

[8.4.4. Standard Error of Measurement 298](#_Toc140043408)

[8.4.5. Student Group Reliabilities 299](#_Toc140043409)

[8.4.6. Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement 300](#_Toc140043410)

[8.4.7. Decision Classification Analyses 302](#_Toc140043411)

[8.4.8. Interrater Agreement (Constructed-Response Scoring Reliability) 304](#_Toc140043412)

[8.5. Validity Evidence 310](#_Toc140043413)

[8.5.1. Design of the Initial ELPAC 310](#_Toc140043414)

[8.5.2. Content 311](#_Toc140043415)

[8.5.3. Internal Structure 312](#_Toc140043416)

[8.5.4. Other Validity Evidence 313](#_Toc140043417)

[References 315](#_Toc140043418)

[Accessibility Information 317](#_Toc140043419)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.1 317](#_Toc140043420)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.2 317](#_Toc140043421)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.3 317](#_Toc140043422)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.4 317](#_Toc140043423)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.5 317](#_Toc140043424)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.6 317](#_Toc140043425)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.7 317](#_Toc140043426)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.8 317](#_Toc140043427)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.9 317](#_Toc140043428)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.10 317](#_Toc140043429)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.11 317](#_Toc140043430)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.12 318](#_Toc140043431)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.13 318](#_Toc140043432)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.14 318](#_Toc140043433)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.15 318](#_Toc140043434)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.16 318](#_Toc140043435)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.17 318](#_Toc140043436)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.18 318](#_Toc140043437)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.19 318](#_Toc140043438)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.20 318](#_Toc140043439)

[Alternative Text for Equation 8.21 319](#_Toc140043440)

[Appendix 8.A: Rotating Score Validation Process Participant Data 320](#_Toc140043441)

[Appendix 8.B: Classical Item Analyses Results 326](#_Toc140043442)

[Appendix 8.C: Response Time Results 338](#_Toc140043443)

[Appendix 8.D: Reliability Estimates 340](#_Toc140043444)

[Appendix 8.E: Classification Analyses 364](#_Toc140043445)

[Appendix 8.F: Correlations Between Initial ELPAC Domains 366](#_Toc140043446)

[Chapter 9: Quality Control Procedures 368](#_Toc140043447)

[9.1. Quality Control of Item Development 368](#_Toc140043448)

[9.2. Quality Control of Test Assembly and Delivery 368](#_Toc140043449)

[9.2.1. Quality Control of Test Assignment 369](#_Toc140043450)

[9.3. Quality Control of Test Materials 370](#_Toc140043451)

[9.3.1. Developing Assessments 370](#_Toc140043452)

[9.3.2. Test Administration Manuals 370](#_Toc140043453)

[9.3.3. Collecting Test Materials 370](#_Toc140043454)

[9.3.4. Processing Test Materials 371](#_Toc140043455)

[9.4. Quality Control of Test Administration 372](#_Toc140043456)

[9.5. Quality Control of Scoring 372](#_Toc140043457)

[9.5.1. Local Scoring Procedures for Speaking and Writing 372](#_Toc140043458)

[9.5.2. Interrater Reliability Results 373](#_Toc140043459)

[9.5.3. Machine-Scoring Procedures 373](#_Toc140043460)

[9.5.4. Development of Scoring Specifications 374](#_Toc140043461)

[9.5.5. Paper–Pencil Scoring 374](#_Toc140043462)

[9.6. Quality Control of Psychometric Processes 374](#_Toc140043463)

[9.6.1. Scoring Verification 374](#_Toc140043464)

[9.6.2. Psychometric Analyses 374](#_Toc140043465)

[9.7. Quality Control of Reporting 375](#_Toc140043466)

[9.7.1. Exclusion of Student Scores from Summary Reports 376](#_Toc140043467)

[9.8. Quality Control of End-to-End Testing 376](#_Toc140043468)

[9.8.1. Computer-based Assessments 376](#_Toc140043469)

[9.8.2. Paper–Pencil Tests 377](#_Toc140043470)

[References 378](#_Toc140043471)

[Chapter 10: Continuous Improvement 379](#_Toc140043472)

[10.1. 2021–22 Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey 379](#_Toc140043473)

[10.1.1. Communications 379](#_Toc140043474)

[10.1.2. Outreach 380](#_Toc140043475)

[10.2. Improvement in the *Directions for Administration* 380](#_Toc140043476)

[10.3. Improvement on Administration and Scoring Training 380](#_Toc140043477)

[10.4. Accessibility Resources 381](#_Toc140043478)

[References 382](#_Toc140043479)

List of Tables

[Acronyms and Initialisms Used in the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Technical Report xiv](#_Toc139275317)

[Table 1.1 Initial ELPAC Testing for July 2021 Through June 2022 1](#_Toc139275318)

[Table 1.2 Differences Between the Initial ELPAC and Summative ELPAC 2](#_Toc139275319)

[Table 3.1 ELPAC CRP and BSRP Qualifications, by Meeting Type and Total 23](#_Toc139275320)

[Table 4.1 Overview of Initial ELPAC Items and Points by Domain and Grade Level or Grade Span 25](#_Toc139275321)

[Table 5.1 LEA Certification Counts 33](#_Toc139275322)

[Table 5.2 Test Examiner Certification Counts for Speaking 34](#_Toc139275323)

[Table 5.3 Test Examiner Certification Counts for Writing 35](#_Toc139275324)

[Table 5.4 Available Scoring Training Videos 37](#_Toc139275325)

[Table 5.5 Available Training Videos and Presentations 40](#_Toc139275326)

[Table 5.6 Training and Calibration Quizzes by Grade Level or Grade Span 42](#_Toc139275327)

[Table 5.7 Types of Appeals 66](#_Toc139275328)

[Table 5.8 Number and Types of Incidents Submitted in STAIRS 68](#_Toc139275329)

[Table 5.9 Total Appeal Types Approved 69](#_Toc139275330)

[Table 5.A.1 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—All 71](#_Toc139275331)

[Table 5.A.2 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Kindergarten 73](#_Toc139275332)

[Table 5.A.3 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade One 74](#_Toc139275333)

[Table 5.A.4 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Two 75](#_Toc139275334)

[Table 5.A.5 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Span Three Through Five 76](#_Toc139275335)

[Table 5.A.6 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Span Six Through Eight 77](#_Toc139275336)

[Table 5.A.7 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 78](#_Toc139275337)

[Table 7.1 Correlation Between ETS and Official Scores for RSVP Samples 82](#_Toc139275338)

[Table 7.2 Recommended Threshold Scores for Oral Language Skill and Associated Theta Score 84](#_Toc139275339)

[Table 7.3 Recommended Threshold Scores for Written Language Skill and Associated Theta Score 85](#_Toc139275340)

[Table 7.4 Slope, Intercept, and Reporting Threshold Scores for Oral Language Scale Linear Transformation 86](#_Toc139275341)

[Table 7.5 Slope, Intercept, and Reporting Threshold Scores for Written Language Scale Linear Transformation 86](#_Toc139275342)

[Table 7.6 Overall Reporting Scale Score Ranges for Each Performance Level by Grade Level or Grade Span 87](#_Toc139275343)

[Table 7.7 Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) of Overall, Oral Language, and Written Language Skill Scale Scores 88](#_Toc139275344)

[Table 7.8 Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level—Overall 90](#_Toc139275345)

[Table 7.9 Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level—Oral Language 92](#_Toc139275346)

[Table 7.10 Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level—Written Language 94](#_Toc139275347)

[Table 7.11 Demographic Student Groups Reported 95](#_Toc139275348)

[Table 7.A.1 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Kindergarten Through Grade   
Three 102](#_Toc139275349)

[Table 7.A.2 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Grade Four Through Grade Six 104](#_Toc139275350)

[Table 7.A.3 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Grade Seven Through Grade   
Nine 106](#_Toc139275351)

[Table 7.A.4 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Grade Ten Through Grade   
Twelve 108](#_Toc139275352)

[Table 7.B.1 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Kindergarten 110](#_Toc139275353)

[Table 7.B.2 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade One 110](#_Toc139275354)

[Table 7.B.3 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Two 111](#_Toc139275355)

[Table 7.B.4 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Three 111](#_Toc139275356)

[Table 7.B.5 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Four 112](#_Toc139275357)

[Table 7.B.6 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Five 112](#_Toc139275358)

[Table 7.B.7 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Six 113](#_Toc139275359)

[Table 7.B.8 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Seven 113](#_Toc139275360)

[Table 7.B.9 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Eight 114](#_Toc139275361)

[Table 7.B.10 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Nine 114](#_Toc139275362)

[Table 7.B.11 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Ten 115](#_Toc139275363)

[Table 7.B.12 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Eleven 115](#_Toc139275364)

[Table 7.B.13 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Twelve 116](#_Toc139275365)

[Table 7.B.14 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Kindergarten 116](#_Toc139275366)

[Table 7.B.15 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade One 117](#_Toc139275367)

[Table 7.B.16 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Two 117](#_Toc139275368)

[Table 7.B.17 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Three 118](#_Toc139275369)

[Table 7.B.18 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Four 118](#_Toc139275370)

[Table 7.B.19 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Five 119](#_Toc139275371)

[Table 7.B.20 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Six 119](#_Toc139275372)

[Table 7.B.21 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Seven 120](#_Toc139275373)

[Table 7.B.22 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Eight 120](#_Toc139275374)

[Table 7.B.23 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Nine 121](#_Toc139275375)

[Table 7.B.24 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Ten 121](#_Toc139275376)

[Table 7.B.25 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Eleven 122](#_Toc139275377)

[Table 7.B.26 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Twelve 122](#_Toc139275378)

[Table 7.B.27 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Kindergarten 123](#_Toc139275379)

[Table 7.B.28 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade One 123](#_Toc139275380)

[Table 7.B.29 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Two 123](#_Toc139275381)

[Table 7.B.30 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Three 124](#_Toc139275382)

[Table 7.B.31 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Four 124](#_Toc139275383)

[Table 7.B.32 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Five 124](#_Toc139275384)

[Table 7.B.33 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Six 125](#_Toc139275385)

[Table 7.B.34 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Seven 125](#_Toc139275386)

[Table 7.B.35 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Eight 125](#_Toc139275387)

[Table 7.B.36 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Nine 126](#_Toc139275388)

[Table 7.B.37 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Ten 126](#_Toc139275389)

[Table 7.B.38 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Eleven 126](#_Toc139275390)

[Table 7.B.39 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Twelve 127](#_Toc139275391)

[Table 7.B.40 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Kindergarten 127](#_Toc139275392)

[Table 7.B.41 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade One 128](#_Toc139275393)

[Table 7.B.42 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Two 128](#_Toc139275394)

[Table 7.B.43 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Three 129](#_Toc139275395)

[Table 7.B.44 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Four 129](#_Toc139275396)

[Table 7.B.45 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Five 130](#_Toc139275397)

[Table 7.B.46 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Six 130](#_Toc139275398)

[Table 7.B.47 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Seven 130](#_Toc139275399)

[Table 7.B.48 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Eight 131](#_Toc139275400)

[Table 7.B.49 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Nine 131](#_Toc139275401)

[Table 7.B.50 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Ten 131](#_Toc139275402)

[Table 7.B.51 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Eleven 132](#_Toc139275403)

[Table 7.B.52 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Twelve 132](#_Toc139275404)

[Table 7.C.1 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Kindergarten 133](#_Toc139275405)

[Table 7.C.2 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade One 134](#_Toc139275406)

[Table 7.C.3 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Two 135](#_Toc139275407)

[Table 7.C.4 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Three 136](#_Toc139275408)

[Table 7.C.5 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Four 137](#_Toc139275409)

[Table 7.C.6 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Five 138](#_Toc139275410)

[Table 7.C.7 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Six 139](#_Toc139275411)

[Table 7.C.8 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Seven 140](#_Toc139275412)

[Table 7.C.9 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Eight 141](#_Toc139275413)

[Table 7.C.10 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Nine 142](#_Toc139275414)

[Table 7.C.11 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Ten 143](#_Toc139275415)

[Table 7.C.12 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Eleven 144](#_Toc139275416)

[Table 7.C.13 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Twelve 145](#_Toc139275417)

[Table 7.C.14 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Kindergarten 146](#_Toc139275418)

[Table 7.C.15 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade One 147](#_Toc139275419)

[Table 7.C.16 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Two 148](#_Toc139275420)

[Table 7.C.17 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Three 149](#_Toc139275421)

[Table 7.C.18 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Four 150](#_Toc139275422)

[Table 7.C.19 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Five 151](#_Toc139275423)

[Table 7.C.20 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Six 152](#_Toc139275424)

[Table 7.C.21 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Seven 153](#_Toc139275425)

[Table 7.C.22 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Eight 154](#_Toc139275426)

[Table 7.C.23 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Nine 155](#_Toc139275427)

[Table 7.C.24 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Ten 156](#_Toc139275428)

[Table 7.C.25 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Eleven 157](#_Toc139275429)

[Table 7.C.26 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Twelve 158](#_Toc139275430)

[Table 7.D.1 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores,   
Kindergarten 159](#_Toc139275431)

[Table 7.D.2 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
One 169](#_Toc139275432)

[Table 7.D.3 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Two 177](#_Toc139275433)

[Table 7.D.4 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Three 184](#_Toc139275434)

[Table 7.D.5 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Four 191](#_Toc139275435)

[Table 7.D.6 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Five 198](#_Toc139275436)

[Table 7.D.7 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Six 205](#_Toc139275437)

[Table 7.D.8 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Seven 211](#_Toc139275438)

[Table 7.D.9 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Eight 217](#_Toc139275439)

[Table 7.D.10 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Nine 223](#_Toc139275440)

[Table 7.D.11 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade   
Ten 230](#_Toc139275441)

[Table 7.D.12 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Eleven 236](#_Toc139275442)

[Table 7.D.13 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Twelve 242](#_Toc139275443)

[Table 7.E.1 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Kindergarten 248](#_Toc139275444)

[Table 7.E.2 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade One 250](#_Toc139275445)

[Table 7.E.3 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Two 251](#_Toc139275446)

[Table 7.E.4 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Three 252](#_Toc139275447)

[Table 7.E.5 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Four 253](#_Toc139275448)

[Table 7.E.6 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Five 254](#_Toc139275449)

[Table 7.E.7 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Six 255](#_Toc139275450)

[Table 7.E.8 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Seven 256](#_Toc139275451)

[Table 7.E.9 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Eight 257](#_Toc139275452)

[Table 7.E.10 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Nine 258](#_Toc139275453)

[Table 7.E.11 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Ten 259](#_Toc139275454)

[Table 7.E.12 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Eleven 260](#_Toc139275455)

[Table 7.E.13 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Twelve 261](#_Toc139275456)

[Table 7.E.14 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Kindergarten 262](#_Toc139275457)

[Table 7.E.15 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade One 263](#_Toc139275458)

[Table 7.E.16 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Two 264](#_Toc139275459)

[Table 7.E.17 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Three 265](#_Toc139275460)

[Table 7.E.18 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Four 266](#_Toc139275461)

[Table 7.E.19 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Five 267](#_Toc139275462)

[Table 7.E.20 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Six 268](#_Toc139275463)

[Table 7.E.21 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Seven 269](#_Toc139275464)

[Table 7.E.22 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Eight 270](#_Toc139275465)

[Table 7.E.23 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Nine 271](#_Toc139275466)

[Table 7.E.24 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Ten 272](#_Toc139275467)

[Table 7.E.25 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Eleven 273](#_Toc139275468)

[Table 7.E.26 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Twelve 274](#_Toc139275469)

[Table 7.E.27 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Kindergarten 275](#_Toc139275470)

[Table 7.E.28 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade One 276](#_Toc139275471)

[Table 7.E.29 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Two 277](#_Toc139275472)

[Table 7.E.30 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Three 278](#_Toc139275473)

[Table 7.E.31 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Four 279](#_Toc139275474)

[Table 7.E.32 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Five 280](#_Toc139275475)

[Table 7.E.33 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Six 281](#_Toc139275476)

[Table 7.E.34 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Seven 282](#_Toc139275477)

[Table 7.E.35 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Eight 283](#_Toc139275478)

[Table 7.E.36 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Nine 284](#_Toc139275479)

[Table 7.E.37 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Ten 285](#_Toc139275480)

[Table 7.E.38 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Eleven 286](#_Toc139275481)

[Table 7.E.39 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Twelve 287](#_Toc139275482)

[Table 8.1 Initial ELPAC Counts for Psychometric Analyses by Grade Level 290](#_Toc139275483)

[Table 8.2 Classical Item Statistics for Each Domain by Grade Level or Grade Span 293](#_Toc139275484)

[Table 8.3 Mean Percent of Items Omitted 295](#_Toc139275485)

[Table 8.4 Reliability Coefficient of Domains, Composite, and Overall Scores 297](#_Toc139275486)

[Table 8.5 SEM Based on Classical Test Theory for Raw Scores 299](#_Toc139275487)

[Table 8.6 SEM Based on Classical Test Theory for Scale Scores 299](#_Toc139275488)

[Table 8.7 Decision Accuracy for Reaching a Performance Level 303](#_Toc139275489)

[Table 8.8 Decision Consistency for Reaching a Performance Level 303](#_Toc139275490)

[Table 8.9 Classification Consistency and Accuracy for Composite Scores 304](#_Toc139275491)

[Table 8.10 Frequencies of Ratings 305](#_Toc139275492)

[Table 8.11 Interrater Reliabilities for Writing Items 307](#_Toc139275493)

[Table 8.12 Interrater Reliability of Speaking Items 308](#_Toc139275494)

[Table 8.13 Correlation Among Composites and the Overall Score 314](#_Toc139275495)

[Table 8.A.1 Number of Students by LEA 320](#_Toc139275496)

[Table 8.B.1 Item Analysis—Listening, Kindergarten 326](#_Toc139275497)

[Table 8.B.2 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade One 326](#_Toc139275498)

[Table 8.B.3 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade Two 327](#_Toc139275499)

[Table 8.B.4 Item Analysis for—Listening, Grade Span Three Through Five 327](#_Toc139275500)

[Table 8.B.5 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade Span Six Through Eight 328](#_Toc139275501)

[Table 8.B.6 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 328](#_Toc139275502)

[Table 8.B.7 Item Analysis—Speaking, Kindergarten 329](#_Toc139275503)

[Table 8.B.8 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade One 329](#_Toc139275504)

[Table 8.B.9 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Two 329](#_Toc139275505)

[Table 8.B.10 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Span Three Through Five 330](#_Toc139275506)

[Table 8.B.11 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Span Six Through Eight 330](#_Toc139275507)

[Table 8.B.12 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 330](#_Toc139275508)

[Table 8.B.13 Item Analysis—Reading, Kindergarten 331](#_Toc139275509)

[Table 8.B.14 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade One 331](#_Toc139275510)

[Table 8.B.15 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Two 331](#_Toc139275511)

[Table 8.B.16 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Span Three Through Five 332](#_Toc139275512)

[Table 8.B.17 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Span Six Through Eight 332](#_Toc139275513)

[Table 8.B.18 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 332](#_Toc139275514)

[Table 8.B.19 Item Analysis—Writing, by Grade Level or Grade Span 333](#_Toc139275515)

[Table 8.B.20 Distribution of Item Scores for Speaking Items with Multiple Score Points 334](#_Toc139275516)

[Table 8.B.21 Distribution of Item Scores for Written Items with Multiple Score Points 336](#_Toc139275517)

[Table 8.C.1 Total Testing Time (in Minutes) at Each Raw Score Interval 338](#_Toc139275518)

[Table 8.D.1 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Kindergarten 340](#_Toc139275519)

[Table 8.D.2 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Kindergarten 342](#_Toc139275520)

[Table 8.D.3 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade One 344](#_Toc139275521)

[Table 8.D.4 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade One 346](#_Toc139275522)

[Table 8.D.5 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Two 348](#_Toc139275523)

[Table 8.D.6 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Two 350](#_Toc139275524)

[Table 8.D.7 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Three Through Five 352](#_Toc139275525)

[Table 8.D.8 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Three Through Five 354](#_Toc139275526)

[Table 8.D.9 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Six Through   
Eight 356](#_Toc139275527)

[Table 8.D.10 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Six Through Eight 358](#_Toc139275528)

[Table 8.D.11 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 360](#_Toc139275529)

[Table 8.D.12 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 362](#_Toc139275530)

[Table 8.E.1 Classification Accuracy at Each Performance Threshold Score—Oral Language Composite 364](#_Toc139275531)

[Table 8.E.2 Classification Accuracy at Each Performance Threshold Score—Written Language Composite 364](#_Toc139275532)

[Table 8.E.3 Classification Accuracy at Each Performance Threshold Score—Overall   
Score 364](#_Toc139275533)

[Table 8.E.4 Classification Consistency at Each Performance Threshold Score—Oral Language Composite 365](#_Toc139275534)

[Table 8.E.5 Classification Consistency at Each Performance Threshold Score—Written Language Composite 365](#_Toc139275535)

[Table 8.E.6 Classification Consistency at Each Performance Threshold Score—Overall Score 365](#_Toc139275536)

[Table 8.F.1 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Kindergarten 366](#_Toc139275537)

[Table 8.F.2 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade One 366](#_Toc139275538)

[Table 8.F.3 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Two 366](#_Toc139275539)

[Table 8.F.4 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Span Three Through Five 367](#_Toc139275540)

[Table 8.F.5 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Span Six Through Eight 367](#_Toc139275541)

[Table 8.F.6 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve 367](#_Toc139275542)

List of Figures

[Figure 7.1 Percentage of students at each overall performance level 89](#_Toc138923756)

[Figure 7.2 Percentage of students at each oral language performance level 91](#_Toc138923757)

[Figure 7.3 Percentage of students at each written language performance level 93](#_Toc138923758)

Acronyms and Initialisms Used in the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Technical Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Term** | **Definition** |
| AERA | American Educational Research Association |
| AIS | average item score |
| ALTRD | Assessment and Learning Technology Research & Development |
| APA | American Psychological Association |
| AST | Administration and Scoring Training |
| BSRP | Bias and Sensitivity Review Panel |
| CAASPP | California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress |
| CAI | Cambium Assessment, Inc. |
| CALPADS | California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System |
| CalTAC | California Technical Assistance Center |
| *CCR* | *California Code of Regulations* |
| CDE | California Department of Education |
| CDS | county/district/school |
| COVID-19 | novel coronavirus disease 2019 |
| CSEM | conditional standard error of measurement |
| CR | constructed response |
| CRP | Content Review Panel |
| DEI | Data Entry Interface |
| *DFA* | *Directions for Administration* |
| DIF | differential item functioning |
| *EC* | *Education Code* |
| EL | English learner |
| ELAS | English language acquisition status |
| ELD | English Language Development |
| ELP | English language proficiency |
| ELPAC | English Language Proficiency Assessments for California |
| eSKM | Enterprise Score Key Management |
| ESSA | Every Student Succeeds Act |
| GIS | Group Information Sheet |
| HLS | home language survey |
| HOSS | highest obtainable scale score |
| IBIS | Item Banking Information System |
| IEP | individualized education program |
| IFEP | initial fluent English proficient |
| IRT | item response theory |
| ISAAP | Individual Student Assessment Accessibility Profile |

Table of Acronyms and Initialisms *(continuation)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Term** | **Definition** |
| K | kindergarten |
| K–12 | kindergarten through grade twelve |
| K–2 | kindergarten through grade two |
| LEA | local educational agency |
| LOSS | lowest obtainable scale score |
| MC | multiple choice |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NCME | National Council on Measurement in Education |
| ONE | Online Network for Evaluation |
| OTI | Office of Testing Integrity |
| PAR | Psychometric Analysis & Research |
| PPT | paper–pencil test |
| QA | quality assurance |
| QWK | quadratic-weighted kappa |
| RSVP | Rotating Score Validation Process |
| SBE | State Board of Education |
| SCOE | Sacramento County Office of Education |
| SD | standard deviation |
| SEM | standard error of measurement |
| SFTP | secure file transfer protocol |
| SSID | Statewide Student Identifier |
| SSR | Student Score Report |
| STAIRS | Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System |
| TBD | To Be Determined |
| TCC | test characteristic curve |
| TDS | test delivery system |
| THSS | Teacher Hand Scoring System |
| TIF | test information function |
| TOMS | Test Operations Management System |
| UAT | user acceptance testing |
| UDL | Universal Design for Learning |
| *USC* | *United States Code* |

**This page is intentionally left blank.**

## Introduction

This technical report focuses on the development, administration, psychometric analyses, and results of the administration of the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This chapter provides an overview of the Initial ELPAC program, including background information, the purpose of the test, the intended population, the testing window, and an overview of the technical report.

The numbers and percentages of students tested by month for the 2021–22 administration are presented in table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Initial ELPAC Testing for July 2021 Through June 2022

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Month and Year** | **Number** | **Percent** |
| July 2021 | 10,801 | 5% |
| August 2021 | 46,530 | 22% |
| September 2021 | 87,628 | 42% |
| October 2021 | 17,500 | 8% |
| November 2021 | 7,511 | 4% |
| December 2021 | 5,046 | 2% |
| January 2022 | 5,450 | 3% |
| February 2022 | 7,885 | 4% |
| March 2022 | 8,452 | 4% |
| April 2022 | 4,053 | 2% |
| May 2022 | 6,068 | 3% |
| June 2022 | 1,661 | 1% |

Of the 208,585 students who completed the Initial ELPAC during the 2021–22 administration, 208,584 students took the assessment on computers or other electronic devices and one used the paper–pencil test (PPT) emergency form of the assessment.

### ELPAC Overview

The ELPAC “is the required state test for English language proficiency (ELP) that must be given to students whose primary language is a language other than English. State and federal laws require that local educational agencies administer a state test of ELP to eligible students in kindergarten through grade twelve” (California Department of Education [CDE], 2022a). California *Education Code (EC)* Section 313(a) requires that the assessment of ELP be done upon initial enrollment and annually thereafter until the local educational agency (LEA) reclassifies the student as English proficient.

### Purposes of the Assessment

The ELPAC consists of two assessments: the Initial ELPAC and the Summative ELPAC. The Initial ELPAC identifies whether a student is initial fluent English proficient (IFEP) or an English learner (EL) who would benefit from additional instructional supports in English. Students identified as ELs after taking the Initial ELPAC go on to take the Summative ELPAC or Summative Alternate ELPAC by the end of each academic year. The Summative ELPAC or Summative Alternate ELPAC is one piece of the evidence used to determine whether the student’s English proficiency has improved to the point that the student can be reclassified as fluent English proficient.

The Initial ELPAC is administered only once during a student’s time in a California public school. The Summative ELPAC or Summative Alternate ELPAC is administered annually to students in kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12) who have been identified as ELs until reclassified as fluent English proficient.

### Test Content

The content of the Initial ELPAC is aligned with the 2012 *California English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten Through Grade 12* (CDE, 2014). The test content corresponds to the *California Common Core State Standards: English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects* (CDE, 2013a)*.* Items on the Initial ELPAC also correspond to the *California Common Core State Standards for Mathematics* (CDE, 2013b) as well as the *Next Generation Science Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* (CDE, 2021).

Both the Initial ELPAC and the Summative ELPAC are computer-based assessments. The content of table 1.2 describes the differences between the Initial ELPAC and the Summative ELPAC.

Table 1.2 Differences Between the Initial ELPAC and Summative ELPAC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial ELPAC** | **Summative ELPAC** |
| This is an assessment used to identify a student as either an EL who needs support to learn English or as IFEP. | This is an assessment used to measure the ELP of EL students. The results will help the school or LEA determine whether the student is ready to be reclassified as proficient in English. |
| This assessment is administered within 30 calendar days of when the student enrolls in a California public school for the first time. | This assessment is administered every spring, from February 1 to May 31. |
| A student takes this test one time only. The Initial ELPAC is taken before the Summative ELPAC. | A student takes this test annually until reclassified. |
| There is one test form. | The test form is refreshed annually. |
| There are six grade levels and grade spans: kindergarten, 1, 2, 3–5, 6–8, and 9–‍12. | There are seven grade levels and grade spans: kindergarten, 1, 2, 3–5, 6–8, 9–10, and 11–‍12. |

Table 1.2 *(continuation)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial ELPAC** | **Summative ELPAC** |
| * The Speaking domain is scored locally, and raw scores are entered into the DEI. * The Writing domain is also scored locally; these scores are entered into the DEI for kindergarten through grade two (K–2) or the Teacher Hand Scoring System for grades three through twelve. * Local scoring for both the Speaking and Writing domains is done by a trained ELPAC test examiner. * The Listening and Reading domains are machine-scored. * Student Score Reports (SSRs) are generated electronically in the Test Operations Management System (TOMS) once all domains have been completed and scores have been merged. These SSRs can be printed locally by designated staff. | * The Speaking domain is scored locally, and raw scores are entered into the DEI. * The Writing domain is scored by ETS. * The Listening and Reading domains are machine-scored. * Once all domains have been completed and scored, SSRs are provided by ETS electronically to the LEA in TOMS and can be printed locally by designated staff. |

### Intended Population

The Initial ELPAC is given to students in K–12 whose primary language is other than English, based on the results of the home language survey (HLS), to determine their English language acquisition status (ELAS). Students with disabilities whose individualized education program (IEP) or Section 504 plan specifies they

cannot take one or more domains of the ELPAC with allowed universal tools, designated supports, or accommodations are eligible for a domain exemption(s). Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot access the ELPAC with approved accessibility resources were eligible to take a locally determined alternate assessment, as noted in their IEP.

Students who were new to a school in California and whose HLS indicated a language other than English were identified with an ELAS of To Be Determined (TBD). Results of Initial ELPAC testing determined whether a student needed EL programs and services.

### Testing Windows and Times

*California Code of Regulations,* Title 5 *(*5 *CCR)*, Section 11518(s), establishes the Initial ELPAC testing window from July 1 through June 30 annually. During this time period, any student whose primary or native language is a language other than English (determined by the HLS administered by the LEA and pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11518.5[a]), or who is identified for the administration of the Initial ELPAC pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11518.20(a); who has not previously been classified as an EL student by a California public school; and who has no record of results of the California English Language Development Test or the Initial ELPAC or Summative ELPAC must be administered the Initial ELPAC (5 *CCR* Section 11518[ag]). The testing window for the administration of the Initial ELPAC was from July 6, 2021, through June 30, 2022.

During the Initial ELPAC testing window, LEAs were required to test and then provide the parent/guardian with the written results of the Initial ELPAC within 30 calendar days of the student’s initial date of California enrollment. If the Initial ELPAC was administered prior to the student’s initial date of California enrollment, the written results of the Initial ELPAC could be provided to the parent/guardian up to 60 calendar days prior to enrollment, but not before July 1, 2021 (5*CCR* Section 11518.5[e]).

The ELPAC is an untimed test, and students were allowed as much time as they need to complete their responses in each domain. The test could be administered over the course of several days. The estimated testing times for the Initial ELPAC domains were posted by grade level and grade span on the ELPAC website. Estimated testing times were provided for administration planning only.

### Test Scores

The Initial ELPAC measures student ELP and determines what support, if any, the student needs to succeed in school while receiving instruction in all school subjects. If a student is identified as IFEP after taking the Initial ELPAC, that student generally requires minimal support learning English and does not need EL programs and services. A student with overall performance levels of Novice EL or Intermediate EL requires substantial to moderate EL programs and services. Student test scores were used to identify their performance levels through a process called standard setting. Refer to [chapter 6](#_Standard_Setting) for more information about this process.

The California State Board of Education (SBE) approved the reporting hierarchy of the Initial ELPAC in May 2018. Individual student scores for the Initial ELPAC for all grade levels and grade spans (i.e., K–12) included

* an overall performance level and scale score;
* an oral language proficiency level, which reflects performance on the Listening and Speaking domains; and
* a written language proficiency level, which reflects performance on the Reading and Writing domains.

Each student who took the Initial ELPAC received an overall score, which placed the student within one of the three Initial ELPAC overall performance levels:

1. Novice EL, Level 1
2. Intermediate EL, Level 2
3. Initial fluent English proficient, Level 3

Each student who took the Initial ELPAC also received an oral language (Listening and Speaking) and a written language (Reading and Writing) proficiency level based on the composite scores. The three Initial ELPAC proficiency levels for the oral and written language composites indicate the following:

1. Minimally developed
2. Somewhat to moderately developed
3. Well developed

### Significant Developments in 2021–22

#### Accessibility Resources

The following accessibility resource–related updates were made:

* The turn off any universal tools embedded designated support was indicated in the Test Administrator Interface; test administrators were notified during the test entry approval process that an individual student needed universal tools turned off.
* In-test widgets, such as help guides, glossaries, and calculators, were resizable and movable on-screen. This allowed students to move or resize widgets to increase focus on desired content.
* LEAs could upload supporting documents as part of the request for an unlisted resource and could use the Notes feature to communicate with the CDE.
* Speech-to-text was embedded within the student testing interface for CR items, meaning that third-party applications were no longer required.
* Text-to-speech for CR items was made available. This resource allowed a student’s response to be read back using text-to-speech.

### Groups and Organizations Involved with the ELPAC

#### California State Board of Education

The SBE is the state agency that establishes educational policy for K–12 in the areas of standards, instructional materials, assessment, and accountability. The SBE adopts textbooks for kindergarten through grade eight, adopts regulations to implement legislation, and has the authority to grant waivers of the *EC*.

In addition to adopting the rules and regulations for itself, its appointees, and California’s public schools, the SBE is also the state educational agency responsible for overseeing California’s compliance with programs that meet the requirements of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act as well as the state’s Public School Accountability Act that measures the academic performance and progress of schools on a variety of academic metrics (CDE, 2022d).

#### California Department of Education

The CDE oversees California’s public school system, which is responsible for the education of more than 5,800,000 children and young adults in more than 10,500 schools.[[1]](#footnote-2) California aims to provide a world-class education for all students, from early childhood to adulthood. The CDE serves the state by innovating and collaborating with educators, school staff, parents/guardians, and community partners which together, as a team, prepare students to live, work, and thrive in a highly connected world.

Within the CDE, it is the Instruction, Measurement, & Administration Branch that oversees programs promoting improved student achievement. Programs include oversight of statewide assessments and the collection and reporting of educational data (CDE, 2022c).

#### California Educators

A variety of California educators, including school administrators and teachers experienced in teaching EL students—who were selected based on their qualifications, experiences, demographic information, and geographic locations—were invited to participate in the ELPAC development process. In this process, California educators participated in tasks that included defining the purpose and scope of the assessment, assessment design, item development, standard setting, score reporting, and scoring constructed-response (CR) items.

#### Contractors

A number of organizations contribute to the success of the Initial ELPAC.

##### Primary Testing Contractor—ETS

The CDE and the SBE contract with ETS to develop, administer, and report the Initial ELPAC. As the primary testing contractor, ETS has overall responsibility for working with the CDE to implement and maintain an effective assessment system and coordinating ETS’ work with its subcontractors.

Activities conducted directly by ETS include, but are not limited to, the following:

* Providing management of the program activities
* Supporting and training county offices of education, LEAs, and direct funded charter schools
* Constructing, producing, and controlling the quality of PPT booklets and related test materials
* Constructing, producing, and controlling the quality of Initial ELPAC test forms and related test materials, including grade- and content-specific Directions for Administration (DFAs)
* Developing processes and scripts associated with remote testing
* Hosting and maintaining a website with resources for LEA ELPAC coordinators
* Developing, hosting, and providing support for TOMS
* Supporting the California Educator Reporting System
* Processing student test assignments
* Processing orders and shipment of test materials
* Producing and distributing score reports electronically
* Developing a summary score reporting website that can be viewed by the public
* Completing all psychometric procedures
* Providing a tiered help desk support system for LEAs

##### Subcontractor—Cambium Assessment, Inc.

ETS also monitors and manages the work of Cambium Assessment, Inc. (CAI), subcontractor to ETS for the ELPAC System of computer-based assessments. Activities conducted by CAI include

* providing the CAI proprietary test delivery system (TDS), including the Student Testing Interface, Test Administrator Interface, secure browser, and practice and training tests;
* hosting and providing support for its TDS, a component of the overall ELPAC Assessment Delivery System;
* hosting and providing support for the Data Entry Interface, the web browser–based application that, for the operational administration of the Initial ELPAC, allows users to enter student responses.
* scoring machine-scorable items; and
* providing high-level technology help desk support to LEAs for technology issues directly related to the TDS.

##### Subcontractor—Sacramento County Office of Education

ETS contracted with the Sacramento County Office of Education to manage all activities associated with educator recruitment, training, and outreach, including the following:

* Supporting and training county offices of education, LEAs, and charter schools
* Developing informational materials
* Recruiting and providing logistics for educator meetings
* Producing Administration and Scoring Training materials and videos, including an online training site for LEA coordinators and test examiners
* Producing *DFA*s

### Systems Overview and Functionality

#### Test Operations Management System

TOMS is the password-protected, web-based system used by LEAs to manage all aspects of ELPAC testing. TOMS serves various functions, including, but not limited to, the following:

* Managing test administration windows
* Assigning and managing ELPAC online user roles
* Managing student test assignments and accessibility resources
* Ordering test materials
* Viewing and downloading reports
* Reporting security incidents
* Providing a platform for authorized user access to secure materials, such as ELPAC *DFAs,* student data and results, ELPAC user information, and access to the ELPAC Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System/Appeals process

TOMS receives student enrollment data and LEA and school hierarchy data from the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) via daily feed. CALPADS is “a longitudinal data system used to maintain individual-level data including student demographics, course data, discipline, assessments, staff assignments, and other data for state and federal reporting.”[[2]](#footnote-3)

LEA staff involved in the administration of the ELPAC—such as LEA ELPAC coordinators, site ELPAC coordinators, and test examiners—are assigned varying levels of access to TOMS. For example, only an LEA ELPAC coordinator is given permission to set up the LEA’s test administration window; a test administrator or test examiner cannot download student reports. A description of user roles is explained more extensively in the *2021–22 Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual* (CDE, 2022b).

#### Test Delivery System

The TDS is the means by which the statewide computer-based assessments are delivered to students. Components of the TDS include

* the Test Administrator Interface, the web browser–based application that allows test examiners to activate student tests and monitor student testing;
* the Student Testing Interface, on which students take the test using the secure browser; and
* the secure browser, the computer-based application through which the Student Testing Interface may be accessed. The secure browser prevents students from accessing other applications during testing.

#### Test Results for California’s Assessments Website

The Test Results for California’s Assessments website is used by educators, families, researchers, and interested members of the public to view aggregated results from the Initial ELPAC. The primary purpose of the Test Results for California’s Assessments website is to provide users with access to results data for groups of students and to allow comparison of test result data for various student groups. Test scores for a given grade level are aggregated at the school, LEA or direct funded charter school, county, and state levels. The aggregated scores are generated for selected student groups of interest (e.g., gender, ethnicity, economic status, migrant status, and special education services status) and for the total population.

#### Constructed-Response Scoring Systems for ETS

For LEAs participating in the Rotating Score Validation Process only, CR items from the grades three through twelve Writing domain in the TDS were routed directly to ETS’ CR scoring system. K–2 Writing Answer Books for participating LEAs were returned to ETS, scanned, and then routed to ETS’ CR scoring system. CR items were scored by certified raters. Hired raters were provided in-depth training and certified before starting the human-scoring process. Human raters were supervised by a scoring leader and provided ELPAC scoring materials such as anchor sets, scoring rubrics, validity samples, qualifying sets, and condition codes for unscorable responses within the interface. The quality control processes for CR scoring are explained further in [*Chapter 9: Quality Control Procedures*](#_Quality_Control_Procedures). The ETS scores were later compared to the local scores, and the comparison reports were provided to the LEAs.

### Overview of the Technical Report

This technical report addresses the characteristics of the Initial ELPAC administered in the 2021–22 school year and contains nine additional chapters, as follows:

* [Chapter 2](#_Overview_of_Initial) gives an overview of initial ELPAC processes.
* [Chapter 3](#_Item_Development_and) presents a brief description of the Initial ELPAC item development processes, including for the test blueprints, item development, and item review, when the 2018–19 Initial ELPAC intact form was newly developed.
* [Chapter 4](#_Test_Assembly) summarizes the processes involved in test assembly, including test forms, special version forms, psychometric criteria, and CDE review of forms.
* [Chapter 5](#_Test_Administration) details the processes involved in the 2021–22 test administration. It also describes the procedures followed to maintain test security throughout the test administration process.
* [Chapter 6](#_Standard_Setting) gives a brief summary of standard setting procedures.
* [Chapter 7](#_Scoring_and_Reporting) describes the scoring procedures at the item level, including CR scoring for the Initial ELPAC and the approach implemented to produce student scores.
* [Chapter 8](#_Psychometric_Analyses) summarizes the item- and test-level statistics from the analyses conducted for the 2021–22 computer-based administration of the Initial ELPAC. Results are included for classical item analyses, information on test reliability, and score validity.
* [Chapter 9](#_Quality_Control_Procedures) highlights the quality-control processes used at various stages of the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration, including item development, test assignment, test administration, scoring procedures, psychometric analysis processes, and score reporting.
* [Chapter 10](#_Continuous_Improvement) details the ongoing means of program improvement.

### References

*California* *Code of Regulations,* Title 1, General Education Code Provisions, Division 1, Part 1, Chapter 3, Article 3.5, Section 313(a). (n.d.).

*California* *Code of Regulations,* Title 5, Education, Division 1, Chapter 2, Subchapter 3.75, Article 2, Section 851.5. (n.d.).

*California* *Code of Regulations,* Title 5, Education, Division 1, Chapter 11, Subchapter 7.6, Article 2. (n.d.).

California Department of Education. (2013a). *California Common Core State Standards: English language arts & literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2013b). *California Common Core State Standards for Mathematics*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2014). *California English language development standards: Kindergarten through grade 12*. Adopted by the State Board of Education November 2012. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2021, July). *NGSS for California public schools, kindergarten through grade twelve.* California Department of Education website.

California Department of Education. (2022a, September). *English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).* California Department of Education website.

California Department of Education. (2022b). *Initial ELPAC online test administration manual.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022c, August). *Organization.* California Department of Education website.

California Department of Education. (2022d, October). *State Board of Education responsibilities.* California Department of Education website.

## Overview of Initial ELPAC Processes

This chapter provides an overview of the processes involved in a testing cycle for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). This includes test administration, generation of test scores, and dissemination of score reports.

### Item Development

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC forms were reused from the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC, which was the first computer-based administration of the Initial ELPAC. No new items were developed for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC.

#### Item Format

The Initial ELPAC includes the following computer-based item formats:

* Selected response
* Constructed response

Formats for these items and the task types are described in more detail in section [*3.4 Task Types and Features*](#_Task_Types_and)*.*

#### Item Specifications

The item specifications describe the characteristics of the items that should be written to measure each content standard. Items of the same type should consistently measure the content standards in the same way. The *ELPAC Item Writing Guidelines* were given to item developers to help ensure that the tests are measuring the intended constructs without influence from extraneous factors. These documents contain item specification tables and provide item writers with definitions of the constructs that are intended to support the claims of measurement and clear direction regarding the types of evidence needed for students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills (California Department of Education [CDE], 2019b, 2019c).

### Test Assembly

Since no revisions were made to the blueprint for the Initial ELPAC in its transition from a paper–pencil test (PPT) to a computer-based assessment, the 2021–22 computer-based Initial ELPAC used the same forms as the paper–pencil 2018–19 Initial ELPAC. The forms used were assembled by ETS assessment specialists and reviewed and approved by the CDE.

#### Test Length

The Initial ELPAC is composed of four domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing.

##### Operational Testing

The number of operational items on a test form vary by grade level and grade span and are based on the *Test Blueprints for the* *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California* (CDE, 2019c).

##### Field Testing

There was no field testing for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC because this form is reused each year, as students only take the Initial ELPAC once before either being classified as initial fluent English proficient (IFEP) or as an English learner (EL) eligible to take the Summative ELPAC.

#### Test Blueprints

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC aligned to the same test blueprints that were implemented for the computer-based 2020–21 Initial ELPAC. These blueprints were developed based on analysis from a pilot of ELPAC items, a standalone field test, and the transition of the ELPAC from a PPT to a computer-based assessment. No revisions were made to the test blueprints during the transition from the PPT to the computer-based Initial ELPAC. Therefore, the 2021–22, computer-based Initial ELPAC used the same forms as the paper–pencil 2018–19 Initial ELPAC.

#### Item Selection

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC consisted of the operational items that were field-tested as computer-based items in fall 2019. The field test is described in the *Computer-based Summative ELPAC Fall 2019 Field Test Technical Report* (CDE, 2020). Originally, these operational items were the paper–pencil items that appeared in the 2018–19 and 2019–20 Initial ELPAC but were converted to a computer-based format for the fall 2019 field test. Each of the six grade levels and grade spans—kindergarten, grade one, grade two, grade span three through five, grade span six through eight, and grade span nine through twelve—had one form that assessed all four of the domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing).

### Test Administration

The Initial ELPAC was administered using the secure browser and test delivery system (TDS), ensuring a secure, confidential, standardized, consistent, and appropriate administration for students. Additional information about the administration of the Initial ELPAC can be found in [*Chapter 5: Test Administration*](#_Toc132644581).

#### Test Security and Confidentiality

All operational tests within the ELPAC System are secure. For the Initial ELPAC administration, every person having access to test materials maintained the security and confidentiality of the tests. ETS’ internal Code of Ethics requires that all test information, including tangible materials (such as test booklets, test questions and test results), confidential files, processes, and activities were kept secure. To ensure security for all tests that ETS develops or handles, ETS maintains an Office of Testing Integrity (OTI). A detailed description of the OTI and its mission is presented in subsection[*5.7.1 ETS’ Office of Testing Integrity*](#_ETS’_Office_of) in [*Chapter 5: Test Administration*](#_Toc132644581).

In the pursuit of enforcing secure practices, ETS strives to safeguard the various processes involved in a test development and administration cycle. Those processes are listed next. The practices related to each of the following security processes are discussed in detail in section [*5.7 Test Security and Confidentiality*](#_Test_Security_and):

* Procedures to maintain standardization of test security
* Test security monitoring
* Security of electronic files using a firewall
* Transfer of scores via secure data exchange
* Data management in the secure database
* Statistical analysis on secure servers
* Student confidentiality
* Student test results

#### Procedures to Maintain Standardization

ETS takes all necessary measures to ensure the standardization of administration of the Initial ELPAC.

The Initial ELPAC is administered in conjunction with the other assessments that compose the ELPAC System. ETS employs processes to ensure the standardization of an administration cycle; these processes are discussed in more detail in section [*5.4 User Roles and Standardization*](#_User_Roles_and_1).

Staff at local educational agencies (LEAs) involved in the ELPAC administration include LEA ELPAC coordinators, site ELPAC coordinators, and test examiners. The responsibilities of each of the staff members are described in the *Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual* (CDE, 2022b).

Several series of instructions regarding the ELPAC administration are compiled in detailed manuals and provided to the LEA staff. Such documents include, but are not limited to, the following:

* ***Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual*—**This web-based manual provides test administration procedures and guidelines for LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators (CDE, 2022b). (Refer to [*5.4.6.2 Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual*](#_Initial_ELPAC_Online) in [chapter 5](#_Toc132644581) for more information.)
* ***CAASPP and ELPAC Test Operations Management System (TOMS) User Guide*—**This web-based manual provides instructions for TOMS, allowing LEA staff, including LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators, to perform several tasks, including setting up test administrations, adding and managing users, assigning tests, and configuring computer-based student test settings (CDE, 2022a). (Refer to [*5.6.4.3 CAASPP and ELPAC Test Operations Management System User Guide*](#_California_Assessment_of_1) in [chapter 5](#_Toc132644581) for more information.)
* ***DFA*s—**These directions include test examiner directions and scripts for administering the tests. They contain grade-specific and form-specific information needed by the test examiners during test sessions.

### Fairness and Accessibility

Several procedures are in place to ensure that the Initial ELPAC is fair and accessible to all test takers. This section provides information on the available accessibility resources.

#### Overview

All eligible students enrolled in a California public school participate in the ELPAC System of assessments, including students with disabilities. Additional resources are sometimes needed for these students. The CDE provides a full range of assessment resources for all students, including those who are students with disabilities.

#### Universal Tools, Designated Supports, and Accommodations

There are four different categories of student accessibility resources in the California assessment accessibility system, including universal tools, designated supports, accommodations, and unlisted resources that are permitted for use in ELPAC computer-based assessments. These are listed in the CDE California Assessment Accessibility Resources Matrix (Accessibility Matrix) (CDE, 2021).

**Universal tools** are available to all students. These resources may be turned on and off when embedded as part of the technology platform for the computer-based ELPAC on the basis of student preference and selection.

**Designated supports** are available to all students when determined as needed by an educator or team of educators, with parent/guardian and student input as appropriate, or when specified in the student’s individualized education program (IEP) or Section 504 plan.

**Accommodations** must be permitted on the ELPAC for all eligible students when specified in the student’s IEP or Section 504 plan.

**Unlisted resources** are non-embedded and made available if specified in the eligible student’s IEP or Section 504 plan and only on approval by the CDE.

[Appendix 5.A](#_Appendix_5.A:_Accessibility) presents counts and percentages of students assigned designated supports, accommodations, and unlisted resources for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration. The tables in [appendix 5.A](#_Appendix__) were created using student demographic data in final version of the production data file updated on August 30, 2022.

The majority of students did not use any designated supports, accommodations, or unlisted resources.

#### Description of Differential Item Functioning Analyses

All items included in 2021–22 Initial ELPAC forms were both operational and reused from the 2018–19 administration; there were no field test or new items in the forms. For this reason, DIF analyses were not conducted for 2021–22 items. Table 8.9 of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2019a) showed the DIF results for 2018–19 administration. Across every grade level or grade span, there were no items that exhibited Category C DIF for gender in any of the domains. Refer to chapter 8 of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2019a) for more details of DIF procedure and results for 2018–19.

### Scores

Individual student scores were reported for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration. Student performance on the reporting scale was designated into one of the three performance levels described in subsection [*7.4.3 Performance Levels*](#_Performance_Levels). For information regarding score specifications and score reports, refer to [*Chapter 7: Scoring and Reporting*](#_Scoring_and_Reporting).

#### Score Reporting

TOMS is a secure website hosted by ETS that permits LEA users to manage aspects of ELPAC test administration such as test assignment and the assignment of test settings. TOMS also provides a secure means for LEA ELPAC coordinators to download Student Score Reports as PDF files.

#### Aggregation Procedures

To provide meaningful results to interested educators, Initial ELPAC scores for a given grade-level assessment were aggregated at the school, LEA or direct funded charter school, county, and state levels. State-level results are available on the Test Results for California’s Assessments website. The aggregated scores were presented for all students or selected demographic student groups.

Aggregated scores were generated by combining student scores at the state, LEA or direct funded charter school, or school level; combining student scores for all students; or by combining student scores for students who represent selected demographic student groups.

The aggregation procedures used to present Initial ELPAC results are described in section [*7.5 Overview of Score Aggregation Procedures*](#_Overview_of_Score). Aggregated results by demographic variables are presented in [appendix 7.D](#_Appendix_7.D:_Overall). In table 7.D.1 through table 7.D.13, students are grouped by demographic groups, including gender, ethnicity, English language fluency, special education service status, and economic status, as well as crosstab analysis for ethnicity and economic status. The tables show the numbers of students with valid scores in each group, scale score means and standard deviations, and the percentage of students in each performance level. To protect student privacy, statistics are presented in the tables as “N/A” when the number of students in the sample is 10 or fewer. Definitions for the demographic student groups included in these tables are provided in table 7.11.

### Calibration and Scaling

The stand-alone field test of the Initial ELPAC administered in September and October 2017 was used to support the creation of the Initial ELPAC operational form.

Because the purpose of the Initial ELPAC is to identify whether a student is IFEP or an EL who would benefit from additional instructional supports (rather than measuring students’ progress from one grade level to another), the Initial ELPAC was not designed to be vertically scaled. The multiple forms used within each grade level or grade span in the field test had common items for the horizontal linking within a grade level or grade span, but there were no common items across grade levels to support vertical scaling.

Item response theory (IRT) analyses for the Initial ELPAC used the stand-alone field test data collected in September and October 2017 to calibrate and link multiple forms within a grade level or grade span to establish a common scale. Specifically, the generalized partial credit model (Muraki, 1992) was applied to both dichotomous and polytomous items. Item parameter estimates were then reviewed by the psychometric team at ETS. It was found that the IRT *b*-values for the field-tested items were within the expected range. Refer to chapter 12 of the *Initial ELPAC 2018–2019 Technical Report* for more details and results of the IRT analyses (CDE, 2019a).

### Psychometric Analyses

Psychometric analyses were conducted on the data from the Initial ELPAC, including classical item analyses, DIF analyses, IRT calibration and linking, testing time analyses, and reliability analyses. The results of these analyses support understanding of item performances and internal structure of the assessment and provide validity evidence for both response processes and scoring. Detailed descriptions of these analyses are presented in [*Chapter 8: Psychometric Analyses*](#_Psychometric_Analyses).

#### Description of Classical Item Analyses

The psychometric analyses for the Initial ELPAC data included classical item analyses and DIF analyses to evaluate the performance of the operational items and the embedded field test items. The classical item analyses included the computation of item difficulty indices, the item-total correlation indices, the omission rate of each item, and the proportion of test takers obtaining each score point for polytomous items. CDE-approved flagging rules based on these statistics identified items that were not performing as expected. A description of the classical item analyses procedure is provided in section [*8.2 Classical Item Analyses*](#_Classical_Item_Analyses)*.*

### References

California Department of Education. (2019a). *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 technical report* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019b). *Item writing guidelines for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019c). *Test blueprints for the* *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* Approved by the California State Board of Education in March 2018. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020). *Computer-based Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California fall 2019 field test technical report.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2021). *California assessment accessibility resources matrix*. California Department of Education website.

California Department of Education. (2022a). *CAASPP and ELPAC Test Operations Management System user guide*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022b). *Initial ELPAC online test administration manual*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Muraki, E. (1992). A generalized partial credit model: Application of an EM algorithm. *ETS Research Report Series*, *1992*(1), i-30.

## Item Development and Review

This chapter describes the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) test development process, including the item use plan, item review process.

### Overview

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC was the second year of the computer-based administration of the Initial ELPAC. It reuses the forms of the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC, which was the first online administration of the assessment. Prior to the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC, several test design tasks were examined prior to conducting item development and test development tasks to transition the assessment to a computer-based format. The Initial ELPAC test blueprints were reviewed (California Department of Education [CDE], 2019d), a high-level test design was developed (CDE, 2019b), a usability pilot was conducted (CDE, 2019a), task type conversion specifications were created (CDE, 2019c), and an item use plan was formed (CDE, 2020a). Then, the entire Summative and Initial ELPAC pool of 2,289 paper–pencil items was converted for computer-based administration on the basis of these plans.

All operational items in the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC were originally field-tested as computer-based items in fall 2019. The field test of those items is described in the *Computer-based Summative ELPAC Fall 2019 Field Test Technical Report* (CDE, 2020a).

### Initial ELPAC Test Blueprints

In November 2015, the California State Board of Education (SBE) approved the *Proposed Test Blueprints for the ELPAC* (CDE, 2015), which included some task types adapted from the California English Language Development Test items that were aligned with the 2012 *California English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten Through Grade 12* (2012 ELD Standards) (CDE, 2014). After the SBE approved the *Proposed Test Blueprints for the ELPAC*, the first pilot of ELPAC items and the stand-alone sample field test of the Initial ELPAC was administered.

Analysis of the pilot and the stand-alone sample field test results led to modifications of the Initial ELPAC test blueprints; for example, the names of some of the task types were changed and some of the task types were removed. The Summative ELPAC test blueprints were separated from the Initial ELPAC test blueprints. While all 27 task types were retained in the Summative ELPAC test blueprints, a total of 23 task types were included in the Initial ELPAC test blueprints. Fewer task types and items were placed on the Initial ELPAC than the Summative ELPAC because less student response data was needed to meet the goals of the Initial ELPAC (CDE, 2020c). The SBE approved the revised Initial ELPAC test blueprints in March 2018, which was prior to the start of the first operational administration of the Initial ELPAC on July 1, 2018.

Test blueprints were developed to describe the content of the paper–pencil Initial ELPAC. The test blueprints contained four tables with information about the task types in each of the four language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Task types were individual items or sets of items that required a student to perform an activity to elicit information about the student’s English language proficiency (ELP).

The test blueprints provided information about the number of items and points that were administered per task type within each grade level and domain. The test blueprints also provided two types of alignment between task types and the standards: “primary” and “secondary.” Primary alignment indicated there was a close or strong match in terms of the language knowledge, skills, and abilities covered by both the task type and the standard. Secondary alignment indicated that there was a moderate or partial match between the standard and the item in terms of language knowledge, skills, and abilities.

In November 2018, the SBE approved plans to transition the ELPAC from a paper–pencil test (PPT) to a computer-based assessment. The transition to the computer-based ELPAC involved a small-scale usability pilot in spring 2019 and a field test in October and November 2019, leading up to the first operational administration in July 2020. No revisions were made to the test blueprints during the transition from the PPT to the computer-based Initial ELPAC.

### Item Development

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC consisted of the operational items that were field-tested as computer-based items in fall 2019 and used operationally on the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC. The field test is described in the *Computer-based Summative ELPAC Fall 2019 Field Test Technical Report* (CDE, 2020a). Originally, these operational items were the paper–pencil items that appeared in the 2018–19 and 2019–20 Initial ELPAC but were converted to a computer-based format for the fall 2019 field test. Each of the six grade levels and grade spans had one form that assessed all four of the domains (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing).

### Task Types and Features

#### Task Types

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC contained 23 task types. Each task type required a student to perform an activity to elicit information about the student’s ELP and had one or more items that aligned with the 2012 ELD Standards (CDE, 2014). While the 2012 ELD Standards are organized according to three modes of communication (collaborative, interpretive, and productive communication), federal Title I requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 call for a statewide assessment of ELP that includes the four language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing (ESSA, 200.6[h][1][ii]).

The Listening domain of the Initial ELPAC had five task types, the Speaking domain had five task types, the Reading domain had eight task types, and the Writing domain had five task types. When a task type required the use of integrated language skills, such as listening and speaking, the task type was classified according to the language skill used to provide the response. For instance, the task type *Summarize an Academic Presentation* required a student to listen to a presentation and then summarize the presentation by speaking to the test examiner. Because the student provided the summary as a spoken response, the task type was classified as a Speaking task type.

The next subsections summarize the task types used to assess ELP within each domain of the Initial ELPAC based on the *Item Writing Guidelines for the ELPAC* (CDE, 2018). A full description of each task type is available in the *Definitions of Task Types for the English Language Proficiency Assessment for California* (CDE, 2020b).

#### Listening

Listening task types assessed the ability of an English learner (EL) student to comprehend spoken English conversations, discussions, and oral presentations in a range of social and academic contexts. Students listened to a stimulus and then demonstrated their ability to listen actively by answering multiple-choice (MC) questions. Students heard audio recordings of the Listening stimuli.

#### Speaking

Speaking task types assessed the ability of an EL student to express information and ideas and to participate in grade-level conversations and class discussions. All task types included one or more constructed-response (CR) items. Test examiners scored student responses in the moment, using scoring rubrics.

#### Reading

Reading task types assessed the ability of an EL student to read, analyze, and interpret a variety of grade-level-appropriate literary and informational texts. For kindergarten and grade one, the Reading domain was scaffolded, as these students are beginning to develop their print literacy. Words and stories were read together, and then students were asked to answer questions about the text. For grades two through twelve, students read a text and then demonstrated their print literacy skills by answering MC questions.

#### Writing

Writing task types assessed the ability of an EL student to write literary and informational texts to present, describe, and explain information. All task types included one or more CR items. Student responses were scored by test examiners using rubrics.

### ETS Item Review Process

After items were drafted, ETS placed items developed for the Initial ELPAC through an extensive internal item review process designed to provide the best standards-based assessments possible. This section summarizes the item review process that confirmed the quality of Initial ELPAC items.

#### Overview

Once an item was accepted for authoring, ETS employed a series of internal reviews. These reviews used established criteria to judge the quality of item content and to ensure that each item measured what it was intended to measure. These internal reviews also examined the overall quality of the items ahead of their being reviewed by the CDE and by educators at item review meetings, which are described in more detail in section [*3.7 California Educator Review*](#_California_Educator_Review_1).

All items were entered into the Item Banking Information System (IBIS) with corresponding artwork and metadata. Within IBIS, items received ETS internal content, fairness, and editorial reviews.

The CDE reviewed proposed changes to items in response to reviews by the participants of the item review meetings to ensure the quality of the item pool. The CDE then gained access to Initial ELPAC items and conducted reviews in IBIS. ETS revised items in response to comments from the CDE prior to using them in the assessment forms.

The ETS review process for the Initial ELPAC includes the following; these tasks are described in the next subsections:

1. Content review
2. Accessibility review
3. Editorial review
4. Sensitivity and fairness review

Throughout this multistep item review process, the lead content-area assessment specialists and development team members at ETS continually evaluated the activities and items for adherence to the rules for item development.

#### ETS Content Review

On all items ETS developed, content-area assessment specialists conducted three reviews on items and stimuli. These assessment specialists verified thatthe items and stimuli were in compliance with ETS’ written guidelines for clarity, style, accuracy, and appropriateness for California students and were also in compliance with the approved item specifications, the *CAASPP and ELPAC Item Review Acceptance Criteria* (ETS, 2019), and other ETS-produced procedures such as the ETS guidelines for fair tests and communications (2016). Assessment specialists reviewed each item in terms of the following characteristics:

* Relevance to the purpose of the test
* Match of each item to the item specifications, including the tier of item complexity
* Match of each item to the principles of quality item writing
* Match of each item to the identified standard or standards
* Difficulty of the item
* Accuracy of the content of the item
* Readability of the item or passage
* Grade-level appropriateness of the item
* Appropriateness of any illustrations, graphs, or figures

Assessment specialists verified the classification of each item, both to evaluate the correctness of the classification and to confirm that the task posed by the item was relevant to the outcome it was intended to measure. The reviewers could accept the item and classification as written, suggest revisions, or recommend that the item be discarded. These steps occurred prior to the CDE’s review.

#### ETS Accessibility Review

The ETS Accessible Content & Inclusive Solutions team advised on accessibility of items and item types during the ETS content review. These experts on alternate test formats reviewed all items, with a focus on accessibility for all student populations, and provided potential refinement solutions to improve the accessibility.

#### ETS Editorial Review

After assessment specialists and researchers reviewed each item, a group of specially trained editors also reviewed each item in preparation for consideration by the CDE and the item review panelists. The editors checked items for clarity, correctness of language, appropriateness of language for the grade level assessed, adherence to the style guidelines, and conformity with accepted item-writing practices.

#### ETS Sensitivity and Fairness Review

ETS assessment specialists who were specially trained to identify and edit or eliminate questions that contained content or wording that could be construed to be offensive to, or biased against, members of specific student groups (e.g., ethnicity, race, or gender) conducted the next level of review (ETS, 2014 and 2016). These trained staff members reviewed every item before the CDE and item review meetings. Newly developed items were then submitted to the CDE for review prior to educator reviews.

The review process promoted a general awareness of, and responsiveness to, the following:

* Cultural diversity
* Diversity of background, cultural tradition, and viewpoints to be found in the test-taking populations
* Changing roles and attitudes toward various groups
* Role of language in setting and changing attitudes toward various groups
* Topics that may be unsettling or otherwise distract the student from the content being measured, such as natural disasters, disease, or family discord
* Contributions of diverse groups (including ethnic and minority groups, individuals with disabilities, and women) to the history and culture of the United States and the achievements of individuals within these groups
* Item accessibility for language learners of diverse backgrounds

### California Department of Education Review

After ETS reviews of items were completed, the items were reviewed by the CDE content teams. CDE content experts reviewed the items using the same criteria used in the ETS reviews. After CDE reviews occurred, ETS made edits to the items based on the CDE feedback, and the items were then finalized for item review meetings with California educators.

### California Educator Review

Each newly developed item was reviewed during the Item Review Meetings, comprised of two educator meetings: a Content Review Panel (CRP) meeting that was held from August 1–5, 2016; and a Bias and Sensitivity Review Panel (BSRP) meeting that was held from August 3–5, 2016. Additional details about these meetings are presented in chapter 3 of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2020c).

Two trainings for the panel participants were conducted during the meetings and prior to the item reviews: educators serving on the CRP were trained on Monday, August 1, 2016; and a different group of educators serving on the BSRP were trained on Wednesday, August 3, 2016 (CDE, 2020c).

Table 3.1 shows the educational qualifications and present occupation of the individuals who participated in an ELPAC CRP or BSRP.

Table 3.1 ELPAC CRP and BSRP Qualifications, by Meeting Type and Total

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Type** | **CRP** | **BSRP** | **Total** |
| Occupation | Classroom Teacher | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| Occupation | EL or Literacy Specialist or Coach | 18 | 7 | 25 |
| Occupation | School Administrator | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Occupation | Local Educational Agency or County Office Employee | 11 | 3 | 14 |
| Highest Degree Earned | Bachelor’s Degree | 22 | 4 | 26 |
| Highest Degree Earned | Master’s Degree | 16 | 13 | 29 |
| Highest Degree Earned | Doctorate | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| **Total Participants:** | **N/A** | **83** | **35** | **118** |

**Note:** Numbers may not match the totals because participants may have multiple occupations or teaching credentials or are currently working toward earning their highest degree. The information is self-reported and may not reflect all their experience and earned credentials.

### References

California Department of Education. (2014). *California English language development standards: Kindergarten through grade 12*. Adopted by the State Board of Education November 2012. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2015). *Proposed test blueprints for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2018). *Item writing guidelines for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019a). *ELPAC usability pilot: A final report (with addendum).* [Unpublished report]*.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019b). *Proposed high-level test design for the transition to computer-based English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* Approved by the California State Board of Education in May 2019. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019c). *Specifications for conversion of ELPAC task types for computer-based delivery*.[Unpublished report]*.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019d). *Test blueprints for the* *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* Approved by the California State Board of Education in March 2018. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020a). *Computer-based Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California fall 2019 field test technical report.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020b). *Definitions of task types for the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020c). *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 technical report* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Educational Testing Service. (2014). *ETS standards for quality and fairness*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Educational Testing Service. (2016). *ETS guidelines for fair tests and communications*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Educational Testing Service. (2019). *CAASPP and ELPAC item acceptance criteria*. [Unpublished manuscript]. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

## Test Assembly

This chapter discusses the detailed procedures of test assembly for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration.

### Overview

Since the blueprint for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) did not change in its transition from a paper–pencil test (PPT) to a computer-based assessment, the 2021–22 computer-based Initial ELPAC used the same forms as the paper–pencil 2018–19 Initial ELPAC (California Department of Education [CDE], 2019). The forms used were assembled by ETS assessment specialists and reviewed and approved by the CDE.

The test assembly process began with the creation of test development specifications, which described the content characteristics, psychometric characteristics, and quantity of items to be used in the 2018–19 Initial ELPAC (CDE, 2020b). ETS created the test development specifications that the CDE reviewed and approved.

### Test Forms

Each grade level and grade span of the computer-based 2021–22 Initial ELPAC had one form with operational items only; each form was based on a 2018–19 Initial ELPAC form. One form was developed for each of the six grade levels and grade spans: kindergarten, grade one, grade two, grade span three through five, grade span six through eight, and grade span nine through twelve. For the computer-based delivery, ETS created a variant of the form that contained twinned items for braille, to which students who required the braille accommodation were routed.

Table 4.1 provides an overview of the number of items and points by domain and grade level or grade span for the Initial ELPAC.

Table 4.1 Overview of Initial ELPAC Items and Points by Domain and Grade Level or Grade Span

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Kindergarten Items** | **Kindergarten Points** | **Grade 1 Items** | **Grade 1 Points** | **Grade 2 Items** | **Grade 2 Points** | **Grades 3–5 Items** | **Grades 3–5 Points** | **Grades 6–8 Items** | **Grades 6–8 Points** | **Grades 9–12 Items** | **Grades 9–12 Points** |
| Listening | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| Speaking | 8 | 15 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 17 | 9 | 17 | 9 | 17 | 9 | 17 |
| Reading | 8 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Writing | 8 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 8 |
| **Total:** | **36** | **50** | **37** | **52** | **36** | **52** | **37** | **52** | **35** | **49** | **35** | **49** |

The number of items in the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC followed the *Test Blueprints for the Initial ELPAC* (CDE, 2019), which the California State Board of Education approved on March 15, 2018.

### Special Version Forms

Items that appeared in the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC had a full set of accessibility resources as described in the California Assessment Accessibility Resources Matrix (CDE, 2020a). The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC had the full set of universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations that were available in the test delivery system (TDS). Descriptions of these features are provided in section [*5.6 Accessibility Resources*](#_Accessibility_Resources). Table 5.A.1 through table 5.A.7 in [appendix 5.A](#_Appendix__) list selected accessibility resources, their assignment, and student usage.

Since the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC is a reuse form, the accessibility resources were reviewed and exported to the TDS for the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC administration. Before the 2020–21 administration, assessment specialists from ETS’ Accessibility and Alternate Formats team reviewed the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC and collaborated with content staff to determine appropriate adaptations and ensure that appropriate content to support the accommodations was created and uploaded in the Item Banking Information System. The accessibility resources were imported into the TDS, along with other item content, and prepared for computer-based delivery. ETS checked the accessibility resources to ensure that they functioned correctly during the user acceptance testing (UAT) process for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC. Any needed revisions to accessibility resources that were identified during UAT were applied prior to the release of the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC.

#### Braille Form

For the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC, ETS created a variant of the form that contained twinned items for braille. ETS originally created these braille variants, where some items were twinned items, to meet the accessibility needs of the population of students with visual impairment. Only the following task types required twinning to make them accessible:

* Speaking—Talk About a Scene: K–12
* Reading—Read Along Word with Scaffolding: Kindergarten
* Reading—Read and Choose a Word: Grades one and two
* Reading—Read and Choose a Sentence: Grades two through twelve
* Writing—Label a Picture–Word, with Scaffolding: Kindergarten and grade one
* Writing—Write a Story Together with Scaffolding: Kindergarten through grade two
* Writing—Write and Describe a Picture: Grades two through five

The item construct and overall cognitive complexity of braille twins were maintained as closely as possible with the original parent item.

#### Emergency Paper–Pencil Form

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration included a PPT emergency form for students whose individualized education program or Section 504 plan specified testing on a paper–pencil form, or when a school experienced unexpected, temporary technology issues beyond the school’s control.

The form used in 2021–22 was the same as the 2018–19 paper–pencil form except for one Writing domain item in grade span three through five that was updated when the test transitioned from PPT to computer based. The forms complied with item selection and forms construction criteria noted in prior sections. Standard, large-print, and braille PPT forms were developed.

### Psychometric Criteria and Identification of Eligible Items

The ETS Psychometric Analysis & Research (PAR) group reviewed the proposed computer-based Initial ELPAC form, for each grade level and grade span, to ensure that the form met the psychometric criteria and was aligned with the computer-based Initial ELPAC blueprints. Classical item analyses are conducted annually as a quality control step. Results of the analyses are reported in [chapter 8](#_Psychometric_Analyses) of this technical report.

The following criteria were used to review the operational forms:

* Do the forms align with the Initial ELPAC blueprints?
* Do item statistics meet the psychometric criteria? Criteria include the following:
* The range for *p*-values is between 0.20 and 0.95.
* Item-total correlations are greater than 0.15.
* Items flagged for C-DIF—differential item functioning—are used only as necessary to meet the test blueprint and with CDE approval.
* Item response theory (IRT) *b*-parameter estimates are within the range of -4.0 to +4.0.

The psychometric review of operational item statistics included several steps. First, PAR staff reviewed forms for consistency with form specifications in terms of content and item type composition; this step occurred before the fall 2019 field test administration.

After the IRT analyses were completed for the field test administration, item performance was evaluated by reviewing individual item parameter estimates and the summary IRT statistics for each operational form. A list was created of items whose estimates fell out of the ranges as indicated in the test development specifications. The list was sent to assessment specialists at ETS for review and to, wherever possible, find alternative items in the field test forms to replace the items with out-of-range statistics.

### California Department of Education Forms Review

The CDE used a gatekeeper process to review all test materials. Test materials for review and approval by the CDE included form planners, *Directions for Administration (DFAs),* and student-facing items in the TDS. All test materials were approved before they were made available for use.

For the reviews of form planners and the *DFAs,* ETS initiated the review by submitting materials to the CDE via the gatekeeper system, along with the criteria for the review. CDE consultants performed the initial review and returned comments and requests for revisions to ETS. ETS staff then revised the materials as requested and returned them to the CDE consultants, who reviewed the updated materials. If the test materials needed additional revisions, they were returned to ETS for further modifications.

Once CDE consultants found that the test materials met the review criteria, the CDE consultants submitted the test materials to the CDE administrator for approval. Test materials that were approved with revisions were revised by ETS and resubmitted for approval. Test materials that were not approved needed significant revisions and had to be submitted to the consultants again before they could be resubmitted to the CDE administrator for approval.

Because the Initial ELPAC is a preequated test, no revisions can be made to the operational items. Once the operational items in a form planner were approved by the CDE, no further item replacements could be made.

### Configuration of the Test Delivery System

Once all the test reviews were completed and concerns, if any, had been resolved, the official ordered item sequence of the proposed forms was sent to Cambium Assessment, Inc. (CAI) for configuration of the TDS. Unlike other stages of the test production process, this stage must occur prior to every administration of the Initial ELPAC, even in the case of a form reuse.

Each item underwent an extensive platform review on different operating systems, such as Windows, Linux, and iOS, to ensure that the item looked consistent across all platforms.

The platform review was conducted by a team at CAI consisting of a team leader and several team members. The team leader presented the item as it was approved in ETS and CAI item banks. Each team member was assigned a different platform—hardware device and operating system—and reviewed the item to see that it rendered as expected. This platform review meeting ensured that all items were presented consistently to all students regardless of testing device or operating system for standardization of the test administration.

Prior to operational deployment, the testing system and content were deployed to a staging server where they were subject to UAT by both ETS and CAI staff. The TDS UAT served as both a software evaluation and a content approval.

Following the UAT by ETS and CAI staff, separate UAT cycles were conducted by the CDE. The UAT review provided the CDE with an opportunity to interact with the exact test that would be administered to the students. The CDE had to approve the Initial ELPAC UAT before the test could be released for administration to students.

### References

California Department of Education. (2019). *Test blueprints for the* *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* Approved by the California State Board of Education in March 2018. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020a). *California assessment accessibility resources matrix*. California Department of Education website.

California Department of Education. (2020b). *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 technical report* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

## Test Administration

This chapter provides the details of administering the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), as well as local educational agency (LEA) participation and demographic summaries.

### Overview

The operational administration of the Initial ELPAC testing window occurred from July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2022.

#### In-Person and Remote Testing

In the 2021–22 administration, the California Department of Education (CDE) continued to offer flexibility for testing students to LEAs for the ELPAC (with the exception of the alternate assessments):

1. Students may test in person, with both students and test examiners co-located in the same room at a school or other secure location and following physical distancing guidelines.
2. Students may test remotely, with students and test examiners located at different physical locations. The test examiners would monitor students’ progress throughout the test by using remote monitoring tools connected to the test delivery system (TDS). This option is offered when instruction is received remotely or when there are health issues that do not allow a student to test in person.

#### Platform

For the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration, students were provided with a computer or other electronic device on which to take the assessment. Each student used the secure browser or web-based browser (remote only) to take the assessment. The Initial ELPAC used the same secure browser, web-based browser, and computer-based testing platform as the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). Test examiners used a separate computer or other electronic device from which to access the Test Administrator Interface and manage the testing session.

Paper–pencil tests (PPTs), also called “emergency forms,” were available for an LEA if a site had an emergency that prevented test examiners from accessing the computer-based tests, as well as for students whose individualized education program (IEP) or Section 504 plan required PPT materials, including braille and large print. The LEA was required to submit a request for these materials and get CDE approval prior to testing. Materials were shipped only after the CDE’s approval had been secured.

#### Materials

Test examiners were required to use the *Directions for Administration (DFAs),* housed securely in the Test Operations Management System (TOMS), to administer tests to students. For kindergarten through grade twelve (K–12), there was a combined grade level– or grade span–*DFA* for the Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing domains.

For students who needed to be tested remotely, test examiners could access *DFAs* for remote testing for kindergarten through grade two (K–2) and remote testing addenda for grades three through twelve in TOMS. PDF versions of the K–2 Writing Teacher Answer Book and Student Writing Response Sheets were provided in TOMS for test examiners to download and share with the student via an online meeting application while administering the Writing domain.

A student score sheet was provided as the last page of the grades three through twelve *DFA.* For K–2, the student score sheet was included in the last page of the Writing Answer Book. Use of the scoring sheet was optional; the test examiner could use it to record a student’s Speaking scores manually. These student scores could then later be entered into the Data Entry Interface (DEI). Alternatively, the test examiner could enter the student’s Speaking scores into the DEI while administering the test.

LEAs that administered the paper-based K–2 Writing domain ordered the Answer Books through TOMS. Since the Writing domain is locally scored, a student score sheet was provided in the last page of the Answer Book to mark scores that could later be entered into the DEI. LEAs that were part of the Rotating Score Validation Process (RSVP) were provided with pre-identification labels and Group Identification Sheets once a month in August through November and were asked to return the PPT materials once a month after the receipt of the pre-identification labels.

#### Means

In accordance with the procedures for all California assessments, LEAs designated trained test examiners for the Initial ELPAC in the secure TOMS. ETS provided LEA staff with the appropriate training materials, such as test administration manuals, videos, and webcasts, to ensure that the LEA staff and test examiners understood how to administer the Initial ELPAC. For this administration and going forward, this includes remote testing training materials.

The Initial ELPAC was designed for one-on-one administration between a single student and a test examiner for K–2 and for group administration for grades three through twelve. The exceptions are as follows:

* Speaking domain: one-on-one administration for all grade levels
* Writing domain: small group administration optional for grade two

For remote administration of the Initial ELPAC, all domains for K–2 were designed for one-on-one administration, with the test examiner logged on to the web-based Student Testing Interface and sharing the screen with the student via an online meeting application. For testing students in grades three through twelve remotely, the Speaking domain would be administered in the same manner as the K–2 administration, but the Listening, Reading, and Writing domains could be administered in a group of up to four students in a single test session. The test examiner would provide instructions to the students via an online meeting application and start the test session, and the students would continue testing using the web-based browser.

#### Score Reporting

Individual student scores, school-level scores, and Student Score Reports (SSRs) for the Initial ELPAC were available to test sites and LEAs through TOMS. The SSRs were available in English and in the student’s primary language if that language was Spanish, Vietnamese, Filipino, or Chinese.

### Administration and Scoring Training

Because of the impacts of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the CDE announced in July 2020 that all trainings would be conducted virtually through June 2022. The ELPAC Administration and Scoring Training (AST) training team created a complete virtual training model for the 2021–22 administration of the Initial ELPAC. The AST on the Moodle Training Site (Moodle) opened April 12, 2021. (Moodle is a free, learning-management, open-source software.)

The online Moodle training site was available as a restricted site that could be accessed only by LEA ELPAC coordinators, LEA lead trainers, ELPAC test examiners, and others requiring general training in the administration of the Initial ELPAC. The site contained all resources needed to conduct a training, such as training presentations, along with the presenters’ scripts.

Every LEA in California was required to complete the online LEA Certification course on Moodle for the Initial ELPAC 2021–22 AST. The LEA ELPAC coordinator, or a designee, was responsible for overseeing test examiners’ calibration progress. The virtual trainings and materials were provided by the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE). SCOE also provided training and calibration quizzes on Moodle for test examiners who administered and scored the Speaking and Writing domains.

The following is a list of high-level assumptions, changes, and enhancements for training for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC:

* All LEA ELPAC coordinators were expected to report and certify that the training requirement had been met.
* Any new coordinators or trainers were expected to complete the LEA Certification.
* All test examiners were expected to calibrate for scoring Speaking and Writing each year.
* The Initial ELPAC training binder did not change from the 2020–21 administration. The binder samples were still valid, as were the samples in Moodle.
* The Examiner’s course in Moodle was redesigned to create nine Calibration Certifications by grade level or grade span and follow the successful model from the Summative ELPAC launch in October 2020.
* Each of the nine grade level or grade span test examiner online Calibration Certifications had two separate certifications, one for Speaking and one for Writing.
* All Moodle training and calibration quizzes were enhanced to include anchor samples, item stems, and pictures to follow the successful model from the Summative ELPAC launch in October 2020.
* A 2021–22 Initial ELPAC overview video was filmed and a new notetaking guide was developed.
* If an LEA completed the 2020–21 Initial ELPAC LEA Certification Course, the 2021–‍22 Initial ELPAC LEA Certification Course was optional with the exception of the updated 2021–22 overview video. Viewing the overview video was required for the LEA ELPAC coordinator or a designee.

#### Goals

All LEAs in California were required to complete, or designate staff to complete, the LEA Certification requirement online through Moodle instead of sending a trainer to the all-day, CDE-sponsored, statewide 2021–22 Initial ELPAC AST, which used the “training-of-trainers” model. The goals of the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC AST were as follows:

1. Standardize the administration of the ELPAC for all domains (i.e., Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing)
2. Train test examiners to score the Speaking and Writing items accurately and reliably
3. Train LEA trainers to train other qualified persons locally to administer and score the Initial ELPAC

#### Local Educational Agency Training Requirement

##### Certification of Training

All LEA ELPAC coordinators were expected to log on to the AST registration site and verify that the LEA training requirement was met. The AST website would be populated with the 2020–21 list of completers. Every LEA ELPAC coordinator was expected to check or mark the box “Each LEA must have at least one person currently active who completed the Initial ELPAC LEA Certification course within the last two years. Checking this box, verifies that my LEA has completed training.”

Two certification courses were created. An LEA representative needed to complete only the one course that best represented the LEA. SCOE tracked LEA completion status.

1. **LEA Certification (K–12):** For the LEA ELPAC coordinator or a designee training in an LEA with K–12 (the person or people who would have attended the statewide in-person training)
2. **LEA Certification (grades six through twelve):** For the LEA ELPAC coordinator or a designee training in an LEA with grades six through twelve (the person or people who would have attended the statewide in-person training)

Table 5.1 shows the number of certificates issued for each certification course. The certificates-issued count is a duplicated count by LEA, as multiple people from an LEA may have completed certification.

Table 5.1 LEA Certification Counts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA Certification Course** | **Number of Certificates Issued** |
| K–12 Certification | 1,112 |
| Grades 6–12 Certification | 258 |

Some LEAs had a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with another LEA to provide training, provide a trained test examiner to perform the testing, or both; and were, therefore, not required to complete the training. In November 2021, the CDE was provided with a list of the 306 LEAs that had still not completed training, and 48 had students with an English language acquisition status of To Be Determined. The total number of LEAs that completed the certification course or had an MOU was 1,903 as of the close of the training window on April 4, 2022; 103 LEAs did not complete certification.

The online LEA certification training in Moodle covered the test administration of all grade levels and grade spans and all domains. The training focused primarily on the Writing scoring because the Summative ELPAC training in the fall of 2021 had focused on administration and scoring of Speaking. To complete LEA certification, for an LEA coordinator or designee, the certification course contained the following eight videos:

1. What’s New for 2021–22 Initial Administration
2. Introduction and Overview
3. Test Administration
4. After Testing
5. K–2 Administration (modeling an administration of the Writing tasks for K–2)
6. Writing—*Describe a Picture,* Grades 3–5
7. Writing—*Justify an Opinion*
8. Writing—*Write About an Experience*

##### Monitoring Test Examiner Calibration

Each LEA has a unique user group within the Moodle Training Site, with each LEA being issued a unique enrollment key for each of the training courses. An LEA ELPAC coordinator can designate ELPAC trainers within the site and request that trainers have access to view reports and monitor the completion of test examiners.

The LEA ELPAC coordinator, or a designee, was responsible for overseeing test examiners’ calibration progress and completion. Test examiners were emailed a certificate of completion upon successfully completing and passing calibration, and examiners were expected to email their certificate to their LEA ELPAC coordinator. LEA ELPAC coordinators could also monitor test examiners’ progress in the Activity Completion Report and Grade Book in Moodle.

The Examiner’s Resources course was for any person administering the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC. The Examiner’s Resources course was organized with training resources and calibration certificates by grade level and grade span. Test examiners needed only to calibrate for Speaking or Writing items in the grade level or grade span being administered.

Table 5.2 and table 5.3 show the number of test examiners statewide who completed calibration certificates by domain and grade level or grade span. The total number of certifications is a duplicate count, as some test examiners could take two or more grade-level certifications. In total, 13,522 test examiners were issued Speaking calibration certificates and 12,865 test examiners were issued Writing calibration certificates, for a total of 26,347 certifications issued. These certificates represented 6,932 individual test examiners certified from 1,191 LEAs.

The total number of certifications in table 5.2 and table 5.3 are duplicate counts, as some test examiners may have taken two or more grade-level certifications.

Table 5.2 Test Examiner Certification Counts for Speaking

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Test Examiner Calibration Course** | **2021–22 Number of Certificates Issued** |
| Kindergarten | 3,445 |
| Grade 1 | 1,536 |
| Grade 2 | 1,122 |
| Kindergarten–Grade 2 | 955 |

Table 5.2 *(continuation)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Test Examiner Calibration Course** | **2021–22 Number of Certificates Issued** |
| Grades 3–5 | 1,326 |
| Kindergarten–Grade 5 | 1,927 |
| Grades 6–8 | 1,620 |
| Grades 9–12 | 911 |
| Grades 6–12 | 680 |
| **TOTAL Speaking Certificates Issued:** | **13,522** |

Table 5.3 Test Examiner Certification Counts for Writing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Test Examiner Calibration Course** | **2021–22 Number of Certificates Issued** |
| Kindergarten | 3,337 |
| Grade 1 | 1,503 |
| Grade 2 | 1,136 |
| Kindergarten–Grade 2 | 937 |
| Grades 3–5 | 1,193 |
| Kindergarten–Grade 5 | 1,789 |
| Grades 6–8 | 1,452 |
| Grades 9–12 | 835 |
| Grades 6–12 | 643 |
| **TOTAL Writing Certificates Issued:** | **12,865** |

##### Materials on the Moodle Training Site

The ELPAC Moodle site provided California LEAs with the necessary training resources to train the test examiners who would score the ELPAC, as well as administration staff. The site contained all resources needed to conduct an LEA test examiner training session, such as a downloadable AST binder, training presentations, training videos, scoring rubrics, and training and calibration quizzes.

To establish consistency in statewide local training, training materials were developed and provided to all LEAs. To provide support to LEAs statewide during the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as to support virtual training, training binders were produced and shipped directly to addresses provided by each LEA. All LEAs also had access to PDFs of the training binder sections.

Test examiners used the site to review training materials and to calibrate in preparation for Speaking and Writing scoring. For remote testing, additional materials such as the remote testing addenda and PDF versions of the K–2 Writing Answer Books were also posted in Moodle for test examiners to access.

To access the ELPAC Moodle site for 2021–22 Initial ELPAC training materials, LEA users required individual user accounts. Each LEA had its own district group. To monitor scoring calibration, the LEA ELPAC coordinator was issued a unique enrollment key for the training course and could view the results of the quizzes taken by test examiners.

Training materials are described in the next subsections.

###### Training Binders

As the Initial ELPAC remained unchanged, with no new items, the Initial ELPAC training binder remained the same as the 2020–21 training binder.

An Initial ELPAC AST binder was provided to LEAs; materials included the following:

* Section 1: Introduction and Test Administration
* Overview of the program
* Contact information
* Test administration
* Rubrics, alignment to the standards cards
* Preparing and training test examiners, including the Moodle Training Site
* Section 2: *Talk About a Scene*—K–12
* Prompting and scoring guidelines
* Rubrics
* Each scene for each grade level and grade span
* Test questions and anchor charts
* Section 3: Speaking*—Support an Opinion*—Kindergarten
* Prompting and scoring guidelines
* Rubric
* Anchors, with 24 audio tracks as samples for training and calibration
* Section 4: Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—K–2
* Prompting and scoring guidelines
* Rubric
* Anchors, with more than 72 audio tracks as samples for training and calibration
* Section 5: Kindergarten Administration
* Presentation
* Testing materials
* Section 6: Writing Letters—K–2
* Rubrics
* Test questions and anchor samples
* Section 7: Writing Words—K–2
* Rubrics
* Test questions with anchor and training student writing samples
* Section 8: Writing Independent Sentences—Grades One and Two
* Rubrics
* Test questions with anchor student writing samples; and training and calibration student writing samples
* Section 9: Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades Three Through Twelve
* Prompting and scoring guidelines
* Rubric
* Anchors, with over 88 audio tracks as samples for training and calibration
* Section 10: Speaking—Summarize an Academic Presentation—Grades One Through Twelve
* Prompting and scoring guidelines
* Rubric
* Anchors, with more than 120 audio tracks as samples for training and calibration
* Section 11—Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grade Span Three Through Five
* Rubric
* Test questions with anchor student writing samples; and training and calibration student writing samples
* Section 12—Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades Three Through Twelve
* Rubrics
* Test questions with anchor student writing samples; and training and calibration student writing samples
* Section 13—*Write About an Experience*—Grades Six Through Twelve
* Rubrics
* Test questions with anchor student writing samples; and training and calibration student writing samples
* Section 14—After Testing

###### Training Videos

Seventeen test administration videos were created and presented for the virtual online training; one of those videos was brand new to support new virtual training. Videos used are listed in table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Available Scoring Training Videos

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Video Topic** | **Description** |
| **K–2 Administration** | The narrated video captured a student in kindergarten or grade one being administered the ELPAC one-on-one using the user acceptance testing environment of the training test. The presentation included information about the test examiner’s knowledge of the use of tools and navigation of the tools. |
| **Speaking Overview** | This narrated video included a student taking the entire Speaking domain and included important tips about computer-based administration. |
| ***Talk About a Scene*** | This narrated video included a student answering *Talk About a Scene* questions and included important tips about computer-based administration. The narrator presented prompting and scoring guidelines and introduced the scoring rubric. |

Table 5.4 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Video Topic** | **Description** |
| ***Speech Functions*** | The narrated video captured a student being administered a set of *Speech Functions* items. This video included the practice question and modeling, pointing guidelines, prompting and scoring guidelines, rubric overview, use of the Speaking *DFA*, and additional computer platform talking points. |
| ***Support an Opinion*** | This narrated video included two subsections coinciding with the two rubrics: K–2 and grades three through twelve, with students answering *Support an Opinion* questions. It included important tips about computer-based administration. The narrator presented prompting and scoring guidelines and introduced the scoring rubric. The video was edited to delete the grades three through twelve rubric, which does not apply to the Initial ELPAC. |
| ***Retell a Narrative*** | This narrated video included a student answering *Retell a Narrative* questions and includes important tips about computer-based administration. The narrator presented prompting and scoring guidelines and introduced the scoring rubric. |
| ***Summarize an Academic Presentation*** | This narrated video included a student answering *Summarize an Academic Presentation* questions and included important tips about computer-based administration. The narrator presented prompting and scoring guidelines and introduced the scoring rubric and use of the main points. |
| **Introduction to the Initial ELPAC** | This video, including narration, explained the purpose of the Initial ELPAC and reviewed test materials, task types, and scoring. This video was updated with new footage of the computer-based ELPAC and new narration that included information about using the Teacher Hand Scoring System (THSS). |
| **Initial Identification of English Learner (EL) Students** | This video, including narration, reviewed the process LEAs should follow in identifying EL students. This video from the paper–pencil ELPAC was revised with new footage from the computer-based ELPAC. |
| **K–2 Writing** | This video included a student being administered the K–2 Writing domain, including letters, words, and independent sentences. The narrator presented prompting and scoring guidelines and introduced the scoring rubrics. The video was segmented to refer to separate binder sections for letters, words, and independent sentences. |

Table 5.4 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Video Topic** | **Description** |
| **Writing—*Describe a Picture* (grades three through five)** | This video included a student using the computer and typing a response to a grades three through five *Describe a Picture* test item. The narrator introduced the task type and scoring rubric. |
| **Writing—*Write About an Experience* (grades six through twelve)** | This video included a student using a computer and typing a response to a *Write About an Experience* test item. The narrator introduced the task type and scoring rubric. |
| **Writing—*Justify an Opinion* (grades three through twelve)** | This video included a student using a computer and typing a response to a *Write About an Experience* test item. The narrator introduced the task type and scoring rubric. |
| **Introduction and Overview** | This video was a recorded presentation of the in-person AST training for Section 1 of the binder. This was part of the LEA certification requirement. |
| **Test Administration** | This video was a recorded presentation of the in-person AST training for Section 1 of the binder. This was part of the LEA certification requirement. |
| **After Testing** | This video was a recorded presentation of the in-person AST training for Section 14 of the binder. This was part of the LEA certification requirement. |
| **2021–22 What’s New Initial ELPAC** | This newly created video included updates for the 2021–‍22 administration, including: reorganization of the Examiner’s Moodle course, PPT now only being available for those designated in an IEP with a request through TOMS, an updated *End Test* screen in the TDS, updates to the *DFAs* and separate in-person and remote *DFAs*, and a new [**Remote or Hybrid**] button within the Test Administrator Interface. |

###### Remote Training Videos

Five test administration video on how to administer the Initial ELPAC remotely were created or updated for the 2021–22 administration:

* + - 1. K–2 Remote Testing—Writing
      2. K–2 Remote Testing—Listening and Reading
      3. K–12 Remote Testing—Speaking
      4. Starting a One-on-One Remote Test Session
      5. How to Take a Remote Test—English

###### Training Presentations

Seven training presentations were created for LEA ELPAC trainers to use for local training. These training presentations included all of the Speaking and Writing video and audio files and Writing samples to be embedded into the presentations. Most of these presentations focused on training and scoring the Speaking and Writing task types.

Table 5.5 includes a list of the training presentations available to LEAs.

Table 5.5 Available Training Videos and Presentations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Binder Section** | **Training Presentations** |
| Section 1 | Overview Training Video |
| Section 2 | Speaking Overview and *Talk About a Scene* Training Video |
| Section 3 | *Speaking—Support an Opinion* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 4 | *Speaking—Retell a Narrative* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 5 | Kindergarten and Grade Two Administration of Reading-Writing-Listening Video |
| Sections 6–8 | *Writing Letters/Writing Words/Writing Independent Sentences* Training Video |
| Section 9 | *Speaking—Speech Functions* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 10 | Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 11 | Writing—*Describe a Picture* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 12 | Writing—*Justify an Opinion* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 13 | Writing—*Write About an Experience* Training Presentation and Video |
| Section 14 | After Testing |

###### Calibration Quizzes

To give test examiners an opportunity to refresh and test their knowledge prior to administering the Initial ELPAC and before scoring Speaking and Writing, the online training site included more than 60 training and calibration quizzes with more than 300 audio samples.

The Speaking training quizzes allowed a test examiner to listen to the audio, select a score, and receive feedback. The Moodle training quiz provided the correct score, justification, and feedback after the test examiner completed 10 samples. Writing training quizzes included student Writing samples and provided correct score, justification, and feedback.

Upon completion of the calibration quiz, the “Pass/Fail” and “Percent correct” notifications were posted for the test examiner.

The following items were new for the 2021–22 administration:

* All the quizzes had anchor samples and item information included in each quiz to create a more paperless quiz system.
* All quizzes received an updated style template.
* A new Writing Independent Sentences quiz was developed so grade one–specific and grade two–specific quizzes could be created.
* Speaking and Writing had separate certificates of calibration.

The training and calibration quizzes and Moodle Training Site provided the following calibration rates:

* 80 percent calibration required for 0–3 and 0–4 rubrics
* 90 percent calibration required for 0–2 rubrics

Table 5.6 shows a list of the training and calibration quizzes, by task type, created and posted to the Moodle Training Site.

Table 5.6 Training and Calibration Quizzes by Grade Level or Grade Span

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span Section in Moodle** | **Training Quizzes** | **Calibration Certificate Quizzes** |
| Kindergarten | * Speaking—*Support an Opinion*—K * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—K * Writing—Words—K | * Speaking—*Support an Opinion*—K * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—K * Writing—Words—K |
| Grade 1 | * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—Grade 1 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grade 1 * Writing—Words—Grade 1 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grade 1 | * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—Grade 1 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grade 1 * Writing—Words—Grade 1 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grade 1 |
| Grade 2 | * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—Grade 2 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grade 2 * Writing—Words—Grade 2 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grade 2 | * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—Grade 2 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grade 2 * Writing—Words—Grade 2 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grade 2 |
| Kindergarten–Grade 2 | * Speaking—*Support an Opinion*—K * *Speaking—Retell a Narrative—K–2* * *Speaking—Summarize an Academic Presentation—Grades 1–2* * *Writing—*Words*—*K*–2* * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grades 1–2 | * Speaking—*Support an Opinion*—K * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—K–2 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 1–2 * Writing—Words—K–2 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grades 1–2 |

Table 5.6 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span Section in Moodle** | **Training Quizzes** | **Calibration Certificate Quizzes** |
| Grade span 3–5 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 3–5 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 3–5 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 1 and 3 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 2 and 4 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 3–5 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 3–5 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 3–5 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 1 and 3 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 2 and 4 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 3–5 |
| Kindergarten–Grade 5 | * Speaking—*Support an Opinion*—K * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—K–2 * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 3–5 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 1–2 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 3–5 * Writing—Words—K–2 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grades 1–2 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 1 and 3 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 2 and 4 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 3–5 | * Speaking—*Support an Opinion*—K * Speaking—*Retell a Narrative*—K–2 * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 3–5 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 1–2 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 3–5 * Writing—Words—K–2 * Writing—Independent Sentences—Grades 1–2 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 1 and 3 * Writing—*Describe a Picture*—Grades 3–5; Q 2 and 4 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 3–5 |

Table 5.6 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span Section in Moodle** | **Training Quizzes** | **Calibration Certificate Quizzes** |
| Grade span 6–8 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 6–8 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 6–8 * Writing—*Write About an Experience*—Grades 6–8 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 6–8 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 6–8 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 6–8 * Writing—*Write About an Experience*—Grades 6–8 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 6–8 |
| Grade span 9–12 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 9–12 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 9–12 * Writing—*Write About an Experience*—Grades 9–12 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 9–12 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 9–12 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 9–12 * Writing—*Write About an Experience*—Grades 9–12 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 9–12 |
| Grades 6–12 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 6–12 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 6–8 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 9–12 * Writing—*Write About an Experience*—Grades 6–12 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 6–12 | * Speaking—*Speech Functions*—Grades 6–12 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 6–8 * Speaking—*Summarize an Academic Presentation*—Grades 9–12 * Writing—*Write About an Experience*—Grades 6–12 * Writing—*Justify an Opinion*—Grades 6–12 |

### Local Educational Agency Training

Each year, ETS, in collaboration with the CDE and its Assessment Validity and Outreach contractor, the SCOE, establishes and implements a comprehensive training plan for LEA assessment staff and educators on all aspects of the assessment program. The ETS and SCOE annual training plans specify the audience, topics, frequency, and mode (synchronous or asynchronous) of the training, including such elements as format, participants, and organization.

Knowing that educators were confronted with challenges daily that put additional demands on their time, ETS and SCOE made every effort to make the information available in a variety of ways that allowed educators access to training at a time that was responsive to their varying circumstances. This included offering training events on multiple days and times, livestreaming events, recording and archiving training, and converting training to self-paced modules that could be taken any time, at the learner’s convenience.

All training opportunities were posted in one centralized location on the ELPAC website. LEA staff were able to register for training opportunities in one place, on the Upcoming Training Opportunities web page. Archived training was made available on the Past Training Opportunities web page, making it easier for educators to find a training they missed, and providing easier access to recorded training. ETS also employed a new strategy for providing access to training materials. Participants could register to receive a copy of the training materials without registering to attend a live training. Training materials were developed in such a way that educators could consume the information independently by reading through materials.

#### Synchronous and Asynchronous Training

All synchronous training was offered on Zoom, recorded, and made available for on-demand viewing. Zoom provides an opportunity for educators to ask questions and get answers in real time. Training was also livestreamed on YouTube so that educators still had access if a particular training reached registration capacity.

In response to an environment where educators had competing priorities to juggle, ETS and SCOE used various strategies to increase engagement during synchronous trainings. Live polls were presented to get real-time feedback about attendees’ knowledge of a particular topic, allowing presenters to tailor presentations to the audience’s level of understanding. The chat functionality was enabled to give participants an opportunity to interact with each other or to provide open-ended feedback, or it was disabled to minimize distraction and drive attendees’ focus to the information being presented. Breakout groups were used in smaller group trainings, as appropriate. Breaks and processing time were incorporated into presentations to give attendees opportunities to attend to other responsibilities that might result as part of their job or home environment.

Working closely with the CDE, ETS and SCOE continued to provide informal support to educators by offering monthly Coffee Sessions. Coffee Sessions included CDE and ETS staff who could answer questions about all aspects of testing. ETS also offered a “workday” for coordinators where support staff were available throughout the day, allowing coordinators to join as needed and get customized support. SCOE continued to offer assessment update meetings intended to provide LEA coordinators with regular updates about California’s assessment system. All trainings and meetings were recorded and archived for on-demand viewing on the Past Training Opportunities web page on the ELPAC website.

#### Videos and Guides

ETS produced videos on various aspects of administering the ELPAC, including how to perform functions within TOMS, such as setting up a test administration window, adding users, assigning tests to students, and uploading test settings. SCOE produced the accompanying quick reference guides, providing multiple avenues of support for educators administering the assessments.

In addition to the standard administration videos, ETS produced additional videos to support administration. Some videos were geared toward parents and guardians to help them understand the assessment’s purpose or how to read the SSR. Other videos were intended to help coordinators or other users complete a process, such as administering a practice or training test, starting and stopping a test session, how to monitor student completion, and how to complete second scoring that is required for some of the assessments. This list is a sampling of the available videos intended to capture the major areas of support for various interest holders. The comprehensive suite of training videos can be found on the ELPAC Videos and Quick Reference Guides web page.

#### Training for Proper Identification and Assignment of Designated Supports and Accommodations

ETS developed a video with LEA staff to help California educators learn more about the importance of implementing ELPAC accessibility resources and best practices used by educators in the field. The “Importance of Implementing CAASPP and ELPAC Accessibility Resources: Voices from Educators” video was available on the Quick Reference Guides and Videos web page on the ELPAC website.

ETS also produced short demonstration videos for every embedded accessibility resource, demonstrating how to use the resource for educators, students, and parents/guardians. The videos were available in both English and Spanish on the Accessibility Resources Demonstration Videos web page on the ELPAC website. Demonstration videos were also created for the most frequently used non-embedded accessibility resources. These videos were linked within the Individual Student Assessment Accessibility Profile (ISAAP) Tool, increasing access to the demonstration videos. Educators using the ISAAP Tool to determine the student’s needs could view the corresponding demonstration video without having to navigate away from the tool.

A video on how to use the ISAAP Tool was also available to support educators in the process of creating an individual student profile and matching accessibility resources to student needs to ensure a fair and valid testing experience for all students.

For the 2021–22 ELPAC administration, ETS produced a two-part asynchronous training module. Module A, Matching Accessibility Resources to Students’ Needs, focused on providing participants with an understanding of the importance of accessibility resources, the categories of accessibility resources, and the process for matching students with appropriate accessibility resources for daily instruction and on assessments. Module B, Using Accessibility Resources in Daily Instruction, focused on the importance of removing barriers to student learning and using accessibility resources in daily instruction. Educators could complete the training independently or had the option to attend one of two live sessions held by ETS to extend and deepen the learning experience.

At the California Assessment Conference, SCOE offered two sessions on accessibility. “Leveraging UDL and Accessibility Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning” explored Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles to help remove barriers to student learning and provided data collection tools to participants. The session on “Introduction to Accessibility and the ISAAP Tool” provided participants with the most up-to-date information regarding accessibility resources and offered a live practical approach to identifying and matching accessibility resources to students using the ISAAP Tool. The conference also included some shared practices sessions focused on accessibility.

#### Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey

The ELPAC program solicits feedback annually from various interest holder groups, including LEA ELPAC coordinators, site ELPAC coordinators, and test examiners, through the CAASPP and ELPAC Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey. Feedback was collected via a post-test survey sent to more than 510,000 California educators and through focus groups. Educators provided valuable feedback for potential improvements to the future administration of CAASPP and the ELPAC—one or both—by reporting some lessons they learned in 2021–22.

Improvements made in response to survey results are detailed in [chapter 10](#_Toc132644737). The CDE and ETS used key recommendations from educators to implement positive changes in the next test administration year.

##### Overview

LEA and site ELPAC coordinators, as well as test examiners, were invited to participate in the survey. The California educators who responded provided specific, actionable insights about their test administration experience. This survey gathered information and data from educators who were part of the administration of CAASPP, the ELPAC, or both programs. Its goal was to highlight successes and identify areas for improvement, both immediate and long term.

Overall, California educators continue to express positive experiences in their preparations for administering CAASPP and the ELPAC.

##### Communication

One example of these efforts is the monthly email communication, which is sent to LEA ELPAC coordinators. During the 2021–22 test administration year, the CDE and ETS worked to streamline communications and provide LEAs with timely and relevant information throughout the year. Monthly CAASPP and ELPAC email communications were sent to the field during the 2021–22 test administration year.

##### Testing Locations

Although the 2021–22 school year included the transition from distance learning back to in-person learning, educators felt that the resources and training materials provided were useful in preparing them and their students for test administration. Their feedback generally described smooth preparation, training, support, and assessment administration experiences.

With the transition back to in-person learning, testing in person was the primary testing mode for LEAs in 2021–22. However, many LEAs expressed their appreciation for the continued option of remote testing, either for students who were receiving remote instruction or for those with medical parameters that prevented them from attending school in person.

Many of the existing remote testing resources were updated or improved from the previous versions. Most notably, the chapter on remote testing was added to the *CAASPP Online Test Administration Manual,* *Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual,* and the *Summative ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual*. Sixty-nine percent of both LEA ELPAC coordinators and LEA CAASPP coordinators indicated that they found it helpful.

### User Roles and Standardization

The test administration procedures were designed so that the tests are administered in a standardized manner. ETS took all necessary measures to ensure the standardization of test administration, as described in this section.

#### Local Educational Agency ELPAC Coordinator

An LEA ELPAC coordinator was designated by the district superintendent or charter school administrator at the beginning of the 2021–22 school year. LEAs include public school districts, California State Board of Education–authorized charter schools, county office of education programs, and direct funded charter schools.

LEA ELPAC coordinators were responsible for ensuring the proper and consistent administration of the ELPAC. In addition to the responsibilities set forth in *California Code of Regulations,* Title 5 (5*CCR*) Section 11518.40, their responsibilities included

* adding site ELPAC coordinators and test examiners into TOMS;
* training site ELPAC coordinators and test examiners regarding the state requirements and ELPAC administration as well as security policies and procedures;
* providing checklists for site ELPAC coordinators and test examiners to review in preparation for administering the summative assessments;
* overseeing test administration activities;
* reporting test security incidents (including testing irregularities) to the CDE using the online Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System (STAIRS)/Appeals process;
* filing a report of a testing incident in STAIRS;
* requesting an Appeal (if indicated by TOMS prompts while reporting an incident using the STAIRS/Appeals process);
* ensuring that correct testing procedures were followed;
* ensuring that test materials were distributed to the schools and kept in a locked, secure area at all times;
* ensuring that all site ELPAC coordinators and test examiners were trained and certified to administer the Initial ELPAC;
* ordering test materials and supplemental test materials in TOMS; and
* ensuring adequate test materials were on hand and redistributed throughout the LEA during the testing window as needed.

#### Site ELPAC Coordinator

A site ELPAC coordinator is trained by the LEA ELPAC coordinator for each test site (5*CCR* Section 11518.40[b][7]). A test site coordinator must be an employee of the LEA and must sign a security agreement (5 *CCR* Section 11518.45[b][3]).

A test site coordinator was responsible for identifying test examiners and ensuring that they have signed ELPAC *Test Security Affidavits* (5 *CCR* Section 11518.45[b][3]). A site ELPAC coordinator’s duties may have included

* adding test examiners into TOMS;
* entering test settings for students;
* creating testing schedules and procedures for a school consistent with state and LEA policies;
* working with technology staff to ensure secure browsers are installed and any technical issues are resolved;
* monitoring testing progress during the testing window and ensuring all students take the Initial ELPAC, as appropriate;
* coordinating and verifying the correction of student data errors in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System;
* ensuring a student’s test session is rescheduled, if necessary;
* addressing testing problems;
* reporting test security incidents (including testing irregularities) to the CDE using the online STAIRS/Appeals process;
* overseeing administration activities at a school site; and
* requesting an Appeal (if indicated by TOMS prompts while reporting an incident using the STAIRS/Appeals process).

#### Test Examiner

Test examiners were identified by site ELPAC coordinators as individuals who will administer the Initial ELPAC.

A test examiner must sign a security affidavit (5 *CCR* Section 11518.50[d]).

A test examiner’s duties may have included

* ensuring the physical conditions of the testing room meet the criteria for a secure test environment;
* administering the ELPAC, including the Initial ELPAC;
* reporting all test security incidents to the site ELPAC coordinator and LEA ELPAC coordinator in a manner consistent with state and LEA policies;
* viewing student information prior to testing to ensure that the correct student receives the proper test with appropriate resources and reporting potential data errors to site ELPAC coordinators and LEA ELPAC coordinators;
* monitoring student progress throughout the test session using the Test Administrator Interface; and
* fully complying with all directions provided in the *DFAs* for the Initial ELPAC (CDE, 2022e).

#### Local Scoring Correspondence Administrator

The local scoring correspondence administrator was the designated staff member who performed score entry in the DEI and THSS and printed individual Initial ELPAC SSRs at the LEA level. This role was assigned by the LEA ELPAC coordinator in TOMS. Prior to handling testing materials, a local scoring correspondence administrator signed a *Test Security Affidavit* (5 *CCR* Section 11518.50[d]).

#### Local Scoring Data Entry Staff

The local scoring data entry staff performed score entry in the DEI and THSS and printed individual Initial ELPAC SSRs at the school level. This role was assigned by the LEA ELPAC coordinator in TOMS. Prior to handling testing materials, a local scoring data entry staff member signed a *Test Security Affidavit* (5 *CCR* Section 11518.50[d]).

#### Instructions for Test Administration

##### *Directions for Administration*

Test examiners were required to use the *DFAs*, housed securely in TOMS, to administer tests to all eligible students. Each grade level and grade span had a combined *DFA* for the Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing domains.

For students who needed to be tested remotely, test examiners could access addenda to the *DFA* for K–2 for some additional directions for the remote administration of the Reading and Listening domains. The *DFA* addenda were available in Moodle. Aside from the *DFA* addenda, the PDF versions of the K–2 Writing Answer Books were also provided in Moodle for test examiners to download and share with the student via an online meeting application while administering the Writing domain.

A student score sheet was provided as the last page of the grades three through twelve *DFA* and the inside back cover of the Writing Answer Books for K–2. Use of the scoring sheet was optional; the test examiner could use it to record a student’s Speaking scores manually. These student scores could later be entered into the DEI. Alternatively, the test examiner could enter the student’s Speaking scores into the DEI while administering the test.

LEAs that administered the K–2 Writing domain PPTs found the Writing rubrics in the *DFA* for test examiners to locally score the students’ responses. The inside back cover of the K–2 Writing Answer Books included a Writing score sheet, along with the Speaking score sheet, for test examiners to record a student’s Writing scores, which were later entered into the DEI.

Additionally, the *Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual* provided information to test administrators regarding the systems involved in testing, including sections describing the TDS, so they could become familiar with the testing application used by their students (CDE, 2021b).

##### *Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual*

The *Initial ELPAC Online Test Administration Manual* (CDE, 2022e) contained information and instructions on overall procedures and guidelines for all LEA and test site staff involved in the administration of computer-based assessments. Sections included the following topics:

* Roles and responsibilities of those involved with ELPAC testing
* Test administration resources
* Test security
* Administration preparation and planning
* General test administration
* In-person test administration
* Remote test administration
* Instructions for steps to take before, during, and after testing
* Dates for ordering materials and testing
* Guidelines for handling materials

Appendices included definitions of common terms and descriptions of different aspects of the test and systems associated with the test.

##### *California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress and ELPAC Test Operations Management System User Guide*

TOMS is a web-based application that allows LEA ELPAC coordinators to set up test administrations, add and manage users, submit computer-based student test settings, and order PPTs.

TOMS modules described in the *TOMS User Guide* included the following (CDE, 2022d):

* **Adding and Managing Users—**This module allowed LEA ELPAC coordinators to add site ELPAC coordinators and test examiners to TOMS so that the designated user could administer, monitor, and manage the ELPAC computer-based assessments.
* **Reports—**This module allowed LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators access to the various reports in TOMS.
* **STAIRS/Appeals—**This module allowed LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators access to create new STAIRS cases or search for STAIRS/Appeals cases.
* **Student Profile—**This module allowed LEA ELPAC coordinators, site ELPAC coordinators, and test examiners to view and manage student’s test assignments and test settings.

##### Other System Manuals

Other manuals were created to assist LEA ELPAC coordinators and others with the technological components of the ELPAC System and are listed next.

* ***CAASPP and ELPAC Technical Specifications and Configuration Guide for Online Testing*—**This manual provided information, tools, and recommended configuration details to help technology staff prepare computers and install the secure browser to be used for the computer-based ELPAC (CDE, 2022c).
* ***CAASPP and ELPAC Security Incidents and Appeals Procedure Guide*—**This manual provided information on how to report a testing incident and submit an Appeal to reset, reopen, invalidate, or restore individual computer-based student assessments (CDE, 2022b).
* ***CAASPP and ELPAC Accessibility Guide*—**This manual provided descriptions of the accessibility features for computer-based tests as well as information about supported hardware and software requirements for administering tests to students using accessibility resources, including those with a braille accommodation using Job Access With Speech® (software) or a braille embosser (hardware) (CDE, 2022a).

### Student Participation Requirement

California *Education Code* Section 313 requires LEAs to administer the ELPAC to all eligible students in K–12 whose primary language is a language other than English. The Initial ELPAC was administered only once to a new student in a California public school. Table 7.A.1 through table 7.A.4 in [appendix 7.A](#_Appendix_7.A:_Initial) provide the number of test takers and select demographic student groups for each test during the 2021–‍22 administration. Note that the data in the *Number Registered* column includes students who were registered within a grade level and eligible for the Initial ELPAC during the 2021–22 administration. The *Number Tested* columns include students who tested at the current grade level and exclude off-grade testers and students who were registered but did not test.

The results of the locally scored Initial ELPAC helped to determine whether the student needed support in learning English. The Initial ELPAC assessed the following six grade levels and grade spans: kindergarten, grade one, grade two, and grade spans three through five, six through eight, and nine through twelve.

### Accessibility Resources

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reaffirms the importance of ensuring that assessments are accessible to special populations, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act lays out monitoring requirements for students with disabilities. This section describes the accessibility resources used to support students in the Initial ELPAC, as well as the procedures to identify and assign students with accommodations and designated supports. Finally, the number of students who were assigned accessibility resources was reported on the basis of available data.

The 2021–22 Initial ELPAC offered commonly used accessibility resources available through the ELPAC computer-based testing platform, where applicable for the tested construct.

#### Domain Exemptions

When a student’s IEP or Section 504 plan specified that the student had a disability for which there were no appropriate accommodations for assessment in one or more of the tested domains, the student was assessed in the remaining domain(s) in which it was possible to assess the student. For the Initial ELPAC, a student may only be exempted in one domain of each composite.

A student was assigned an overall score only if assessed in both oral language and written language skills. To be considered as having been assessed in a language composite, the student must have been assessed in the nonexempted domain within the composite.

IEP teams may also determine that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities be tested with a locally determined alternate assessment, as noted in the student’s IEP. (A statewide Initial Alternate ELPAC, for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, was not developed at the time of this test administration.)

#### Accessibility Resource Categories

The purpose of universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations in testing is to provide *all* students with the opportunity to demonstrate what they know and what they are able to do. Universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations minimize or remove barriers that could otherwise prevent students from demonstrating their knowledge, skills, and achievement in a specific content area.

The CDE’s *California Assessment Accessibility Resources Matrix* (Accessibility Matrix) (CDE, 2021) is intended for school-level personnel and IEP and Section 504 plan teams to select and administer the appropriate universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations as deemed necessary for individual students.

##### Universal Tools

Universal tools were available to all students by default, although they could be disabled if a student found them distracting. Each universal tool fell into one of two categories: embedded and non-embedded. Embedded universal tools were provided through the TDS (through the ELPAC secure browser), although they could be turned off by a test examiner.

The universal tools in the following subsections were available in the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration.

###### Embedded

The following embedded universal tools were available to students testing in the secure browser and web-based browser:

* Breaks
* Digital notepad
* Expandable items
* Expandable passages
* Highlighter
* Keyboard navigation
* Line reader (grades three through twelve)
* Mark for review (grades two through twelve)
* Strikethrough (grades three through twelve)
* Writing tools (grades three through twelve)
* Zoom (in or out)

###### Non-Embedded

The following non-embedded universal tools were available to students testing in the secure browser and web-based browser:

* Breaks
* Oral clarification of test directions by the test examiner in English
* Scratch paper
* Test navigation assistant

The following non-embedded universal tools were available to students in K–2 taking the PPT Writing domain:

* Breaks
* Highlighter
* Mark for review
* Oral clarification of test directions by the test examiner in English
* Scratch paper

The following non-embedded universal tools were available to students taking the PPT emergency form:

* Breaks
* Highlighter (in the test book for grades two through twelve)
* Line reader (grades three through twelve)
* Mark for review (in the test book for grades two through twelve [highlighters] and grades three through twelve [nonhighlighters])
* Oral clarification of test directions by the test examiner in English
* Scratch paper
* Strikethrough (grades three through twelve)

##### Designated Supports

Designated supports were available to all students through the test settings in TOMS. The designated supports each fell into one of two categories: embedded and non-embedded. Embedded designated supports were provided through the Student Testing Interface (through the ELPAC secure browser).

The designated supports in the following subsections were available in the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration.

###### Embedded

The following embedded designated supports were available to students testing in the secure browser and web-based browser:

* Color contrast
* Masking
* Mouse pointer (size and color)
* Pause or replay audio—Listening domain
* Pause or replay audio—Speaking domain
* Permissive mode
* Print (font) size
* Streamline
* Turn off any universal tool(s)

###### Non-Embedded

The following non-embedded designated supports were available to students testing in the secure browser and web-based browser:

* Amplification
* Color contrast
* Color overlay
* Designated interface assistant
* Magnification
* Masking
* Medical supports
* Noise buffers
* Print-on-demand
* Read aloud for items—Writing domain
* Separate setting
* Simplified test directions
* Translated test directions (including American Sign Language or Manually Coded English)

The following non-embedded designated supports were available to students in K–2 taking the PPT Writing domain:

* American Sign Language or Manual Coded English
* Amplification
* Color overlay
* Magnification
* Masking
* Medical supports
* Noise buffers
* Read-aloud items
* Separate setting
* Simplified test directions
* Translated test directions (including American Sign Language or Manually Coded English)

The following non-embedded designated supports were available to students taking the PPT emergency form:

* Amplification
* Color overlay
* Magnification
* Masking
* Medical supports
* Noise buffers
* Pause or replay audio—Listening domain
* Pause or replay audio—Speaking domain
* Read aloud for items—Writing domain
* Separate setting
* Simplified test directions
* Translated test directions (including American Sign Language or Manually Coded English)

##### Accommodations

Accommodations are changes in procedures or materials that increased equitable access during ELPAC administration. Assessment accommodations for students who needed them generated valid assessment results; they allowed these students to show what they know and can do. Accommodations did not compromise the learning expectations, construct, grade-level standard, or intended outcome of the assessments.

The accommodations in the following subsections were available in the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration.

###### Embedded

The following embedded accommodations were available to students testing in the secure browser and web-based browser:

* American Sign Language
* Audio transcript (includes braille transcript)
* Braille (embossed and refreshable)
* Closed-captioning
* Text-to-speech—Listening, Speaking, and Writing domains (Although this support is allowable, it is also built into the items through test examiner–read questions or audio recordings.)

###### Non-Embedded

The following non-embedded accommodations were available to students testing in the secure browser and web-based browser:

* Alternate response options
* American Sign Language or Manually Coded English
* Braille
* Breaks
* Scribe (Writing)
* Speech-to-text

The following non-embedded accommodations were available to students in K–2 taking the PPT Writing domain:

* Alternate response options
* American Sign Language or Manually Coded English
* Braille
* Breaks
* Large print
* Scribe (Writing)

The following non-embedded accommodations were available to students taking the PPT emergency form:

* Alternate response options
* American Sign Language or Manually Coded English
* Audio transcript (includes braille transcript)
* Braille
* Breaks
* Large print
* Scribe
* Word processor (Writing domain) (grades three through twelve)

##### Unlisted Resources

An unlisted resource is an instructional support a student regularly uses in daily instruction, assessment, or both, and has not been previously identified as a universal tool, designated support, or accommodation. The Accessibility Matrix included an inventory of unlisted resources that were already identified and were preapproved (CDE, 2021). During the 2021–22 ELPAC administration, an LEA ELPAC coordinator or a site ELPAC coordinator would use TOMS to submit a request for use of an unlisted resource. A preidentified, preapproved unlisted resource request was automatically approved. A request for an unlisted resource that was not preidentified was sent to the CDE for review and adjudication.

Unlisted resources are non-embedded resources that are made available if specified in the eligible student’s IEP or Section 504 plan and only upon approval by the CDE. Unlisted resources that changed the construct of an assessment and were approved were flagged as causing a change in construct. The lowest obtainable scale score (LOSS) would be assigned to the Initial ELPAC with the unlisted resource that changes the construct, the student’s score status would remain valid, and the student’s scale score would be reported but appear on the SSR with an asterisk and a footnote that the test was administered under conditions that resulted in a score that may not be an accurate representation of the student’s achievement.

Preidentified unlisted resources applicable to the Initial ELPAC were as follows:

* Bilingual dictionary
* English dictionary
* Signed exact English
* Thesaurus
* Translated word lists
* Translations (not provided by Smarter Balanced)

The LEA ELPAC coordinator or site ELPAC coordinator was required to submit a request for the use of an unlisted resource to the CDE a minimum of 10 business days before the student’s first day of testing. The LOSS was reported for the affected domain when administrations included unlisted resources that changed the construct of that assessment.

#### Identification and Selection

All eligible students enrolled in a California public school participate in the ELPAC System, including students with disabilities and EL students. The CDE Accessibility Matrix (CDE, 2021) is intended for school-level personnel and IEP and Section 504 plan teams to select and administer the appropriate universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations as deemed necessary for individual students.[[3]](#footnote-4)

The full list of the universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations used in ELPAC computer-based assessments, including the Initial ELPAC, is documented in the Accessibility Matrix. Most embedded and non-embedded universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations listed in parts 1, 2, and 3 of the Accessibility Matrix are available for the Initial ELPAC through the computer-based testing interface or, in the case of non-embedded resources, from the school or LEA. Part 5 of the Accessibility Matrix includes approved unlisted resources. School-level personnel, IEP teams, and Section 504 teams used the Accessibility Matrix when deciding how best to support the student’s test-taking experience.

Test examiners are given the opportunity to administer the ELPAC practice and training tests so that students have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with a designated support or accommodation prior to testing.

#### Assignment

Designated supports and accommodations are assigned to individual students on the basis of identified student need. Such assignments are implemented in TOMS by the LEA ELPAC coordinator or site ELPAC coordinator, either through individual assignment through the student’s profile in TOMS or in a batch upload for multiple students. When the batch upload process was used, settings were uploaded into TOMS using a spreadsheet with data that had either been entered into a template downloaded from TOMS; or created by selecting and entering information into the web-based ISAAP Tool. The ISAAP Tool could be used by LEAs in conjunction with the *Guidelines* and the *2021–22* CAASPP and ELPAC Accessibility Guide (CDE, 2022a), as well as with state regulations and policies (such as the Accessibility Matrix) related to assessment accessibility*.*

The embedded designated supports and accommodations were delivered to the student through the TDS at the time of testing; the non-embedded designated supports and accommodations were provided at the time of testing to the student by the LEA. Refer to section [*1.9 Systems Overview and Functionality*](#_Systems_Overview_and) in [*Chapter 1: Introduction*](#_Introduction) for more details regarding the TDS.

Once a student’s IEP or Section 504 plan team decided which accessibility resource(s) the student should use, LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators used TOMS to assign designated supports and accommodations to students prior to the start of a test session.

There were three ways a student’s accessibility resource(s) could be assigned:

1. Using the ISAAP Tool to identify the accessibility resource(s) and then uploading the spreadsheet it creates into TOMS (This process is discussed in more detail in subsection [*5.6.3 Identification and Selection*](#_Identification_and_Selection).)
2. Using the Online Student Test Settings template to enter students’ assignments and then uploading the spreadsheet into TOMS
3. Entering assignments for each student individually in TOMS

If a student’s IEP or Section 504 plan team identified and designated a resource not identified in the CDE Accessibility Matrix, the LEA ELPAC coordinator or site ELPAC coordinator needed to submit a request for an unlisted resource to be approved by the CDE. The CDE then determined whether the requested unlisted resource changed the construct being measured before the student started testing.

[Appendix 5.A](#_Appendix_5.A:_Accessibility) provides information on the number of students who were assigned accommodations and designated supports.

Accommodations and designated supports assigned to students in K–2 can apply to all domains and all modes of delivery (computer-based and PPT when applicable) because accessibility resources were assigned at the assessment level.

#### Delivery

Universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations can be delivered as either embedded or non-embedded resources. Embedded resources are digitally delivered features or settings available as part of the technology platform for Initial ELPAC testing. Examples of embedded resources include the expandable items, color contrast, and masking.

Non-embedded resources are available, when provided by the LEA, for both computer-based and PPT assessments. These resources are not part of the technology platform for the computer-administered Initial ELPAC. Examples of non-embedded resources include magnification, noise buffers, and the use of a scribe.

Refer to subsection [*5.6.2 Accessibility Resource Categories*](#_Accessibility_Resource_Categories) for a detailed description of the accessibility resources available to students taking the Initial ELPAC.

#### Usage of Designated Supports and Accommodations

LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators were responsible for assigning their students’ test settings in TOMS before testing occurred and providing the necessary resources during testing. For the Initial ELPAC, test examiners had the ability to assign designated supports during the test administration if the test examiner determined the student would benefit from the designated support. This was available only for the Initial ELPAC, as the student being assessed was new to the LEA and designated support determination was not known prior to testing.

If a student needed an accessibility resource that was not applied before testing—either through a TOMS test setting or through an act of the test examiner in the Test Administrator Interface—then a STAIRS incident was to be submitted to reset the test so the student could be retested with the correct accommodation or designated support. If a test setting was accidentally assigned to a student, then a STAIRS incident could also be submitted to reset the test so the student could be retested without the accommodation or designated support.

Assignment and usage of test settings were directed by the LEA or site at which the student was tested. At the end of the administration, Cambium Assessment, Inc. (CAI) provided ETS with a file listing which accommodation and designated support resources were used. This was combined with a file from TOMS of assigned test settings. Only specific accommodations and designated supports were tracked. These include the embedded accommodations American Sign Language, audio transcript, and text-to-speech; and the embedded masking and non-embedded print-on-demand designated supports. Assigned designated supports, accommodations, and usage information is provided in table 5.A.1 through table 5.A.7 of [appendix 5.A](#_Appendix__).

### Test Security and Confidentiality

For the operational Initial ELPAC, every person who worked with the assessments, communicated test results, or received testing information was responsible for maintaining the security and confidentiality of the tests, including CDE staff, ETS staff, ETS subcontractors, LEA assessment coordinators, school assessment coordinators, students, parents/guardians, teachers, and cooperative educational service agency staff. ETS’ Code of Ethics required that all test information, including tangible materials (e.g., test items), confidential files (e.g., those containing personally identifiable student information), and processes related to test administration (e.g., the configurations of secure servers), were kept secure. ETS had systems in place that maintained tight security for test items and test results, as well as for student data. To ensure security for all tests that ETS develops or handles, ETS maintains an Office of Testing Integrity (OTI), which is described in the next subsection.

All tests within the ELPAC System, as well as the confidentiality of student information, should be protected to ensure the validity, reliability, and fairness of the results. As stated in *Standard 7.9* (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 2014), “The documentation should explain the steps necessary to protect test materials and to prevent inappropriate exchange of information during the test administration session” (p. 128).

This section of the *Initial ELPAC Technical Report* describes the measures intended to prevent potential test security incidents prior to testing and the actions that were taken to handle security incidents occurring during or after the testing window using the STAIRS process.

#### ETS’ Office of Testing Integrity

The OTI is a division of ETS that provides quality-assurance services for all testing programs managed by ETS. This division resides in the ETS legal department. The Office of Professional Standards Compliance at ETS publishes and maintains the *ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness* (2014), which supports the OTI’s goals and activities. The *ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness* provides guidelines to help ETS staff design, develop, and deliver technically sound, fair, and beneficial products and services and help the public and auditors evaluate those products and services.

The OTI’s mission is to

* minimize any testing security violations that can impact the fairness of testing,
* minimize and investigate any security breach that threatens the validity of the interpretation of test scores, and
* report on security activities.

The OTI helps prevent misconduct on the part of students and administrators, detects potential misconduct through empirically established indicators, and resolves situations involving misconduct in a fair and balanced way that reflects the laws and professional standards governing the integrity of testing. In its pursuit of enforcing secure testing practices, the OTI strives to safeguard the various processes involved in a test development and administration cycle. For the Initial ELPAC, those processes included the following:

* Test development
* Item and data review
* Item banking
* Transfer of forms and items to the CDE and CAI
* Security of electronic files using a firewall
* Test administration
* Test delivery
* Processing and scoring
* Data management
* Statistical analysis
* Student confidentiality

#### Procedures to Maintain Standardization of Test Security

Test security requires the accounting of all secure materials—including computer-based summative test items and student data—before, during, and after each test administration. The LEA ELPAC coordinator is responsible for keeping all electronic test materials secure, keeping student information confidential, and making sure the site ELPAC coordinators and test examiners are properly trained regarding security policies and procedures.

The site ELPAC coordinator is responsible for mitigating test security incidents at the test site and for reporting incidents to the LEA ELPAC coordinator.

The test examiner is responsible for reporting testing incidents to the site ELPAC coordinator and securely destroying printed and digital media for items and passages generated by the print-on-demand feature of the TDS (CDE, 2022e).

The following measures ensured the security of the ELPAC:

* LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators must have electronically signed and submitted a “ELPAC Test Security Agreement for LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators” form in TOMS before ETS can grant the coordinators access to TOMS (5 *CCR* Section 11518.50[d]).
* Anyone having access to the testing materials must have electronically signed and submitted a “Test Security Affidavit for Test Examiners, Test Administrators, Proctors, Translators, Scribes, and Any Other Person Having Access to ELPAC Tests” form in TOMS before receiving access to any testing materials (5 *CCR* Section 11518.50[d]).
* Anyone having access to the testing materials but not having access to TOMS must have signed the ELPAC *Test Security Affidavit for Non-TOMS Users*, which was available as a web-based form, before receiving access to any testing materials.

In addition, it was the responsibility of every participant in the ELPAC System to report immediately any violation or suspected violation of test security or confidentiality. The test examiner reported to the site ELPAC coordinator or LEA ELPAC coordinator, who then submitted the incident using the STAIRS/Appeals process. Breach incidents were to be reported by the LEA ELPAC coordinator to the California Technical Assistance Center (CalTAC) and entered into STAIRS within 24 hours of the incident (5 *CCR* Section 11518.40[b][13]).

#### Test Security Monitoring

The LEA and school testing staff were responsible for maintaining the security and confidentiality of testing materials and devices during the testing window and reporting any irregularities or breaches that occurred. ETS performed site visits and testing procedure audits at randomly selected LEAs and test sites throughout California during the test administration of the ELPAC and the CAASPP operational assessments. Audits were performed before, during, and after test administrations to observe adherence to published procedures regarding the handling of testing materials and test administration guidelines.

To provide this service, ETS used its OTI and subcontractor staff as auditors. All auditors had a minimum of a high school diploma, a valid driver’s license, and experience in security auditing or a related field. All had passed a background check conducted by the subcontracted vendor as part of the employment process.

ETS provided a final summary report of audit findings to the CDE at the end of the test administration. In addition, the OTI reported findings and recommendations to ETS program management on a weekly basis as audits were completed. ETS program management reported a summary of these findings to the CDE after a site visit. The OTI also provided individual audit reports directly to the LEA at the completion of the testing year.

#### Test Delivery

Although the Initial ELPAC transitioned to a computer-based assessment, the Writing domain for K–2 remained as a PPT. There were logistics involved to ensure the timely delivery of test materials to LEAs across the state. To manage the materials ordering process, ETS used TOMS, the secure website that permitted ELPAC users to perform a number of tasks for the ELPAC system. Through TOMS, users could perform the following activities:

* Confirm or update an LEA shipping address and indicate whether an LEA can receive pallet shipments
* Order test materials in the primary test materials order window and order additional test materials, including braille and large-print forms, as needed in the supplemental test materials order window
* Add site ELPAC coordinators, test examiners, the local scoring correspondence administrator, and local scoring data entry users
* Administer the Listening domain and the *Speaking—Summarize Academic Presentations* item for grades three through twelve, when needed for students taking a PPT emergency form

The ETS warehouse team prepared shipments based on orders submitted by each LEA. Materials were tracked using closed-loop tracking and United Parcel Service tracking methods to ensure timely delivery of Initial ELPAC test materials. Shipping notices were included in each delivery. These notices provided LEAs with an inventory of the number of Answer Books included in the shipment. Additionally, LEAs were provided with instructions on how to handle test materials after testing—and, for LEAs that participated in the RSVP, scannable Answer Books, return instructions, pre-identification labels, and shipping labels that allowed tracking of materials that were returned to ETS for scoring.

#### Security of Electronic Files Using a Firewall

A firewall is software that prevents unauthorized entry to files, email, and other organization-specific information. All ETS data exchanges and internal email remain within the ETS firewall at all ETS locations, ranging from Princeton, New Jersey; to San Antonio, Texas; to Sacramento, California.

All electronic applications that are included in TOMS remain protected by the ETS firewall software at all times. Because of the sensitive nature of the student information processed by TOMS, the firewall plays a significant role in maintaining assurance of confidentiality among the users of this information.

Refer to section [*1.9 Systems Overview and Functionality*](#_Systems_Overview_and) in [*Chapter 1: Introduction*](#_Introduction) for more information on TOMS.

#### Transfer of Scores via Secure Data Exchange

Because of the confidential nature of test results, ETS currently uses secure file transfer protocol (SFTP) and encryption for all data file transfers; test data is never sent via email. SFTP is a method for reliable and exclusive routing of files. Files reside on a password-protected server that only authorized users can access. ETS shares an SFTP server with the CDE. On that site, ETS posts Microsoft Word and Excel files, Adobe Acrobat PDFs, or other document files for the CDE to review; the CDE returns reviewed materials in the same manner. Files are deleted upon retrieval.

The SFTP server is used as a conduit for the transfer of files; secure test data is stored only temporarily on the shared SFTP server. Industry-standard secure protocols are used to transfer test content and student data from the ETS internal data center to any external systems.

For the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC, ETS entered information about the deliverable into a web form on a SharePoint website when a file was posted. A CDE staff member monitored this log throughout the day for updates to the status of deliverables and downloaded and deleted the file from the SFTP server when its status showed that it had been posted.

#### Data Management in the Secure Database

ETS currently maintains a secure database to house all student demographic data and assessment results. Information associated with each student has a database relationship to the LEA, school, and grade codes as the data is collected during testing. Only individuals with the appropriate credentials can access the data. ETS builds all interfaces with the most stringent security considerations, including interfaces with data encryption for databases that store test items and student data. ETS applies best and up-to-date security practices, including system-to-system authentication and authorization, in all solution designs.

All stored test content and student data is encrypted. Industry-standard secure protocols are used to transfer test content and student data from the ETS internal data center to any external systems. ETS complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (20 *United States Code [USC]* § 1232g; 34 *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 99) and the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act (15 *USC* §§ 6501-6506, P.L. No. 105–277, 112 Stat. 2681–1728).

In TOMS, staff at LEAs and test sites have different levels of access appropriate to the role assigned to them (CDE, 2022d).

#### Statistical Analysis on Secure Servers

During ELPAC testing, ETS information technology staff members retrieve data files from CAI and load those files into a database. The ETS Data Quality Services staff extract the data from the database and perform quality control procedures (e.g., the values of all variables are as expected) before passing files to the ETS statistical analysis group. The statistical analysis staff store the files on secure servers. All staff members involved with the data adhere to the ETS Code of Ethics and the ETS Information Protection Policies to prevent any unauthorized access to data.

#### Student Confidentiality

To meet the requirements of the ESSA, as well as state requirements, LEAs must collect demographic data about students’ ethnicity, disabilities, parent/guardian education, and so forth during the school year. ETS takes every precaution to prevent any of this information from becoming public or being used for anything other than for testing and score-reporting purposes. These procedures are applied to all documents in which student demographic data appears, such as technical reports.

#### Student Test Results

##### Types of Results

The following deliverables are produced for reporting of the Initial ELPAC:

* Individual SSRs (electronic)
* Internet reports—available on the CDE Test Results for California’s Assessments website—aggregated by content area and state, county, LEA, or test site

##### Security of Results Files

ETS takes measures to protect files and reports that show students’ scores and reporting levels. ETS is committed to safeguarding all secure information in its possession from unauthorized access, disclosure, modification, or destruction. ETS has strict information security policies in place to protect the confidentiality of both student and client data. ETS staff access to production databases is limited to personnel with a business need to access the data. User IDs for production systems must be person-specific or for systems use only.

ETS has implemented network controls for routers, gateways, switches, firewalls, network tier management, and network connectivity. Routers, gateways, and switches represent points of access between networks. However, these do not contain mass storage or represent points of vulnerability, particularly for unauthorized access or denial of service.

ETS has many facilities, policies, and procedures to protect computer files. Software and procedures such as firewalls, intrusion detection, and virus control are in place to provide for physical security, data security, and disaster recovery. ETS is certified in the BS 25999-2 standard for business continuity and conducts disaster recovery exercises annually. ETS routinely backs up all data to either disks through deduplication or to tapes, all of which are stored off site.

Access to the ETS Computer Processing Center is controlled by employee and visitor identification badges. The Center is secured by doors that can be unlocked only by the badges of personnel who have functional responsibilities within its secure perimeter. Authorized personnel accompany visitors to the ETS Computer Processing Center at all times. Extensive smoke detection and alarm systems, as well as a preaction fire-control system, are installed in the Center.

##### Security of Individual Results

ETS protects individual students’ results during the following events:

* Scoring
* Transfer of scores by means of secure data exchange
* Reporting
* Posting of aggregated data
* Storage

In addition to protecting the confidentiality of testing materials, ETS’ Code of Ethics further prohibits ETS employees from financial misuse, conflicts of interest, and unauthorized appropriation of ETS property and resources. Specific rules are also given to ETS employees and their immediate families who may take a test developed by ETS. The ETS OTI verifies that these standards are followed throughout ETS. This verification is conducted, in part, by periodic on-site security audits of departments, with follow-up reports containing recommendations for improvement.

#### Security and Test Administration Incident Reporting System Process

Test security incidents, such as improprieties, irregularities, and breaches, are prohibited behaviors that give a student an unfair advantage or compromise the secure administration of the tests, which, in turn, compromise the reliability and validity of test results (CDE, 2022b). Whether intentional or unintentional, failure by staff or students to comply with security rules constitutes a test security incident. Test security incidents have impacts on scoring and affect students’ performance on the test.

LEA ELPAC coordinators and site ELPAC coordinators ensured that all test security and summative administration incidents were documented by following the prompts in TOMS that guided coordinators in their submittal. An Appeal is a request to reset, restore, reopen, invalidate, or grant a grace period extension to a student’s test. If an Appeal to a student’s test was warranted, TOMS provided additional prompts to file the Appeal.

After a case was submitted, an email containing a case number and next steps was sent to the submitter (and to the LEA ELPAC coordinator, if the case was submitted by the site ELPAC coordinator). The STAIRScase in TOMS provided the LEA ELPAC coordinator, the CDE, and the LEA Outreach Administrator with the opportunity to interact and communicate regarding the STAIRS process (CDE, 2022b).

Prior to the assessment administration, ETS and the CDE agreed that the following types of STAIRS cases would also be forwarded to the CDE:

* Student cheating or accessing unauthorized devices
* Security breach (where a student exposed secure materials)
* Student unable to review previous answers (i.e., 20-minute pause rule)

Appeals requests were reviewed by the CDE or an ETS LEA Outreach Administrator. When a request to submit an Appeal was approved, the coordinator received a system-generated email with the Appeal type that was approved (CDE, 2022b).

Types of Appeals available during the 2021–22 ELPAC administration are described in table 5.7.

Table 5.7 Types of Appeals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Appeal** | **Description** |
| Reset | Resetting a student’s assessment removed that assessment from the system and enabled the student to start a new assessment from the beginning. |
| Re-open | Reopening an assessment allowed a student to access an assessment that had already been submitted or had expired. |
| Restore | Restoring an assessment returned an assessment from the Reset status to its prior status. This action could be performed only on tests that were reset previously. |
| Grace Period Extension | Permitting a grace period extension allowed the student to review previously answered questions upon logging back on to the assessment after expiration of the pause rule.  A grace period extension was granted only in cases where there was a disruption to a test session, such as a technical difficulty, fire drill, schoolwide power outage, earthquake, or other act beyond the control of the test examiner. |

##### Impropriety

A testing impropriety is an unusual circumstance that has a low impact on the individual or group of students who are testing and has a low risk of potentially affecting student performance on the test, test security, or test validity. An impropriety can be corrected and contained at a local level. An impropriety should be reported to the LEA ELPAC coordinator and site ELPAC coordinator immediately. The coordinator must report the incident within 24 hours, using the STAIRS/Appeals process in TOMS.

##### Irregularity

A testing irregularity is an unusual circumstance that impacts an individual or a group of students who are testing and may potentially affect student performance on the test or impact test security or test validity. These circumstances can be corrected and contained at the local level and submitted using the STAIRS/Appeals process in TOMS. An irregularity must be reported to the LEA ELPAC coordinator and site ELPAC coordinator immediately. The coordinator must report the irregularity within 24 hours, using the online STAIRS/Appeals process in TOMS.

##### Breach

A testing breach is an event that poses a threat to the validity of the test. Breaches require immediate attention; a breach that was due to social media exposure on the part of a student or adult or due to media coverage of an administration was to be escalated to CalTAC via telephone. Following the call, the site ELPAC coordinator or LEA ELPAC coordinator must report the incident using the online STAIRS/Appeals process in TOMS within 24 hours. All other breaches were to be entered into STAIRS directly.

Examples may include such situations as a release of secure materials or a security or system risk. These circumstances have external implications for the CDE and may result in a decision to remove the test item(s) from the available secure item bank.

#### Appeals

For test security incidents reported in STAIRS that resulted in a need to reset, reopen, or restore individual student assessments or that required a grace period extension to be applied, the request had to be approved by the CDE. Requests to reset and reopen assessments were processed by an LEA Outreach Administrator.

In most instances, an Appeal was submitted to address a test security breach or irregularity. The LEA ELPAC coordinator or site ELPAC coordinator submitted Appeals in TOMS. All submitted Appeals were available for retrieval and reviewed by LEA and site coordinators within a given organization. An Appeal could be requested only by the LEA ELPAC coordinator or site ELPAC coordinator if prompted while filing a STAIRS case in TOMS (CDE, 2022b). Types of Appeals available during the 2021–22 ELPAC administration are described in table 5.7.

Table 5.8 provides the list of incident or issue types, the Appeal type associated with it, the number of incidents reported for that issue, and number of individual Statewide Student Identifiers (SSIDs) affected. The number in the *Appeals SSIDs Approved* column is the number of accepted cases that resulted in an Appeal, which may differ from the number in the *Number of Incidents* column because of incorrect entry or other factors. The incidents involving Exposing Secure Materials or security breaches ranged from students and parents/guardians taking pictures of the testing device or test materials; to test examiners accidentally sharing the *DFAs* with parents/guardians; to test materials becoming lost at the school site because they were not kept in a secure, locked room. These counts exclude incidents that were in draft form, pending, or partially approved.

Table 5.8 Number and Types of Incidents Submitted in STAIRS

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Appeal Type** | **Number of Incidents** | **Total Number of SSIDs Submitted** | **Appeals SSID(s) Approved** |
| Accessibility Issue | Reset or No Appeal | 14 | 18 | 16 |
| Administered Incorrect Assessment | Reset or No Appeal | 2,190 | 3,036 | 2,749 |
| Administration Error | Reset or No Appeal | 157 | 323 | 273 |
| Data Entry Issue | Reset or Re-open or No Appeal | 738 | 801 | 744 |
| Expired or Accidentally Submitted Test or Domain | Re-open | 713 | 912 | 829 |
| Exposing Secure Materials | No Appeal | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Hand Scoring Issue | Rescore | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Incorrect Domain Exemption or Alternate Assessment | Reset or No Appeal | 80 | 131 | 111 |
| Incorrect SSID Used | Reset or No Appeal | 737 | 899 | 338 |
| Irregularity Flag submitted in error | No Appeal | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Issues | No Appeal | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Restore from Reset | Restore | 197 | 357 | 280 |
| Student Cheating or Accessing Unauthorized Devices | No Appeal | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Student Disruption | No Appeal | 15 | 15 | 7 |

Table 5.8 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Appeal Type** | **Number of Incidents** | **Total Number of SSIDs Submitted** | **Appeals SSID(s) Approved** |
| Technical Issues | Grace Period Extension or Reset or No Appeal | 178 | 103 | 90 |
| Validity Issue | No Appeal | 3 | 3 | 2 |

Table 5.9 provides the counts of approved Appeals.

Table 5.9 Total Appeal Types Approved

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Appeal Type Approved** | **N Appeals** |
| Reset | 3,583 |
| Re-open | 1,008 |
| Grace Period Extension | 4 |
| Restore | 280 |
| Rescore | 0 |

### Technology Readiness

Students who may have limited access to technology were of particular concern as the ELPAC transitioned from PPTs to computer-based assessments, starting with the fall 2019 field test. It was important that all students be able to participate in the computer-based Initial ELPAC.

The CDE and ETS teams involved in supporting this transition recognized that appropriate resources were critical to helping ensure that lack of prior technology access did not serve as a barrier to students’ ability to demonstrate their language proficiency on these tests. In anticipation of students coming from countries of origin where access to computers and other devices might be limited, as well as students who are technology novices in general, ETS and the CDE developed the Technology Readiness Checker for Students (CDE, 2020). This online resource was designed to help educators determine a student’s familiarity with navigating a computer-based interface. The purpose of the tool is to help educators better understand what kind of supports a student may need to increase technology familiarity.

### References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

*California Code of Regulations,* Title 5, Education, Division 1, Chapter 11, Article 2.

California Department of Education. (2020). *Technology Readiness Checker for Students.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2021). *California assessment accessibility resources matrix*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022a). *CAASPP and ELPAC accessibility guide*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022b). *CAASPP and ELPAC security incidents and Appeals procedure guide.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022c). *CAASPP and ELPAC technical specifications and configuration guide for online testing*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022d). *CAASPP and ELPAC Test Operations Management System user guide*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022e). *Initial ELPAC* *online test administration manual.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Educational Testing Service. (2014). *ETS standards for quality and fairness*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

### Appendix 5.A: Accessibility Resource Assignment

**Notes:**

* Table 5.A.1 through table 5.A.7 include cases where both assignment and usage data are available.
* Cases where assignment data was available, but usage data was not available, are excluded.
* In the *Domain* column, “All” represents the unique students who have an accommodation or designated support across any of their testing opportunities.
* In the *Resource Type* column, “ACC” indicates an accommodation, and “DS” indicates a designated support.

Table 5.A.1 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—All

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 65 | 5 | 7.69 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 59 | 4 | 6.78 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 7 | 1 | 14.29 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 37 | 1 | 2.70 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 27 | 2 | 7.41 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 62 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 8 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 39 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 26 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 29 | 3 | 10.34 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 27 | 2 | 7.41 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 2 | 1 | 50.00 |

Table 5.A.1 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 9 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 6 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |

Table 5.A.2 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 48 | 3 | 6.25 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 47 | 3 | 6.38 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 5 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 30 | 1 | 3.33 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 22 | 2 | 9.09 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 47 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 5 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 30 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 21 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 22 | 2 | 9.09 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 22 | 2 | 9.09 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |

Table 5.A.3 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 4 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 4 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 3 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |

Table 5.A.4 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |

Table 5.A.5 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 9 | 1 | 11.11 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 8 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 6 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 8 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 6 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 4 | 1 | 25.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 2 | 1 | 50.00 |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 8 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 6 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |

Table 5.A.6 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |

Table 5.A.7 Initial ELPAC Accessibility Resource and Usage—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Accessibility Resource** | **Resource Type** | **Students Assigned** | **Students Used** | **Percentage Used** |
| All | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 3 | 1 | 33.33 |
| Listening | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 1 | 1 | 100.00 |
| Listening | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 1 | 1 | 100.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Listening | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 2 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded American Sign Language | ACC | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Speaking | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Embedded Masking | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Reading | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Any Tracked Resource | Any | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Audio Transcript | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Text-to-Speech (English TTS) | ACC | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Embedded Masking | DS | 1 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Writing | Non-embedded Print-on-Demand | DS | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |

## Standard Setting

### Description

Standard setting, which also is referred to as performance level setting, refers to a class of methodologies by which one or more thresholds are used to determine achievement levels. The California Department of Education (CDE) set three performance levels (Level 1—Novice, Level 2—Intermediate, and Level 3—Initial Fluent English Proficient) with two threshold cuts for each grade level and content area.

The CDE and ETS implemented an extensive performance level–setting process involving software development, item mapping, review panels, committees, workshops, and extensive validity research to set the final thresholds and achievement level descriptors. For detailed information regarding this process, refer to the *Standard-Setting Technical Report for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California* (CDE, 2018).

### Reference

California Department of Education. (2018). *Standard-setting technical report for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

## Scoring and Reporting

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the work performed to develop score reporting procedures for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC). The chapter summarizes scoring at the item level, including the types of scoring approaches that are used for each type of item in the Initial ELPAC and the approach implemented to produce student scores. This chapter also describes scores reported at the individual student level and various reports that are generated.

With the transition to computer-based administration, Initial ELPAC local scoring was performed only for the Speaking and Writing domains—the Listening and Reading domains were machine-scored in the test delivery system (TDS). All domain scores were merged to produce the Initial ELPAC Student Score Report (SSR). Student Writing scores from the Rotating Score Validation Process (RSVP) were used only for local educational agency (LEA) and ETS score comparison purposes. A subset of Speaking responses received a second rating from ETS raters; these were used in combination with the scores provided by local test examiners to evaluate the interrater reliability.

### Rotating Score Validation Process

Approximately 10 percent of LEAs in California were identified by the California Department of Education (CDE) to take part in the RSVP for the Initial ELPAC in 2021–22. These identified LEAs returned their scannable K–2 Writing Answer Books to the testing contractor, ETS, after administering all domains, locally scoring the Speaking and Writing domains, and generating the Initial ELPAC SSR. For grades three through twelve, ETS received the Writing item responses by the students from the TDS for back-scoring; this was the only domain that was back-scored. This process helped to produce task-level statistics at the domain level for the Initial ELPAC, validate scores, and provide technical assistance for guidance in understanding the score reports.

LEAs identified to participate in the RSVP returned Answer Books for tests completed from July 6 to October 29, 2021. The LEAs were provided comparison report files in November, December, and January that showed scores from two sources: (1) Writing scores entered in the Data Entry Interface or Teacher Hand Scoring System by the LEA and (2) scores from the scoring at ETS.

Table 7.1 reports correlation coefficients between ETS and official Writing scores for the RSVP samples. All the coefficients were at least 0.940, indicating a very high level of correlation between scores that local test examiners and ETS assigned to the students in 2021–22 for the Initial ELPAC. Note that high correlations do not guarantee that the local raters and the ETS raters gave the same scores. If one type of rater consistently rated the responses higher or lower, it could yield high correlations as well. For more results that measure the agreement between the local and ETS raters, refer to subsection [*8.4.8 Interrater Agreement (Constructed-Response Scoring Reliability)*](#_Toc118703517). For more details about quality control of scoring, refer to subsection [*9.5.1. Local Scoring Procedures for Speaking and Writing*](#_Local_Scoring_Procedures).

Table 7.1 Correlation Between ETS and Official Scores for RSVP Samples

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Writing: Total Score Points** | **Writing: Correlation Between ETS and Official Scores** | **Number of Students** | **Mean Official Raw Scores** | **Standard Deviation of Official Raw Scores** | **Mean ETS Raw Scores** | **Standard Deviation of ETS Raw Scores** |
| Kindergarten | 12 | 0.974 | 16,184 | 1.98 | 3.42 | 2.08 | 3.38 |
| 1 | 13 | 0.978 | 1,119 | 3.90 | 4.48 | 3.92 | 4.36 |
| 2 | 13 | 0.964 | 426 | 4.04 | 4.75 | 4.16 | 4.56 |
| 3–5 | 12 | 0.951 | 1,186 | 3.41 | 4.27 | 3.64 | 4.31 |
| 6–8 | 8 | 0.940 | 1,062 | 2.99 | 2.87 | 3.10 | 2.83 |
| 9–12 | 8 | 0.951 | 2,080 | 3.02 | 3.04 | 3.11 | 2.97 |

### Human Scoring for Speaking Constructed-Response Items

Responses to Speaking constructed-response (CR) items were scored locally by test examiners. Speaking CR items and a random selection of about 1,200 recorded voice responses from the TDS were routed to ETS’ CR scoring systems to be scored a second time. The raters scoring these items were supervised by a scoring leader and provided scoring materials such as scoring rubrics, anchor sets, and training samples within the interface. The quality control processes for CR scoring are explained further in section [*9.5 Quality Control of Scoring*](#_Quality_Control_of_1).

Raters were not aware when a second scoring occurred, and second raters did not have access to the first score. The results of interrater agreement are reported in subsection [*8.4.8.4 Interrater Reliability Results*](#_Interrater_Reliability_Results_1).

### Machine Scoring for Selected-Response Items

After the certification of student records for scoring, ETS transferred the records to the scoring management system. These records contained all relevant response data and identifying information for matching against the correct scoring keys. The ETS scoring engine then processed the records and produced the multiple-choice raw scores before permanently storing the results in the students’ records.

### Student Test Scores

Scale scores for the Initial ELPAC were produced at the individual student level. To obtain scale scores, raw scores were converted to scale scores through conversion tables. Refer to subsection [*7.4.2 Scale Scores*](#_Scale_Scores) for additional details.

#### Raw Scores

Raw scores for each domain were obtained by summing the number of points earned on all items on that domain.

The domain raw scores from Listening and Speaking were summed to compute the oral language skill composite raw score. The domain raw scores from Reading and Writing were summed to compute the written language skill composite raw score. The number and percentage of students at each raw score are reported for each domain in table 7.B.1 through table 7.B.52 in [appendix 7.B](#_Appendix_7.B:_Raw).

#### Scale Scores

Student performance on the Initial ELPAC is reported by means of scale scores that express student proficiency in terms of a constant metric. Thus, a scale score of 350 in one language skill area in one administration represents the same level of English proficiency as 350 in the same language skill area in another administration.

Initial ELPAC scale scores are expressed as three-digit numbers that range from 150 to 600 within each grade level or grade span. Lower scores indicate lower levels of English proficiency, and higher scores indicate higher levels of English proficiency.

The oral language composite scale score consists of the sum of the student’s scores from the Speaking and Listening domains. The written language composite scale score consists of the student’s scores from the Reading and Writing domains. The weighting of the oral and written language scores is based upon the student’s grade level.

To produce scale scores for each composite language skill, the inverse of the test characteristic curve (TCC) method (Stocking, 1996) was used to develop a number-correct, raw-score-to-scale-score conversion table. The item response theory calibration process described in chapter 12 of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2020) provides information in the logistic theta metric (mean 0, standard deviation 1). The theta scale is not particularly useful for reporting purposes because half of the theta scores are negative in any given administration, and the average student earns a theta score of zero; neither of these outcomes would be well understood by score users. Students’ raw scores on the Initial ELPAC are instead converted into scale scores by following a two-step procedure: (1) nonlinear monotonic transformations of the raw score points into theta metric points; and (2) linear transformations of the theta (proficiency estimate) points into reported scale score points. The linear transformations lead to scores that are uniformly positive.

First, using the inverse of the TCC constructed from the item parameter estimates obtained by calibration of data from the Initial ELPAC field test, each raw score is mapped to a corresponding theta score (proficiency estimate). The results can be described in a transformation table that converts raw scores to theta scores. Because the tests are not vertically scaled, each written language and oral language composite, by grade level or grade span, has its own theta scale.

Second, the theta score is converted to the reported scale score metric via a linear transformation. Thus, through this two-step process, each raw score point is converted to a corresponding theta score that is subsequently converted to a scale score. The general form of the function used to translate the theta points to scale score points is presented in equation 7.1. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 7.1*](#_Alternative_Text_for) *for a description of this equation.*

 (7.1)

where,

 is the theta score corresponding to the raw score point to be transformed, and

*SS* is the resulting scale score point.

An initial scale was defined for use only in the standard setting using a slope of 90 and an intercept of 450. The threshold scores obtained as a result of the standard setting process are presented on the standard setting scale in table 7.2 for oral language skills and table 7.3 for written language skills. The three Initial ELPAC proficiency levels for the oral and written language composites classify the composite skill as the following:

1. Minimally developed
2. Somewhat to moderately developed
3. Well developed

Table 7.2 Recommended Threshold Scores for Oral Language Skill and Associated Theta Score

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Level 2 Standard-Setting Scale Threshold** | **Level 2 Theta Threshold** | **Level 3 Standard-Setting Scale Threshold** | **Level 3 Theta Threshold** |
| Kindergarten | 441 | -0.10 | 532 | 0.91 |
| 1 | 404 | -0.51 | 506 | 0.62 |
| 2 | 346 | -1.16 | 504 | 0.61 |
| 3–5 | 417 | -0.36 | 501 | 0.57 |
| 6–8 | 425 | -0.28 | 492 | 0.47 |
| 9–12 | 461 | 0.12 | 532 | 0.91 |

Table 7.3 Recommended Threshold Scores for Written Language Skill and Associated Theta Score

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Level 2 Standard-Setting Scale Threshold** | **Level 2 Theta Threshold** | **Level 3 Standard-Setting Scale Threshold** | **Level 3 Theta Threshold** |
| Kindergarten | 582 | 1.46 | 738 | 3.20 |
| 1 | 410 | -0.44 | 574 | 1.37 |
| 2 | 387 | -0.71 | 580 | 1.44 |
| 3–5 | 484 | 0.38 | 582 | 1.46 |
| 6–8 | 461 | 0.12 | 611 | 1.79 |
| 9–12 | 464 | 0.15 | 579 | 1.43 |

After the standard setting, slopes and intercepts were adjusted for each test to produce thresholds that would be used for reporting. For reporting, the scalar and location constants were obtained by computing the slope and intercept using equation 7.2. *(Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 7.2*](#_Alternative_Text_for_7) *for a description of this equation.)*

 (7.2)

and equation 7.3 *(Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 7.3*](#_Alternative_Text_for_8) *for a description of this equation.)*

 (7.3)

where,

*SS*1 is the proposed scale score for the Level 2 threshold,

*SS*2 is the proposed scale score for the Level 3 threshold,

 is the interpolated theta score for the Level 2 threshold, and

 is the interpolated theta score for the Level 3 threshold.

The following points were considered to meet the CDE’s requirements during development of the proposed reporting scale score:

* Each scale score has three digits, with the lowest obtainable scale score (LOSS) at 150 and the highest obtainable scale score (HOSS) at 600.
* If possible, two consecutive raw scores are not transformed into the same scale score, with the exception of the LOSS and HOSS.
* The Level 3 threshold scores are set to be the same across the grade levels and grade spans; similarly, Level 2 threshold scores are the same across grade levels and grade spans.

Table 7.4 represents the slope and intercept of the linear transformation for the oral language skills composite reporting scales. Table 7.5 represents the slope and intercept of the linear transformation for written language skills composite reporting scales. These two tables remain the same as table 7.7 and table 7.8 ofthe *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2020) because the test forms for the two years were the same.

Table 7.4 Slope, Intercept, and Reporting Threshold Scores for Oral Language Scale Linear Transformation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Oral Language Slope** | **Oral Language Intercept** | **Scale Score for Level 2** | **Scale Score for Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 79.13 | 377.91 | 370 | 450 |
| 1 | 70.61 | 406.08 | 370 | 450 |
| 2 | 45.40 | 422.49 | 370 | 450 |
| 3–5 | 86.21 | 401.12 | 370 | 450 |
| 6–8 | 107.38 | 399.85 | 370 | 450 |
| 9–12 | 101.39 | 357.63 | 370 | 450 |

Table 7.5 Slope, Intercept, and Reporting Threshold Scores for Written Language Scale Linear Transformation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Written Language Slope** | **Written Language Intercept** | **Scale Score for Level 2** | **Scale Score for Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 46.00 | 302.80 | 370 | 450 |
| 1 | 44.05 | 389.56 | 370 | 450 |
| 2 | 37.21 | 396.27 | 370 | 450 |
| 3–5 | 73.87 | 342.08 | 370 | 450 |
| 6–8 | 47.85 | 364.40 | 370 | 450 |
| 9–12 | 62.35 | 360.65 | 370 | 450 |

The overall reporting scale was calculated based on a weighted average of the two composite language skills, written and oral language. For kindergarten, the overall scores were calculated as the weighted average scores of the two composite scores:

* 0.90 × oral language skill score + 0.10 × written language skill score

For grade one, the overall scores were calculated as the weighted average scores of the two composite scores:

* 0.70 × oral language skill score + 0.30 × written language skill score

And for grades two through twelve, the overall scores were calculated as the average scores of the two composite scores:

* 0.50 × oral language skills score + 0.50 × written language skills score

The scale score ranges for each grade level and grade span are presented in table 7.6. This table shows the weight for each composite skill in forming the overall score for each grade level and grade span. The frequency distributions of raw-score-to-scale-score for the oral and written language composites are presented in [appendix 7.C](#_Appendix_7.C:_Raw), in table 7.C.1 through table 7.C.26. Additionally, [appendix 7.D](#_Appendix_7.D:_Overall) provides the overall scale score distribution for each grade level.

Table 7.6 Overall Reporting Scale Score Ranges for Each Performance Level by Grade Level or Grade Span

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Weight for Oral Language** | **Weight for Written Language** | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 90% | 10% | 150–369 | 370–449 | 450–600 |
| 1 | 70% | 30% | 150–369 | 370–449 | 450–600 |
| 2 | 50% | 50% | 150–369 | 370–449 | 450–600 |
| 3–5 | 50% | 50% | 150–369 | 370–449 | 450–600 |
| 6–8 | 50% | 50% | 150–369 | 370–449 | 450–600 |
| 9–12 | 50% | 50% | 150–369 | 370–449 | 450–600 |

#### Performance Levels

To aid in the interpretation of the score scale, Initial ELPAC results also provide three proficiency levels for overall scale scores, as Level 1—Novice, Level 2—Intermediate, and Level 3—Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP). The scale score ranges defining the levels are presented for each of the grade levels or grade spans in table 7.6. More detailed descriptions of the performance levels are provided in chapter 6 of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2020).

### Overview of Score Aggregation Procedures

To provide meaningful results to the interested educators and others, test scores for a given grade level are aggregated at the school, LEA or direct funded charter school, county, and state levels. The aggregated scores are generated for selected groups of interest (gender, ethnicity, primary disability, etc.) and for the total population. This section contains a description of the types of aggregation that are performed on the Initial ELPAC test summary scores.

#### Score Distributions and Summary Statistics

Summary statistics that describe student performance on a test are presented in table 7.7. Included in the table are the number of students taking each test and the means and standard deviations of student scores expressed in terms of scale scores for both composite skills. [Appendix 7.C](#_Appendix_7.C:_Raw) provides the scale score distributions for the oral language skill and the written language skill. [Appendix 7.D](#_Appendix_7.D:_Overall) provides the overall scale score distribution for each grade level or grade span.

Table 7.7 Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) of Overall, Oral Language, and Written Language Skill Scale Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **Number of Students Tested** | **Overall Scale Score Mean** | **Overall Scale Score SD** | **Oral Language Scale Score Mean** | **Oral Language Scale Score SD** | **Written Language Scale Score Mean** | **Written Language Scale Score SD** |
| Kindergarten | 133,652 | 311 | 125 | 317 | 131 | 260 | 100 |
| 1 | 12,612 | 305 | 130 | 309 | 138 | 295 | 125 |
| 2 | 6,488 | 307 | 129 | 307 | 143 | 306 | 129 |
| 3 | 5,709 | 250 | 127 | 275 | 149 | 225 | 115 |
| 4 | 5,333 | 268 | 142 | 290 | 160 | 247 | 132 |
| 5 | 4,928 | 279 | 148 | 300 | 163 | 258 | 140 |
| 6 | 4,719 | 298 | 136 | 309 | 170 | 286 | 112 |
| 7 | 4,995 | 295 | 136 | 302 | 167 | 288 | 114 |
| 8 | 4,771 | 302 | 137 | 307 | 168 | 296 | 115 |
| 9 | 10,448 | 268 | 126 | 265 | 150 | 271 | 111 |
| 10 | 6,258 | 292 | 133 | 293 | 157 | 290 | 116 |
| 11 | 5,261 | 303 | 140 | 305 | 165 | 301 | 123 |
| 12 | 3,411 | 321 | 148 | 328 | 173 | 314 | 129 |

#### Performance Levels

The percentage of students at each proficiency level for overall, oral, and written language skills are presented in table 7.8 through table 7.10, respectively. Figure 7.1 through figure 7.3 present bar graphs for the percentage of students in each performance level for overall, oral, and written language composites, using the data in table 7.8 through table 7.10, respectively. Values in the tables have been rounded and may not always sum to 100.

Figure 7.1 presents a graphical representation of the percentage of students at each overall performance level by grade level. These are the overall performance levels shown in table 7.8, which immediately follows. Across the grade levels, about two-thirds of the students were in performance level 1, which is the minimally developed level. From 12 to 28 percent of the students reached the highest level of English proficiency, well developed.

Figure 7.1 Percentage of students at each overall performance level

Table 7.8 Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level—Overall

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **Overall Performance Level 1** | **Overall Performance Level 2** | **Overall Performance Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 66 | 19 | 14 |
| 1 | 68 | 17 | 16 |
| 2 | 69 | 14 | 18 |
| 3 | 79 | 9 | 12 |
| 4 | 73 | 9 | 18 |
| 5 | 72 | 9 | 20 |
| 6 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| 7 | 69 | 12 | 20 |
| 8 | 68 | 12 | 21 |
| 9 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| 10 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| 11 | 68 | 10 | 22 |
| 12 | 62 | 11 | 28 |

Figure 7.2 presents a graphical representation of the percentage of students at each oral language performance level by grade level. These are the oral language performance levels shown in table 7.9, which immediately follows. Across the grade levels, from 60 to 77 percent of the students were in performance level 1, which is the minimally developed level. From 15 to 32 percent of the students reached the highest level of English proficiency, well developed.

Figure 7.2 Percentage of students at each oral language performance level

Table 7.9 Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level—Oral Language

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **Oral Language Performance Level 1** | **Oral Language Performance Level 2** | **Oral Language Performance Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 65 | 20 | 15 |
| 1 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| 2 | 65 | 15 | 20 |
| 3 | 71 | 11 | 18 |
| 4 | 68 | 8 | 24 |
| 5 | 67 | 8 | 25 |
| 6 | 63 | 9 | 29 |
| 7 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| 8 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| 9 | 77 | 5 | 18 |
| 10 | 70 | 8 | 22 |
| 11 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| 12 | 60 | 8 | 32 |

Figure 7.3 presents a graphical representation of the percentage of students at each written language performance level by grade level. These are the written language performance levels shown in table 7.10, which immediately follows. Across the grade levels, from 64 to 87 percent of the students were in performance level 1, which is the minimally developed level. From 15 to 20 percent of the students reached the highest level of English proficiency, well developed. It was expected that the written language skills would have more kindergarten students in performance level 1 than in the higher grade levels.

Figure 7.3 Percentage of students at each written language performance level

Table 7.10 Percentage of Students in Each Performance Level—Written Language

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **Written Language Performance Level 1** | **Written Language Performance Level 2** | **Written Language Performance Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| 1 | 76 | 13 | 11 |
| 2 | 72 | 14 | 14 |
| 3 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| 4 | 78 | 10 | 11 |
| 5 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| 6 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| 7 | 76 | 14 | 10 |
| 8 | 74 | 15 | 12 |
| 9 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| 10 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| 11 | 70 | 14 | 15 |
| 12 | 64 | 16 | 20 |

#### Demographic Student Group Summaries

Table 7.A.1 through table 7.A.4, in [appendix 7.A](#_Appendix_7.A:_Initial), provide the number of participants and the percent of participation of all students and select demographic groups for each test during the 2021–22 administration. Note that the data in the *Number Registered* column includes students who were enrolled within a grade level and eligible for the Initial ELPAC during the 2021–22 administration. The *Number Tested* columns include students who tested at the current grade level and exclude off-grade testers and students registered who did not test.

The demographic composition of 2021–22 Initial ELPAC students was similar to the 2019–‍20 tested population (refer to appendix 3.A of the *Paper–Pencil Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2019–2020 Technical Report* [CDE, 2021]). Across almost all the grade levels, grade spans, and demographic student groups, more than 95 percent of the registered students took the Initial ELPAC in 2021–22.

Table 7.11 presents the demographic student groups to be reported for the 2021–22 administration.

Table 7.11 Demographic Student Groups Reported

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Student Groups** |
| **Accommodations** | * Assigned accommodations * Not assigned accommodations |
| **Economic Status** | * Economically disadvantaged * Not economically disadvantaged |
| **Ethnicity** | * American Indian or Alaska Native * Asian * Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander * Filipino * Hispanic or Latino * Black or African American * White * Two or more races |
| **Foster Status** | * Foster youth * Not foster youth |
| **Gender** | * Male * Female * Nonbinary |
| **Homeless Status** | * Homeless * Not homeless |
| **Migrant Status** | * Migrant education * Not migrant education |

Table 7.11 *(continuation)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Student Groups** |
| **Military Status** | * Military * Not military |
| **Disability Status** | * Disability * Tested with alternate assessment * No disability |
| **Calculated ELAS** | * English learner (EL) * IFEP |

The number of students who tested overall and for composites by demographic student group, along with the summary of scale scores, and percentages of students at each performance level are presented in [appendix 7.E](#_Appendix_7.E:_Means), in table 7.E.1 through table 7.E.39.

### Reports Produced and Scores for Each Report

The tests that make up the ELPAC computer-based assessments provide results or score summaries that are reported for different purposes. The four major purposes are to

1. help facilitate conversations between parents/guardians and teachers about student performance,
2. serve as a tool to help parents/guardians and teachers work together to improve student learning,
3. help schools and LEAs identify strengths and areas that need improvement in their educational programs, and
4. provide the public and policymakers with information about student performance.

This section provides detailed descriptions of the uses and applications of ELPAC reporting for students.

#### Online Reporting

The Test Operations Management System (TOMS) is a secure website hosted by ETS that permits LEA users to manage the ELPAC computer-based assessments and to inform the TDS. This system uses a role-specific design to restrict access to certain tools and applications based on the user’s designated role. Specific functions of TOMS include the following:

* Manage user access privileges
* Manage test administration calendars and testing windows
* Manage student test assignments
* Manage and confirm the accuracy of students’ test settings (i.e., designated supports and accommodations) prior to testing
* Generate and download various reports

#### Special Cases

Sometimes a student’s individualized education program (IEP) or Section 504 plan specified that the student had a disability for which there were no appropriate accommodations for assessment in one or more of the Speaking, Listening, Reading, and Writing domains. For these cases, the student was assessed in the remaining domains in which it was possible to assess the student, per the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 34, Section 200.6.

Note the following considerations for reporting special cases:

* A student may be assigned an overall score only if assessed in all Initial ELPAC domains.
* An LEA could assign an alternate assessment locally for up to four domains, and the student would receive a score of zero for each domain with this designation.
* A student may receive a domain exemption for only one domain within each of the oral language and written language composites, and the student’s score would be calculated without the exempted domain(s). The score for a composite containing an exempted domain would be calculated by interpolation of the score of the nonexempted domain.

#### Types of Score Reports

There are two categories of ELPAC reports. The specific reports within each category are presented in this subsection.

1. **SSR—**The SSR was the official score report for parents/guardians. An SSR described the student’s results and was made available only to students who met the program’s participation requirement.
2. **LEA student data files and aggregations—**LEA student data files were available for download on demand by the LEA in TOMS to coincide with availability of the SSRs.

##### Student Score Reports

The SSR was the official score report for the student’s parent/guardian and describes the student’s results. For the 2021–22 administration, the SSR was produced in TOMS and could be downloaded in PDF form. The SSR included the following:

* Overall score and reporting level
* Oral language reporting level
* Written language reporting level

As mentioned previously, the overall score, oral language, and written language levels were used to place a student within one of three Initial ELPAC proficiency levels: Novice EL, Intermediate EL, and IFEP.

LEAs had three options for accessing and distributing SSRs to parents/guardians:

1. Accessing electronic SSR PDFs using a locally provided parent/guardian or student portal
2. Downloading SSR PDFs from TOMS and making them available electronically using a secure local method
3. Downloading SSR PDFs from TOMS, printing them, and making them available locally

The LEA ELPAC coordinator could forward the appropriate reports to test sites. In the case of a locally printed Initial ELPAC SSR, the LEA sent the printed report(s) to the child’s parent/guardian. Initial ELPAC SSRs that included individual student results were not distributed beyond the student’s school.

Scores for students who were assigned accommodations or designated supports are reported in the same way as for students who were not assigned accommodations or designated supports. Detailed information about accessibility resources is described in subsection [*5.6.2 Accessibility Resource Categories*](#_Accessibility_Resource_Categories).

For the 2021–22 test administration, SSRs were made available to the LEAs in English, Spanish, Filipino, Chinese (Traditional), and Vietnamese. An SSR in a supported language was created if the student’s primary language as reported in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System was one of these supported languages. The LEAs that received SSRs in supported languages received one SSR in English and another in the supported language. These reports were available as PDFs for the LEA to download from TOMS.

Further information about the SSR and its interpretation is provided on the ELPAC Starting Smarter website for California assessments.

###### Access via Student or Parent Portal

LEAs had the option to provide SSRs electronically using a locally provided parent or student portal.

Amazon Web Services—with the Amazon Simple Storage Service and the Amazon Key Management Service—ensured encrypted access for parents/guardians to view a child’s electronic SSR, which was available as a PDF.

###### Access via the Test Operations Management System

The LEA ELPAC coordinator downloaded the electronic PDFs directly from TOMS and could forward the appropriate reports to test sites. Optionally, the LEA could download and then print the SSR PDF and then send the printed report(s) to the child’s parent/guardian.

##### School Reports

Site ELPAC coordinators could download a file of student results for the school from TOMS.

##### Local Educational Agency Student Data Files and Aggregations

The ELPAC student data files for the LEA were available for the LEA ELPAC coordinator and site ELPAC coordinator to download from TOMS.

Current and historical aggregated results are accessible to the public on the CDE Test Results for California’s Assessments website.

#### Score Report Applications

Initial ELPAC results provided parents/guardians and LEAs with information about a child’s English proficiency as the child entered a California public school for the first time. Identifying students who need help in English is important because it helps students obtain the extra support and resources they need to do well in school.

#### Criteria for Interpreting Test Scores

An LEA may use ELPAC computer-based assessment results to help make decisions about student placement, promotion, retention, or other considerations related to student achievement. However, it is important to remember that a single test can provide only limited information. Other relevant information should be considered as well. It is advisable for parents/guardians to evaluate their child’s strengths and weaknesses in the relevant topics by reviewing classroom work and progress reports in addition to the child’s ELPAC computer-based assessment results. It is also important to note that a student’s score in a content area could vary somewhat if the student were retested.

#### Criteria for Interpreting Score Reports

The information presented in various reports must be interpreted with caution when making performance comparisons. When comparing scale score and performance-level results, the user is limited to comparisons within a grade level or grade span. The user may compare scale scores for the same grade level or grade span, within a school, between schools, or between a school and its LEA, its county, or the state. The ELPAC user can also make comparisons within the same grade level or grade band across years.

However, comparing scale scores from different grade levels for the ELPAC is not appropriate, because the curricula are different across grade levels and the scale scores are not vertically linked between grade levels or grade spans.

For more details on the criteria for interpreting information provided on the score reports, refer to the ELPAC Starting Smarter website for California assessments or the *2021–22 ELPAC Post-Test Guide* (CDE, 2022), which was applicable for the 2021–22 ELPAC administration.

### References

California Department of Education. (2020). *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 technical report* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2021). *Paper–pencil Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2019–2020 technical report* [Unpublished report]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022). *ELPAC post-test guide: Technical information for student score reports for ELPAC LEA and site coordinators and research specialists.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Stocking, M. L. (1996). An alternative method for scoring adaptive tests. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 21*(4), 365–89.

### Accessibility Information

#### Alternative Text for Equation 7.1

Scale score equals slope times theta-hat plus intercept.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 7.2

Slope equals the SS sub 2 minus SS sub 1 divided by the denominator theta-hat sub 2 minus theta-hat sub 1.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 7.3

Intercept equals SS sub 2 minus theta-hat sub 2 times slope.

### Appendix 7.A: Initial ELPAC Participation

Table 7.A.1 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Kindergarten Through Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Kindergarten: Number Registered** | **Kindergarten: Number Tested** | **Kindergarten: Percent Tested** | **Grade 1: Number Registered** | **Grade 1: Number Tested** | **Grade 1: Percent Tested** | **Grade 2: Number Registered** | **Grade 2: Number Tested** | **Grade 2: Percent Tested** | **Grade 3: Number Registered** | **Grade 3: Number Tested** | **Grade 3: Percent Tested** |
| All | 134,215 | 133,652 | 100 | 12,800 | 12,612 | 99 | 6,633 | 6,488 | 98 | 5,823 | 5,709 | 98 |
| Male | 68,226 | 67,937 | 100 | 6,734 | 6,637 | 99 | 3,414 | 3,346 | 98 | 2,966 | 2,906 | 98 |
| Female | 65,967 | 65,693 | 100 | 6,065 | 5,974 | 98 | 3,218 | 3,141 | 98 | 2,854 | 2,800 | 98 |
| Nonbinary | 22 | 22 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 287 | 287 | 100 | 24 | 23 | 96 | 17 | 17 | 100 | 11 | 11 | 100 |
| Asian | 21,994 | 21,911 | 100 | 2,581 | 2,562 | 99 | 1,531 | 1,505 | 98 | 1,362 | 1,344 | 99 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 315 | 313 | 99 | 45 | 44 | 98 | 31 | 31 | 100 | 33 | 33 | 100 |
| Filipino | 1,053 | 1,047 | 99 | 146 | 144 | 99 | 75 | 75 | 100 | 76 | 74 | 97 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 97,956 | 97,610 | 100 | 7,742 | 7,636 | 99 | 3,558 | 3,495 | 98 | 3,103 | 3,051 | 98 |
| Black or African American | 801 | 795 | 99 | 96 | 93 | 97 | 60 | 59 | 98 | 56 | 55 | 98 |
| White | 7,688 | 7,661 | 100 | 1,387 | 1,370 | 99 | 767 | 746 | 97 | 698 | 687 | 98 |
| Two or more races | 4,121 | 4,028 | 98 | 779 | 740 | 95 | 594 | 560 | 94 | 484 | 454 | 94 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 83,559 | 83,366 | 100 | 6,801 | 6,757 | 99 | 3,066 | 3,022 | 99 | 2,724 | 2,693 | 99 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 50,656 | 50,286 | 99 | 5,999 | 5,855 | 98 | 3,567 | 3,466 | 97 | 3,099 | 3,016 | 97 |

Table 7.A.1 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Kindergarten: Number Registered** | **Kindergarten: Number Tested** | **Kindergarten: Percent Tested** | **Grade 1: Number Registered** | **Grade 1: Number Tested** | **Grade 1: Percent Tested** | **Grade 2: Number Registered** | **Grade 2: Number Tested** | **Grade 2: Percent Tested** | **Grade 3: Number Registered** | **Grade 3: Number Tested** | **Grade 3: Percent Tested** |
| Calculated English Language Acquisition Status (ELAS): English learner (EL) | 114,480 | 114,480 | 100 | 10,639 | 10,639 | 100 | 5,348 | 5,348 | 100 | 5,027 | 5,027 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: Initial fluent English proficient (IFEP) | 19,172 | 19,172 | 100 | 1,973 | 1,973 | 100 | 1,140 | 1,140 | 100 | 682 | 682 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: Unknown | 563 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 0 |
| Migrant education | 2,052 | 2,047 | 100 | 204 | 203 | 100 | 130 | 129 | 99 | 93 | 93 | 100 |
| Not migrant education | 132,163 | 131,605 | 100 | 12,596 | 12,409 | 99 | 6,503 | 6,359 | 98 | 5,730 | 5,616 | 98 |
| Disability | 13,194 | 13,059 | 99 | 689 | 663 | 96 | 169 | 151 | 89 | 113 | 104 | 92 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 536 | 536 | 100 | 60 | 60 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 7 | 7 | 100 |
| No disability | 121,021 | 120,593 | 100 | 12,111 | 11,949 | 99 | 6,464 | 6,337 | 98 | 5,710 | 5,605 | 98 |
| Assigned accommodations | 94 | 94 | 100 | 7 | 7 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 133,145 | 133,022 | 100 | 12,574 | 12,546 | 100 | 6,494 | 6,482 | 100 | 5,718 | 5,697 | 100 |
| Military | 936 | 933 | 100 | 105 | 105 | 100 | 60 | 60 | 100 | 46 | 45 | 98 |
| Not military | 133,279 | 132,719 | 100 | 12,695 | 12,507 | 99 | 6,573 | 6,428 | 98 | 5,777 | 5,664 | 98 |
| Homeless | 4,671 | 4,662 | 100 | 812 | 810 | 100 | 518 | 512 | 99 | 468 | 466 | 100 |
| Not homeless | 129,544 | 128,990 | 100 | 11,988 | 11,802 | 98 | 6,115 | 5,976 | 98 | 5,355 | 5,243 | 98 |
| Foster youth | 390 | 388 | 99 | 35 | 35 | 100 | 14 | 13 | 93 | 8 | 8 | 100 |
| Not foster youth | 133,825 | 133,264 | 100 | 12,765 | 12,577 | 99 | 6,619 | 6,475 | 98 | 5,815 | 5,701 | 98 |

Table 7.A.2 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Grade Four Through Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Grade 4: Number Registered** | **Grade 4: Number Tested** | **Grade 4: Percent Tested** | **Grade 5: Number Registered** | **Grade 5: Number Tested** | **Grade 5: Percent Tested** | **Grade 6: Number Registered** | **Grade 6: Number Tested** | **Grade 6: Percent Tested** |
| All | 5,453 | 5,333 | 98 | 5,033 | 4,928 | 98 | 4,824 | 4,719 | 98 |
| Male | 2,902 | 2,834 | 98 | 2,604 | 2,550 | 98 | 2,485 | 2,436 | 98 |
| Female | 2,551 | 2,499 | 98 | 2,427 | 2,378 | 98 | 2,337 | 2,281 | 98 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | 6 | 100 | 6 | 6 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| Asian | 1,299 | 1,283 | 99 | 1,167 | 1,153 | 99 | 995 | 981 | 99 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 29 | 29 | 100 | 21 | 20 | 95 | 26 | 24 | 92 |
| Filipino | 65 | 64 | 98 | 87 | 84 | 97 | 88 | 87 | 99 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,877 | 2,827 | 98 | 2,682 | 2,642 | 99 | 2,646 | 2,597 | 98 |
| Black or African American | 51 | 50 | 98 | 51 | 48 | 94 | 45 | 43 | 96 |
| White | 631 | 617 | 98 | 577 | 572 | 99 | 607 | 596 | 98 |
| Two or more races | 495 | 457 | 92 | 442 | 403 | 91 | 413 | 387 | 94 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,452 | 2,420 | 99 | 2,345 | 2,325 | 99 | 2,284 | 2,252 | 99 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,001 | 2,913 | 97 | 2,688 | 2,603 | 97 | 2,540 | 2,467 | 97 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,393 | 4,393 | 100 | 3,951 | 3,951 | 100 | 3,769 | 3,769 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 940 | 940 | 100 | 977 | 977 | 100 | 950 | 950 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: Unknown | 120 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 |
| Migrant education | 114 | 114 | 100 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 88 | 88 | 100 |
| Not migrant education | 5,339 | 5,219 | 98 | 4,936 | 4,831 | 98 | 4,736 | 4,631 | 98 |
| Disability | 106 | 97 | 92 | 78 | 74 | 95 | 70 | 68 | 97 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | 6 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| No disability | 5,347 | 5,236 | 98 | 4,955 | 4,854 | 98 | 4,754 | 4,651 | 98 |

Table 7.A.2 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Grade 4: Number Registered** | **Grade 4: Number Tested** | **Grade 4: Percent Tested** | **Grade 5: Number Registered** | **Grade 5: Number Tested** | **Grade 5: Percent Tested** | **Grade 6: Number Registered** | **Grade 6: Number Tested** | **Grade 6: Percent Tested** |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | 2 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,368 | 5,326 | 99 | 4,950 | 4,924 | 99 | 4,751 | 4,717 | 99 |
| Military | 46 | 45 | 98 | 28 | 28 | 100 | 33 | 32 | 97 |
| Not military | 5,407 | 5,288 | 98 | 5,005 | 4,900 | 98 | 4,791 | 4,687 | 98 |
| Homeless | 479 | 474 | 99 | 430 | 425 | 99 | 399 | 389 | 97 |
| Not homeless | 4,974 | 4,859 | 98 | 4,603 | 4,503 | 98 | 4,425 | 4,330 | 98 |
| Foster youth | 8 | 7 | 88 | 5 | 4 | 80 | 9 | 8 | 89 |
| Not foster youth | 5,445 | 5,326 | 98 | 5,028 | 4,924 | 98 | 4,815 | 4,711 | 98 |

Table 7.A.3 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Grade Seven Through Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Grade 7: Number Registered** | **Grade 7: Number Tested** | **Grade 7: Percent Tested** | **Grade 8: Number Registered** | **Grade 8: Number Tested** | **Grade 8: Percent Tested** | **Grade 9: Number Registered** | **Grade 9: Number Tested** | **Grade 9: Percent Tested** |
| All | 5,118 | 4,995 | 98 | 4,877 | 4,771 | 98 | 10,869 | 10,448 | 96 |
| Male | 2,679 | 2,610 | 97 | 2,511 | 2,457 | 98 | 6,275 | 6,034 | 96 |
| Female | 2,437 | 2,383 | 98 | 2,364 | 2,312 | 98 | 4,588 | 4,409 | 96 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 6 | 5 | 83 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 6 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| Asian | 970 | 961 | 99 | 842 | 828 | 98 | 1,178 | 1,162 | 99 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 28 | 27 | 96 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 31 | 31 | 100 |
| Filipino | 96 | 94 | 98 | 104 | 102 | 98 | 177 | 176 | 99 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,001 | 2,945 | 98 | 2,945 | 2,907 | 99 | 7,293 | 7,088 | 97 |
| Black or African American | 34 | 32 | 94 | 32 | 31 | 97 | 82 | 81 | 99 |
| White | 533 | 522 | 98 | 524 | 520 | 99 | 702 | 681 | 97 |
| Two or more races | 449 | 407 | 91 | 404 | 357 | 88 | 1,396 | 1,219 | 87 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,512 | 2,480 | 99 | 2,413 | 2,396 | 99 | 5,397 | 5,325 | 99 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,606 | 2,515 | 97 | 2,464 | 2,375 | 96 | 5,472 | 5,123 | 94 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,019 | 4,019 | 100 | 3,787 | 3,787 | 100 | 8,981 | 8,981 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 976 | 976 | 100 | 984 | 984 | 100 | 1,467 | 1,467 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: Unknown | 123 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 421 | 0 | 0 |
| Migrant education | 96 | 96 | 100 | 89 | 89 | 100 | 143 | 143 | 100 |
| Not migrant education | 5,022 | 4,899 | 98 | 4,788 | 4,682 | 98 | 10,726 | 10,305 | 96 |
| Disability | 65 | 58 | 89 | 64 | 59 | 92 | 68 | 63 | 93 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | 8 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 100 |
| No disability | 5,053 | 4,937 | 98 | 4,813 | 4,712 | 98 | 10,801 | 10,385 | 96 |

Table 7.A.3 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Grade 7: Number Registered** | **Grade 7: Number Tested** | **Grade 7: Percent Tested** | **Grade 8: Number Registered** | **Grade 8: Number Tested** | **Grade 8: Percent Tested** | **Grade 9: Number Registered** | **Grade 9: Number Tested** | **Grade 9: Percent Tested** |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,019 | 4,986 | 99 | 4,804 | 4,768 | 99 | 10,615 | 10,440 | 98 |
| Military | 32 | 32 | 100 | 38 | 38 | 100 | 54 | 54 | 100 |
| Not military | 5,086 | 4,963 | 98 | 4,839 | 4,733 | 98 | 10,815 | 10,394 | 96 |
| Homeless | 413 | 409 | 99 | 404 | 403 | 100 | 804 | 794 | 99 |
| Not homeless | 4,705 | 4,586 | 97 | 4,473 | 4,368 | 98 | 10,065 | 9,654 | 96 |
| Foster youth | 4 | 4 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 100 | 19 | 15 | 79 |
| Not foster youth | 5,114 | 4,991 | 98 | 4,873 | 4,767 | 98 | 10,850 | 10,433 | 96 |

Table 7.A.4 Initial ELPAC Assessment Participation—Grade Ten Through Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Grade 10: Number Registered** | **Grade 10: Number Tested** | **Grade 10: Percent Tested** | **Grade 11: Number Registered** | **Grade 11: Number Tested** | **Grade 11: Percent Tested** | **Grade 12: Number Registered** | **Grade 12: Number Tested** | **Grade 12: Percent Tested** |
| All | 6,425 | 6,258 | 97 | 5,361 | 5,261 | 98 | 3,467 | 3,411 | 98 |
| Male | 3,489 | 3,396 | 97 | 3,024 | 2,972 | 98 | 1,872 | 1,837 | 98 |
| Female | 2,933 | 2,859 | 97 | 2,333 | 2,285 | 98 | 1,594 | 1,573 | 99 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | 3 | 100 | 4 | 4 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | 10 | 100 | 10 | 8 | 80 | 7 | 6 | 86 |
| Asian | 787 | 771 | 98 | 642 | 632 | 98 | 373 | 370 | 99 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 24 | 22 | 92 | 20 | 19 | 95 | 24 | 23 | 96 |
| Filipino | 116 | 115 | 99 | 133 | 132 | 99 | 83 | 81 | 98 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,473 | 4,382 | 98 | 3,632 | 3,568 | 98 | 2,181 | 2,145 | 98 |
| Black or African American | 45 | 41 | 91 | 40 | 39 | 98 | 36 | 35 | 97 |
| White | 602 | 592 | 98 | 586 | 579 | 99 | 560 | 556 | 99 |
| Two or more races | 368 | 325 | 88 | 298 | 284 | 95 | 203 | 195 | 96 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,313 | 3,254 | 98 | 2,763 | 2,721 | 98 | 1,699 | 1,674 | 99 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,112 | 3,004 | 97 | 2,598 | 2,540 | 98 | 1,768 | 1,737 | 98 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,153 | 5,153 | 100 | 4,110 | 4,110 | 100 | 2,472 | 2,472 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,105 | 1,105 | 100 | 1,151 | 1,151 | 100 | 939 | 939 | 100 |
| Calculated ELAS: Unknown | 167 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 |
| Migrant education | 136 | 136 | 100 | 117 | 116 | 99 | 51 | 51 | 100 |
| Not migrant education | 6,289 | 6,122 | 97 | 5,244 | 5,145 | 98 | 3,416 | 3,360 | 98 |
| Disability | 52 | 48 | 92 | 34 | 30 | 88 | 45 | 36 | 80 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | 6 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 8 | 8 | 100 |
| No disability | 6,373 | 6,210 | 97 | 5,327 | 5,231 | 98 | 3,422 | 3,375 | 99 |

Table 7.A.4 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Grade 10: Number Registered** | **Grade 10: Number Tested** | **Grade 10: Percent Tested** | **Grade 11: Number Registered** | **Grade 11: Number Tested** | **Grade 11: Percent Tested** | **Grade 12: Number Registered** | **Grade 12: Number Tested** | **Grade 12: Percent Tested** |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,325 | 6,249 | 99 | 5,278 | 5,259 | 100 | 3,414 | 3,402 | 100 |
| Military | 42 | 42 | 100 | 38 | 37 | 97 | 15 | 15 | 100 |
| Not military | 6,383 | 6,216 | 97 | 5,323 | 5,224 | 98 | 3,452 | 3,396 | 98 |
| Homeless | 455 | 446 | 98 | 428 | 422 | 99 | 229 | 227 | 99 |
| Not homeless | 5,970 | 5,812 | 97 | 4,933 | 4,839 | 98 | 3,238 | 3,184 | 98 |
| Foster youth | 15 | 12 | 80 | 11 | 10 | 91 | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| Not foster youth | 6,410 | 6,246 | 97 | 5,350 | 5,251 | 98 | 3,464 | 3,408 | 98 |

### Appendix 7.B: Raw Score Frequency Distributions

**Note:** In table 7.B.1 through table 7.B.52, a domain raw score of “NS” was given to students who were exempted for the domain.

Table 7.B.1 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 30,615 | 22.91 |
| 1 | 4,686 | 3.51 |
| 2 | 3,231 | 2.42 |
| 3 | 4,712 | 3.53 |
| 4 | 8,135 | 6.09 |
| 5 | 11,327 | 8.47 |
| 6 | 12,963 | 9.70 |
| 7 | 12,574 | 9.41 |
| 8 | 10,987 | 8.22 |
| 9 | 9,762 | 7.30 |
| 10 | 8,810 | 6.59 |
| 11 | 8,301 | 6.21 |
| 12 | 7,548 | 5.65 |
| NS | 1 | 0.00 |

Table 7.B.2 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade One

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 3,288 | 26.07 |
| 1 | 693 | 5.49 |
| 2 | 696 | 5.52 |
| 3 | 932 | 7.39 |
| 4 | 1,121 | 8.89 |
| 5 | 1,111 | 8.81 |
| 6 | 945 | 7.49 |
| 7 | 769 | 6.10 |
| 8 | 645 | 5.11 |
| 9 | 606 | 4.80 |
| 10 | 641 | 5.08 |
| 11 | 652 | 5.17 |
| 12 | 513 | 4.07 |

Table 7.B.3 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Two

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,481 | 38.24 |
| 1 | 325 | 5.01 |
| 2 | 174 | 2.68 |
| 3 | 229 | 3.53 |
| 4 | 326 | 5.02 |
| 5 | 333 | 5.13 |
| 6 | 286 | 4.41 |
| 7 | 235 | 3.62 |
| 8 | 225 | 3.47 |
| 9 | 220 | 3.39 |
| 10 | 377 | 5.81 |
| 11 | 604 | 9.31 |
| 12 | 673 | 10.37 |

Table 7.B.4 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Three

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,793 | 31.41 |
| 1 | 374 | 6.55 |
| 2 | 224 | 3.92 |
| 3 | 269 | 4.71 |
| 4 | 400 | 7.01 |
| 5 | 463 | 8.11 |
| 6 | 405 | 7.09 |
| 7 | 295 | 5.17 |
| 8 | 242 | 4.24 |
| 9 | 248 | 4.34 |
| 10 | 248 | 4.34 |
| 11 | 312 | 5.47 |
| 12 | 278 | 4.87 |
| 13 | 158 | 2.77 |

Table 7.B.5 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Four

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,520 | 28.50 |
| 1 | 331 | 6.21 |
| 2 | 208 | 3.90 |
| 3 | 225 | 4.22 |
| 4 | 382 | 7.16 |
| 5 | 425 | 7.97 |
| 6 | 379 | 7.11 |
| 7 | 269 | 5.04 |
| 8 | 200 | 3.75 |
| 9 | 235 | 4.41 |
| 10 | 258 | 4.84 |
| 11 | 313 | 5.87 |
| 12 | 326 | 6.11 |
| 13 | 262 | 4.91 |

Table 7.B.6 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Five

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,202 | 24.39 |
| 1 | 301 | 6.11 |
| 2 | 179 | 3.63 |
| 3 | 254 | 5.15 |
| 4 | 357 | 7.24 |
| 5 | 389 | 7.89 |
| 6 | 376 | 7.63 |
| 7 | 290 | 5.88 |
| 8 | 204 | 4.14 |
| 9 | 179 | 3.63 |
| 10 | 221 | 4.48 |
| 11 | 296 | 6.01 |
| 12 | 367 | 7.45 |
| 13 | 313 | 6.35 |

Table 7.B.7 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Six

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 851 | 18.03 |
| 1 | 239 | 5.06 |
| 2 | 103 | 2.18 |
| 3 | 155 | 3.28 |
| 4 | 241 | 5.11 |
| 5 | 334 | 7.08 |
| 6 | 393 | 8.33 |
| 7 | 415 | 8.79 |
| 8 | 344 | 7.29 |
| 9 | 303 | 6.42 |
| 10 | 274 | 5.81 |
| 11 | 286 | 6.06 |
| 12 | 299 | 6.34 |
| 13 | 262 | 5.55 |
| 14 | 220 | 4.66 |

Table 7.B.8 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 842 | 16.86 |
| 1 | 248 | 4.96 |
| 2 | 129 | 2.58 |
| 3 | 163 | 3.26 |
| 4 | 246 | 4.92 |
| 5 | 431 | 8.63 |
| 6 | 413 | 8.27 |
| 7 | 441 | 8.83 |
| 8 | 366 | 7.33 |
| 9 | 345 | 6.91 |
| 10 | 270 | 5.41 |
| 11 | 294 | 5.89 |
| 12 | 280 | 5.61 |
| 13 | 267 | 5.35 |
| 14 | 260 | 5.21 |

Table 7.B.9 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 776 | 16.26 |
| 1 | 230 | 4.82 |
| 2 | 130 | 2.72 |
| 3 | 148 | 3.10 |
| 4 | 240 | 5.03 |
| 5 | 353 | 7.40 |
| 6 | 437 | 9.16 |
| 7 | 428 | 8.97 |
| 8 | 351 | 7.36 |
| 9 | 320 | 6.71 |
| 10 | 260 | 5.45 |
| 11 | 278 | 5.83 |
| 12 | 277 | 5.81 |
| 13 | 272 | 5.70 |
| 14 | 270 | 5.66 |
| NS | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.B.10 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,612 | 15.43 |
| 1 | 667 | 6.38 |
| 2 | 634 | 6.07 |
| 3 | 868 | 8.31 |
| 4 | 1,167 | 11.17 |
| 5 | 1,235 | 11.82 |
| 6 | 1,018 | 9.74 |
| 7 | 700 | 6.70 |
| 8 | 404 | 3.87 |
| 9 | 316 | 3.02 |
| 10 | 274 | 2.62 |
| 11 | 328 | 3.14 |
| 12 | 361 | 3.46 |
| 13 | 466 | 4.46 |
| 14 | 398 | 3.81 |

Table 7.B.11 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,036 | 16.55 |
| 1 | 310 | 4.95 |
| 2 | 279 | 4.46 |
| 3 | 405 | 6.47 |
| 4 | 614 | 9.81 |
| 5 | 670 | 10.71 |
| 6 | 589 | 9.41 |
| 7 | 416 | 6.65 |
| 8 | 317 | 5.07 |
| 9 | 237 | 3.79 |
| 10 | 209 | 3.34 |
| 11 | 221 | 3.53 |
| 12 | 297 | 4.75 |
| 13 | 348 | 5.56 |
| 14 | 310 | 4.95 |

Table 7.B.12 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 861 | 16.37 |
| 1 | 282 | 5.36 |
| 2 | 242 | 4.60 |
| 3 | 317 | 6.03 |
| 4 | 490 | 9.31 |
| 5 | 524 | 9.96 |
| 6 | 435 | 8.27 |
| 7 | 319 | 6.06 |
| 8 | 220 | 4.18 |
| 9 | 193 | 3.67 |
| 10 | 205 | 3.90 |
| 11 | 251 | 4.77 |
| 12 | 290 | 5.51 |
| 13 | 334 | 6.35 |
| 14 | 297 | 5.65 |
| NS | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.B.13 Raw Score Distribution—Listening, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 517 | 15.16 |
| 1 | 160 | 4.69 |
| 2 | 138 | 4.05 |
| 3 | 182 | 5.34 |
| 4 | 280 | 8.21 |
| 5 | 304 | 8.91 |
| 6 | 289 | 8.47 |
| 7 | 182 | 5.34 |
| 8 | 136 | 3.99 |
| 9 | 124 | 3.64 |
| 10 | 148 | 4.34 |
| 11 | 161 | 4.72 |
| 12 | 228 | 6.68 |
| 13 | 278 | 8.15 |
| 14 | 284 | 8.33 |

Table 7.B.14 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 34,593 | 25.88 |
| 1 | 2,622 | 1.96 |
| 2 | 3,293 | 2.46 |
| 3 | 3,997 | 2.99 |
| 4 | 4,530 | 3.39 |
| 5 | 4,992 | 3.74 |
| 6 | 5,294 | 3.96 |
| 7 | 5,700 | 4.26 |
| 8 | 6,298 | 4.71 |
| 9 | 6,875 | 5.14 |
| 10 | 7,468 | 5.59 |
| 11 | 8,520 | 6.37 |
| 12 | 9,021 | 6.75 |
| 13 | 10,388 | 7.77 |
| 14 | 11,278 | 8.44 |
| 15 | 8,782 | 6.57 |
| NS | 1 | 0.00 |

Table 7.B.15 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade One

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 4,939 | 39.16 |
| 1 | 371 | 2.94 |
| 2 | 259 | 2.05 |
| 3 | 246 | 1.95 |
| 4 | 262 | 2.08 |
| 5 | 247 | 1.96 |
| 6 | 304 | 2.41 |
| 7 | 276 | 2.19 |
| 8 | 308 | 2.44 |
| 9 | 394 | 3.12 |
| 10 | 398 | 3.16 |
| 11 | 457 | 3.62 |
| 12 | 568 | 4.50 |
| 13 | 632 | 5.01 |
| 14 | 758 | 6.01 |
| 15 | 792 | 6.28 |
| 16 | 775 | 6.14 |
| 17 | 625 | 4.96 |
| NS | 1 | 0.01 |

Table 7.B.16 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Two

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 3,536 | 54.50 |
| 1 | 170 | 2.62 |
| 2 | 115 | 1.77 |
| 3 | 86 | 1.33 |
| 4 | 77 | 1.19 |
| 5 | 83 | 1.28 |
| 6 | 88 | 1.36 |
| 7 | 80 | 1.23 |
| 8 | 96 | 1.48 |
| 9 | 101 | 1.56 |
| 10 | 127 | 1.96 |
| 11 | 126 | 1.94 |
| 12 | 166 | 2.56 |
| 13 | 180 | 2.77 |
| 14 | 218 | 3.36 |
| 15 | 327 | 5.04 |
| 16 | 392 | 6.04 |
| 17 | 520 | 8.01 |

Table 7.B.17 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Three

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,996 | 52.48 |
| 1 | 168 | 2.94 |
| 2 | 124 | 2.17 |
| 3 | 111 | 1.94 |
| 4 | 101 | 1.77 |
| 5 | 76 | 1.33 |
| 6 | 93 | 1.63 |
| 7 | 68 | 1.19 |
| 8 | 86 | 1.51 |
| 9 | 87 | 1.52 |
| 10 | 95 | 1.66 |
| 11 | 125 | 2.19 |
| 12 | 121 | 2.12 |
| 13 | 180 | 3.15 |
| 14 | 229 | 4.01 |
| 15 | 368 | 6.45 |
| 16 | 402 | 7.04 |
| 17 | 279 | 4.89 |

Table 7.B.18 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Four

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,622 | 49.17 |
| 1 | 179 | 3.36 |
| 2 | 147 | 2.76 |
| 3 | 100 | 1.88 |
| 4 | 104 | 1.95 |
| 5 | 104 | 1.95 |
| 6 | 71 | 1.33 |
| 7 | 59 | 1.11 |
| 8 | 67 | 1.26 |
| 9 | 68 | 1.28 |
| 10 | 59 | 1.11 |
| 11 | 90 | 1.69 |
| 12 | 103 | 1.93 |
| 13 | 150 | 2.81 |
| 14 | 191 | 3.58 |
| 15 | 309 | 5.79 |
| 16 | 526 | 9.86 |
| 17 | 384 | 7.20 |

Table 7.B.19 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Five

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,310 | 46.88 |
| 1 | 159 | 3.23 |
| 2 | 120 | 2.44 |
| 3 | 112 | 2.27 |
| 4 | 99 | 2.01 |
| 5 | 98 | 1.99 |
| 6 | 90 | 1.83 |
| 7 | 72 | 1.46 |
| 8 | 68 | 1.38 |
| 9 | 83 | 1.68 |
| 10 | 65 | 1.32 |
| 11 | 72 | 1.46 |
| 12 | 94 | 1.91 |
| 13 | 110 | 2.23 |
| 14 | 181 | 3.67 |
| 15 | 299 | 6.07 |
| 16 | 432 | 8.77 |
| 17 | 464 | 9.42 |

Table 7.B.20 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Six

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,176 | 46.11 |
| 1 | 120 | 2.54 |
| 2 | 97 | 2.06 |
| 3 | 68 | 1.44 |
| 4 | 79 | 1.67 |
| 5 | 73 | 1.55 |
| 6 | 68 | 1.44 |
| 7 | 58 | 1.23 |
| 8 | 59 | 1.25 |
| 9 | 64 | 1.36 |
| 10 | 78 | 1.65 |
| 11 | 63 | 1.34 |
| 12 | 108 | 2.29 |
| 13 | 134 | 2.84 |
| 14 | 160 | 3.39 |
| 15 | 336 | 7.12 |
| 16 | 487 | 10.32 |
| 17 | 491 | 10.40 |

Table 7.B.21 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,399 | 48.03 |
| 1 | 140 | 2.80 |
| 2 | 114 | 2.28 |
| 3 | 101 | 2.02 |
| 4 | 71 | 1.42 |
| 5 | 68 | 1.36 |
| 6 | 72 | 1.44 |
| 7 | 68 | 1.36 |
| 8 | 82 | 1.64 |
| 9 | 77 | 1.54 |
| 10 | 74 | 1.48 |
| 11 | 87 | 1.74 |
| 12 | 124 | 2.48 |
| 13 | 114 | 2.28 |
| 14 | 171 | 3.42 |
| 15 | 220 | 4.40 |
| 16 | 515 | 10.31 |
| 17 | 498 | 9.97 |

Table 7.B.22 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,192 | 45.94 |
| 1 | 156 | 3.27 |
| 2 | 110 | 2.31 |
| 3 | 89 | 1.87 |
| 4 | 74 | 1.55 |
| 5 | 70 | 1.47 |
| 6 | 83 | 1.74 |
| 7 | 75 | 1.57 |
| 8 | 64 | 1.34 |
| 9 | 91 | 1.91 |
| 10 | 74 | 1.55 |
| 11 | 92 | 1.93 |
| 12 | 105 | 2.20 |
| 13 | 142 | 2.98 |
| 14 | 150 | 3.14 |
| 15 | 232 | 4.86 |
| 16 | 464 | 9.73 |
| 17 | 508 | 10.65 |

Table 7.B.23 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 5,889 | 56.36 |
| 1 | 348 | 3.33 |
| 2 | 300 | 2.87 |
| 3 | 255 | 2.44 |
| 4 | 202 | 1.93 |
| 5 | 160 | 1.53 |
| 6 | 171 | 1.64 |
| 7 | 130 | 1.24 |
| 8 | 128 | 1.23 |
| 9 | 134 | 1.28 |
| 10 | 135 | 1.29 |
| 11 | 154 | 1.47 |
| 12 | 155 | 1.48 |
| 13 | 194 | 1.86 |
| 14 | 279 | 2.67 |
| 15 | 407 | 3.90 |
| 16 | 583 | 5.58 |
| 17 | 823 | 7.88 |
| NS | 1 | 0.01 |

Table 7.B.24 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,782 | 44.46 |
| 1 | 203 | 3.24 |
| 2 | 199 | 3.18 |
| 3 | 182 | 2.91 |
| 4 | 168 | 2.68 |
| 5 | 128 | 2.05 |
| 6 | 148 | 2.36 |
| 7 | 131 | 2.09 |
| 8 | 105 | 1.68 |
| 9 | 103 | 1.65 |
| 10 | 115 | 1.84 |
| 11 | 136 | 2.17 |
| 12 | 156 | 2.49 |
| 13 | 161 | 2.57 |
| 14 | 215 | 3.44 |
| 15 | 301 | 4.81 |
| 16 | 402 | 6.42 |
| 17 | 623 | 9.96 |

Table 7.B.25 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,260 | 42.96 |
| 1 | 182 | 3.46 |
| 2 | 145 | 2.76 |
| 3 | 129 | 2.45 |
| 4 | 114 | 2.17 |
| 5 | 89 | 1.69 |
| 6 | 100 | 1.90 |
| 7 | 88 | 1.67 |
| 8 | 111 | 2.11 |
| 9 | 95 | 1.81 |
| 10 | 84 | 1.60 |
| 11 | 109 | 2.07 |
| 12 | 111 | 2.11 |
| 13 | 134 | 2.55 |
| 14 | 188 | 3.57 |
| 15 | 291 | 5.53 |
| 16 | 414 | 7.87 |
| 17 | 617 | 11.73 |

Table 7.B.26 Raw Score Distribution—Speaking, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,340 | 39.28 |
| 1 | 101 | 2.96 |
| 2 | 91 | 2.67 |
| 3 | 70 | 2.05 |
| 4 | 66 | 1.93 |
| 5 | 63 | 1.85 |
| 6 | 50 | 1.47 |
| 7 | 58 | 1.70 |
| 8 | 61 | 1.79 |
| 9 | 41 | 1.20 |
| 10 | 65 | 1.91 |
| 11 | 62 | 1.82 |
| 12 | 76 | 2.23 |
| 13 | 101 | 2.96 |
| 14 | 124 | 3.64 |
| 15 | 211 | 6.19 |
| 16 | 332 | 9.73 |
| 17 | 499 | 14.63 |

Table 7.B.27 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 31,147 | 23.30 |
| 1 | 8,958 | 6.70 |
| 2 | 9,618 | 7.20 |
| 3 | 10,960 | 8.20 |
| 4 | 12,450 | 9.32 |
| 5 | 13,266 | 9.93 |
| 6 | 12,109 | 9.06 |
| 7 | 11,149 | 8.34 |
| 8 | 8,713 | 6.52 |
| 9 | 7,751 | 5.80 |
| 10 | 2,986 | 2.23 |
| 11 | 4,545 | 3.40 |

Table 7.B.28 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade One

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 4,153 | 32.93 |
| 1 | 625 | 4.96 |
| 2 | 578 | 4.58 |
| 3 | 727 | 5.76 |
| 4 | 784 | 6.22 |
| 5 | 806 | 6.39 |
| 6 | 742 | 5.88 |
| 7 | 785 | 6.22 |
| 8 | 798 | 6.33 |
| 9 | 932 | 7.39 |
| 10 | 1,682 | 13.34 |

Table 7.B.29 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Two

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,932 | 29.78 |
| 1 | 273 | 4.21 |
| 2 | 370 | 5.70 |
| 3 | 406 | 6.26 |
| 4 | 484 | 7.46 |
| 5 | 523 | 8.06 |
| 6 | 458 | 7.06 |
| 7 | 346 | 5.33 |
| 8 | 312 | 4.81 |
| 9 | 438 | 6.75 |
| 10 | 946 | 14.58 |

Table 7.B.30 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Three

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,672 | 46.80 |
| 1 | 455 | 7.97 |
| 2 | 417 | 7.30 |
| 3 | 459 | 8.04 |
| 4 | 411 | 7.20 |
| 5 | 329 | 5.76 |
| 6 | 273 | 4.78 |
| 7 | 197 | 3.45 |
| 8 | 182 | 3.19 |
| 9 | 204 | 3.57 |
| 10 | 110 | 1.93 |

Table 7.B.31 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Four

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,125 | 39.85 |
| 1 | 409 | 7.67 |
| 2 | 394 | 7.39 |
| 3 | 462 | 8.66 |
| 4 | 408 | 7.65 |
| 5 | 313 | 5.87 |
| 6 | 242 | 4.54 |
| 7 | 258 | 4.84 |
| 8 | 261 | 4.89 |
| 9 | 260 | 4.88 |
| 10 | 201 | 3.77 |

Table 7.B.32 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Five

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,744 | 35.39 |
| 1 | 393 | 7.97 |
| 2 | 349 | 7.08 |
| 3 | 494 | 10.02 |
| 4 | 381 | 7.73 |
| 5 | 293 | 5.95 |
| 6 | 230 | 4.67 |
| 7 | 218 | 4.42 |
| 8 | 244 | 4.95 |
| 9 | 294 | 5.97 |
| 10 | 288 | 5.84 |

Table 7.B.33 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Six

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,373 | 29.10 |
| 1 | 393 | 8.33 |
| 2 | 456 | 9.66 |
| 3 | 541 | 11.46 |
| 4 | 486 | 10.30 |
| 5 | 382 | 8.09 |
| 6 | 288 | 6.10 |
| 7 | 264 | 5.59 |
| 8 | 201 | 4.26 |
| 9 | 203 | 4.30 |
| 10 | 132 | 2.80 |

Table 7.B.34 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,374 | 27.51 |
| 1 | 485 | 9.71 |
| 2 | 499 | 9.99 |
| 3 | 555 | 11.11 |
| 4 | 511 | 10.23 |
| 5 | 417 | 8.35 |
| 6 | 308 | 6.17 |
| 7 | 202 | 4.04 |
| 8 | 239 | 4.78 |
| 9 | 231 | 4.62 |
| 10 | 174 | 3.48 |

Table 7.B.35 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,184 | 24.82 |
| 1 | 400 | 8.38 |
| 2 | 492 | 10.31 |
| 3 | 552 | 11.57 |
| 4 | 485 | 10.17 |
| 5 | 414 | 8.68 |
| 6 | 305 | 6.39 |
| 7 | 257 | 5.39 |
| 8 | 249 | 5.22 |
| 9 | 238 | 4.99 |
| 10 | 195 | 4.09 |

Table 7.B.36 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,134 | 20.42 |
| 1 | 983 | 9.41 |
| 2 | 1,225 | 11.72 |
| 3 | 1,441 | 13.79 |
| 4 | 1,279 | 12.24 |
| 5 | 894 | 8.56 |
| 6 | 697 | 6.67 |
| 7 | 555 | 5.31 |
| 8 | 525 | 5.02 |
| 9 | 436 | 4.17 |
| 10 | 279 | 2.67 |

Table 7.B.37 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,241 | 19.83 |
| 1 | 429 | 6.86 |
| 2 | 584 | 9.33 |
| 3 | 676 | 10.80 |
| 4 | 761 | 12.16 |
| 5 | 628 | 10.04 |
| 6 | 515 | 8.23 |
| 7 | 413 | 6.60 |
| 8 | 436 | 6.97 |
| 9 | 361 | 5.77 |
| 10 | 214 | 3.42 |

Table 7.B.38 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,059 | 20.13 |
| 1 | 309 | 5.87 |
| 2 | 428 | 8.14 |
| 3 | 515 | 9.79 |
| 4 | 530 | 10.07 |
| 5 | 518 | 9.85 |
| 6 | 430 | 8.17 |
| 7 | 395 | 7.51 |
| 8 | 434 | 8.25 |
| 9 | 413 | 7.85 |
| 10 | 230 | 4.37 |

Table 7.B.39 Raw Score Distribution—Reading, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 632 | 18.53 |
| 1 | 207 | 6.07 |
| 2 | 229 | 6.71 |
| 3 | 338 | 9.91 |
| 4 | 319 | 9.35 |
| 5 | 300 | 8.80 |
| 6 | 265 | 7.77 |
| 7 | 281 | 8.24 |
| 8 | 317 | 9.29 |
| 9 | 328 | 9.62 |
| 10 | 195 | 5.72 |

Table 7.B.40 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 86,808 | 64.95 |
| 1 | 9,987 | 7.47 |
| 2 | 7,617 | 5.70 |
| 3 | 4,538 | 3.40 |
| 4 | 3,551 | 2.66 |
| 5 | 2,678 | 2.00 |
| 6 | 2,583 | 1.93 |
| 7 | 2,470 | 1.85 |
| 8 | 2,667 | 2.00 |
| 9 | 1,434 | 1.07 |
| 10 | 1,751 | 1.31 |
| 11 | 1,933 | 1.45 |
| 12 | 5,634 | 4.22 |
| NS | 1 | 0.00 |

Table 7.B.41 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade One

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 5,645 | 44.76 |
| 1 | 844 | 6.69 |
| 2 | 694 | 5.50 |
| 3 | 515 | 4.08 |
| 4 | 559 | 4.43 |
| 5 | 459 | 3.64 |
| 6 | 434 | 3.44 |
| 7 | 418 | 3.31 |
| 8 | 392 | 3.11 |
| 9 | 415 | 3.29 |
| 10 | 479 | 3.80 |
| 11 | 473 | 3.75 |
| 12 | 483 | 3.83 |
| 13 | 801 | 6.35 |
| NS | 1 | 0.01 |

Table 7.B.42 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Two

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 3,217 | 49.58 |
| 1 | 306 | 4.72 |
| 2 | 318 | 4.90 |
| 3 | 313 | 4.82 |
| 4 | 144 | 2.22 |
| 5 | 136 | 2.10 |
| 6 | 164 | 2.53 |
| 7 | 168 | 2.59 |
| 8 | 156 | 2.40 |
| 9 | 243 | 3.75 |
| 10 | 251 | 3.87 |
| 11 | 248 | 3.82 |
| 12 | 367 | 5.66 |
| 13 | 457 | 7.04 |

Table 7.B.43 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Three

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 3,916 | 68.59 |
| 1 | 164 | 2.87 |
| 2 | 136 | 2.38 |
| 3 | 100 | 1.75 |
| 4 | 121 | 2.12 |
| 5 | 136 | 2.38 |
| 6 | 168 | 2.94 |
| 7 | 140 | 2.45 |
| 8 | 163 | 2.86 |
| 9 | 171 | 3.00 |
| 10 | 186 | 3.26 |
| 11 | 217 | 3.80 |
| 12 | 91 | 1.59 |

Table 7.B.44 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Four

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 3,370 | 63.19 |
| 1 | 163 | 3.06 |
| 2 | 133 | 2.49 |
| 3 | 95 | 1.78 |
| 4 | 96 | 1.80 |
| 5 | 106 | 1.99 |
| 6 | 137 | 2.57 |
| 7 | 173 | 3.24 |
| 8 | 168 | 3.15 |
| 9 | 190 | 3.56 |
| 10 | 220 | 4.13 |
| 11 | 283 | 5.31 |
| 12 | 199 | 3.73 |

Table 7.B.45 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Five

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,956 | 59.98 |
| 1 | 151 | 3.06 |
| 2 | 136 | 2.76 |
| 3 | 110 | 2.23 |
| 4 | 109 | 2.21 |
| 5 | 103 | 2.09 |
| 6 | 137 | 2.78 |
| 7 | 152 | 3.08 |
| 8 | 131 | 2.66 |
| 9 | 203 | 4.12 |
| 10 | 221 | 4.48 |
| 11 | 283 | 5.74 |
| 12 | 236 | 4.79 |

Table 7.B.46 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Six

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,554 | 54.12 |
| 1 | 231 | 4.90 |
| 2 | 284 | 6.02 |
| 3 | 213 | 4.51 |
| 4 | 316 | 6.70 |
| 5 | 270 | 5.72 |
| 6 | 318 | 6.74 |
| 7 | 235 | 4.98 |
| 8 | 298 | 6.31 |

Table 7.B.47 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,705 | 54.15 |
| 1 | 260 | 5.21 |
| 2 | 338 | 6.77 |
| 3 | 233 | 4.66 |
| 4 | 320 | 6.41 |
| 5 | 266 | 5.33 |
| 6 | 296 | 5.93 |
| 7 | 241 | 4.82 |
| 8 | 336 | 6.73 |

Table 7.B.48 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,497 | 52.34 |
| 1 | 277 | 5.81 |
| 2 | 321 | 6.73 |
| 3 | 192 | 4.02 |
| 4 | 316 | 6.62 |
| 5 | 262 | 5.49 |
| 6 | 296 | 6.20 |
| 7 | 246 | 5.16 |
| 8 | 364 | 7.63 |

Table 7.B.49 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 6,796 | 65.05 |
| 1 | 454 | 4.35 |
| 2 | 425 | 4.07 |
| 3 | 327 | 3.13 |
| 4 | 458 | 4.38 |
| 5 | 402 | 3.85 |
| 6 | 500 | 4.79 |
| 7 | 417 | 3.99 |
| 8 | 669 | 6.40 |

Table 7.B.50 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 3,378 | 53.98 |
| 1 | 312 | 4.99 |
| 2 | 378 | 6.04 |
| 3 | 258 | 4.12 |
| 4 | 407 | 6.50 |
| 5 | 308 | 4.92 |
| 6 | 415 | 6.63 |
| 7 | 339 | 5.42 |
| 8 | 463 | 7.40 |

Table 7.B.51 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 2,682 | 50.98 |
| 1 | 256 | 4.87 |
| 2 | 285 | 5.42 |
| 3 | 212 | 4.03 |
| 4 | 352 | 6.69 |
| 5 | 271 | 5.15 |
| 6 | 380 | 7.22 |
| 7 | 325 | 6.18 |
| 8 | 498 | 9.47 |

Table 7.B.52 Raw Score Distribution—Writing, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 1,599 | 46.88 |
| 1 | 136 | 3.99 |
| 2 | 173 | 5.07 |
| 3 | 127 | 3.72 |
| 4 | 226 | 6.63 |
| 5 | 202 | 5.92 |
| 6 | 275 | 8.06 |
| 7 | 271 | 7.94 |
| 8 | 402 | 11.79 |

### Appendix 7.C: Raw Score, Scale Score, and Performance Level Distributions for Each Composite

**Note:** For table 7.C.1 through table 7.C.26, a very small number of students are exempt from one domain or use alternate assessments for a domain in a composite and receive non-zero raw scores for the other domain. Their results are not included in the tables for two reasons:

1. Their raw scores are based on the remaining domain, which makes them inconsistent in meaning with other students’ raw scores.
2. There are few students who are exempted from a domain or use alternate assessments for a domain and receive a non-zero raw score for the other domain. Reporting their scores would introduce privacy concerns.

Table 7.C.1 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 50 | 20,136 | 15.07 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 50 | 2,840 | 2.12 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 50 | 2,597 | 1.94 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 50 | 3,036 | 2.27 |
| 4 | 170 | 1 | 46 | 3,814 | 2.85 |
| 5 | 194 | 1 | 40 | 4,392 | 3.29 |
| 6 | 214 | 1 | 39 | 4,271 | 3.20 |
| 7 | 233 | 1 | 37 | 3,905 | 2.92 |
| 8 | 249 | 1 | 36 | 3,628 | 2.71 |
| 9 | 264 | 1 | 34 | 3,700 | 2.77 |
| 10 | 278 | 1 | 33 | 3,631 | 2.72 |
| 11 | 292 | 1 | 33 | 3,901 | 2.92 |
| 12 | 304 | 1 | 32 | 4,041 | 3.02 |
| 13 | 317 | 1 | 32 | 4,281 | 3.20 |
| 14 | 329 | 1 | 31 | 4,427 | 3.31 |
| 15 | 342 | 1 | 32 | 4,480 | 3.35 |
| 16 | 354 | 1 | 32 | 4,749 | 3.55 |
| 17 | 367 | 1 | 33 | 4,996 | 3.74 |
| 18 | 380 | 2 | 34 | 5,252 | 3.93 |
| 19 | 394 | 2 | 35 | 5,236 | 3.92 |
| 20 | 410 | 2 | 36 | 5,480 | 4.10 |
| 21 | 427 | 2 | 38 | 5,360 | 4.01 |
| 22 | 445 | 2 | 41 | 5,200 | 3.89 |
| 23 | 468 | 3 | 45 | 4,864 | 3.64 |
| 24 | 497 | 3 | 51 | 4,737 | 3.54 |
| 25 | 534 | 3 | 60 | 4,395 | 3.29 |
| 26 | 594 | 3 | 78 | 3,739 | 2.80 |
| 27 | 600 | 3 | 80 | 2,562 | 1.92 |

Table 7.C.2 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 52 | 2,938 | 23.30 |
| 1 | 152 | 1 | 51 | 530 | 4.20 |
| 2 | 171 | 1 | 46 | 447 | 3.54 |
| 3 | 203 | 1 | 42 | 486 | 3.85 |
| 4 | 227 | 1 | 37 | 462 | 3.66 |
| 5 | 246 | 1 | 33 | 394 | 3.12 |
| 6 | 262 | 1 | 31 | 331 | 2.62 |
| 7 | 276 | 1 | 29 | 270 | 2.14 |
| 8 | 288 | 1 | 27 | 242 | 1.92 |
| 9 | 300 | 1 | 26 | 228 | 1.81 |
| 10 | 311 | 1 | 26 | 210 | 1.67 |
| 11 | 320 | 1 | 25 | 249 | 1.97 |
| 12 | 330 | 1 | 25 | 262 | 2.08 |
| 13 | 340 | 1 | 25 | 241 | 1.91 |
| 14 | 350 | 1 | 25 | 270 | 2.14 |
| 15 | 359 | 1 | 25 | 296 | 2.35 |
| 16 | 369 | 1 | 25 | 330 | 2.62 |
| 17 | 379 | 2 | 26 | 351 | 2.78 |
| 18 | 390 | 2 | 27 | 362 | 2.87 |
| 19 | 401 | 2 | 28 | 320 | 2.54 |
| 20 | 413 | 2 | 29 | 367 | 2.91 |
| 21 | 427 | 2 | 30 | 405 | 3.21 |
| 22 | 441 | 2 | 32 | 368 | 2.92 |
| 23 | 457 | 3 | 33 | 354 | 2.81 |
| 24 | 475 | 3 | 36 | 360 | 2.85 |
| 25 | 496 | 3 | 40 | 383 | 3.04 |
| 26 | 522 | 3 | 44 | 360 | 2.85 |
| 27 | 557 | 3 | 47 | 321 | 2.55 |
| 28 | 599 | 3 | 63 | 286 | 2.27 |
| 29 | 600 | 3 | 63 | 189 | 1.50 |

Table 7.C.3 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 80 | 2,220 | 34.22 |
| 1 | 222 | 1 | 46 | 352 | 5.43 |
| 2 | 257 | 1 | 35 | 198 | 3.05 |
| 3 | 280 | 1 | 29 | 224 | 3.45 |
| 4 | 297 | 1 | 25 | 270 | 4.16 |
| 5 | 310 | 1 | 22 | 283 | 4.36 |
| 6 | 321 | 1 | 20 | 189 | 2.91 |
| 7 | 330 | 1 | 18 | 117 | 1.80 |
| 8 | 338 | 1 | 16 | 87 | 1.34 |
| 9 | 345 | 1 | 15 | 61 | 0.94 |
| 10 | 350 | 1 | 14 | 79 | 1.22 |
| 11 | 356 | 1 | 14 | 65 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 362 | 1 | 14 | 44 | 0.68 |
| 13 | 367 | 1 | 14 | 52 | 0.80 |
| 14 | 372 | 2 | 13 | 40 | 0.62 |
| 15 | 378 | 2 | 13 | 61 | 0.94 |
| 16 | 383 | 2 | 14 | 57 | 0.88 |
| 17 | 389 | 2 | 14 | 67 | 1.03 |
| 18 | 394 | 2 | 15 | 70 | 1.08 |
| 19 | 401 | 2 | 16 | 79 | 1.22 |
| 20 | 408 | 2 | 16 | 102 | 1.57 |
| 21 | 416 | 2 | 17 | 116 | 1.79 |
| 22 | 424 | 2 | 19 | 109 | 1.68 |
| 23 | 434 | 2 | 20 | 116 | 1.79 |
| 24 | 446 | 2 | 22 | 144 | 2.22 |
| 25 | 460 | 3 | 25 | 162 | 2.50 |
| 26 | 477 | 3 | 28 | 226 | 3.48 |
| 27 | 500 | 3 | 33 | 301 | 4.64 |
| 28 | 535 | 3 | 38 | 310 | 4.78 |
| 29 | 600 | 3 | 72 | 287 | 4.42 |

Table 7.C.4 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 1,556 | 27.26 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 362 | 6.34 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 204 | 3.57 |
| 3 | 151 | 1 | 56 | 238 | 4.17 |
| 4 | 166 | 1 | 52 | 308 | 5.39 |
| 5 | 194 | 1 | 45 | 293 | 5.13 |
| 6 | 217 | 1 | 40 | 250 | 4.38 |
| 7 | 237 | 1 | 37 | 163 | 2.86 |
| 8 | 254 | 1 | 35 | 116 | 2.03 |
| 9 | 269 | 1 | 33 | 85 | 1.49 |
| 10 | 284 | 1 | 31 | 70 | 1.23 |
| 11 | 297 | 1 | 30 | 73 | 1.28 |
| 12 | 309 | 1 | 29 | 52 | 0.91 |
| 13 | 321 | 1 | 28 | 51 | 0.89 |
| 14 | 333 | 1 | 28 | 51 | 0.89 |
| 15 | 344 | 1 | 27 | 65 | 1.14 |
| 16 | 355 | 1 | 27 | 65 | 1.14 |
| 17 | 366 | 1 | 27 | 57 | 1.00 |
| 18 | 377 | 2 | 27 | 72 | 1.26 |
| 19 | 389 | 2 | 28 | 85 | 1.49 |
| 20 | 401 | 2 | 28 | 89 | 1.56 |
| 21 | 414 | 2 | 29 | 108 | 1.89 |
| 22 | 427 | 2 | 31 | 109 | 1.91 |
| 23 | 442 | 2 | 33 | 141 | 2.47 |
| 24 | 460 | 3 | 36 | 151 | 2.64 |
| 25 | 479 | 3 | 39 | 147 | 2.57 |
| 26 | 503 | 3 | 44 | 182 | 3.19 |
| 27 | 533 | 3 | 48 | 190 | 3.33 |
| 28 | 573 | 3 | 61 | 171 | 3.00 |
| 29 | 599 | 3 | 69 | 137 | 2.40 |
| 30 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 68 | 1.19 |

Table 7.C.5 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Four

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 1,280 | 24.01 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 311 | 5.83 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 217 | 4.07 |
| 3 | 151 | 1 | 56 | 196 | 3.68 |
| 4 | 166 | 1 | 52 | 306 | 5.74 |
| 5 | 194 | 1 | 45 | 309 | 5.80 |
| 6 | 217 | 1 | 40 | 265 | 4.97 |
| 7 | 237 | 1 | 37 | 143 | 2.68 |
| 8 | 254 | 1 | 35 | 99 | 1.86 |
| 9 | 269 | 1 | 33 | 90 | 1.69 |
| 10 | 284 | 1 | 31 | 65 | 1.22 |
| 11 | 297 | 1 | 30 | 64 | 1.20 |
| 12 | 309 | 1 | 29 | 52 | 0.98 |
| 13 | 321 | 1 | 28 | 58 | 1.09 |
| 14 | 333 | 1 | 28 | 43 | 0.81 |
| 15 | 344 | 1 | 27 | 41 | 0.77 |
| 16 | 355 | 1 | 27 | 51 | 0.96 |
| 17 | 366 | 1 | 27 | 36 | 0.68 |
| 18 | 377 | 2 | 27 | 47 | 0.88 |
| 19 | 389 | 2 | 28 | 67 | 1.26 |
| 20 | 401 | 2 | 28 | 63 | 1.18 |
| 21 | 414 | 2 | 29 | 85 | 1.59 |
| 22 | 427 | 2 | 31 | 87 | 1.63 |
| 23 | 442 | 2 | 33 | 103 | 1.93 |
| 24 | 460 | 3 | 36 | 147 | 2.76 |
| 25 | 479 | 3 | 39 | 172 | 3.23 |
| 26 | 503 | 3 | 44 | 175 | 3.28 |
| 27 | 533 | 3 | 48 | 210 | 3.94 |
| 28 | 573 | 3 | 61 | 234 | 4.39 |
| 29 | 599 | 3 | 69 | 198 | 3.71 |
| 30 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 118 | 2.21 |

Table 7.C.6 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 975 | 19.79 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 279 | 5.66 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 185 | 3.75 |
| 3 | 151 | 1 | 56 | 222 | 4.51 |
| 4 | 166 | 1 | 52 | 275 | 5.58 |
| 5 | 194 | 1 | 45 | 288 | 5.85 |
| 6 | 217 | 1 | 40 | 249 | 5.05 |
| 7 | 237 | 1 | 37 | 167 | 3.39 |
| 8 | 254 | 1 | 35 | 110 | 2.23 |
| 9 | 269 | 1 | 33 | 89 | 1.81 |
| 10 | 284 | 1 | 31 | 81 | 1.64 |
| 11 | 297 | 1 | 30 | 64 | 1.30 |
| 12 | 309 | 1 | 29 | 68 | 1.38 |
| 13 | 321 | 1 | 28 | 68 | 1.38 |
| 14 | 333 | 1 | 28 | 59 | 1.20 |
| 15 | 344 | 1 | 27 | 51 | 1.04 |
| 16 | 355 | 1 | 27 | 52 | 1.06 |
| 17 | 366 | 1 | 27 | 41 | 0.83 |
| 18 | 377 | 2 | 27 | 41 | 0.83 |
| 19 | 389 | 2 | 28 | 51 | 1.04 |
| 20 | 401 | 2 | 28 | 53 | 1.08 |
| 21 | 414 | 2 | 29 | 62 | 1.26 |
| 22 | 427 | 2 | 31 | 80 | 1.62 |
| 23 | 442 | 2 | 33 | 86 | 1.75 |
| 24 | 460 | 3 | 36 | 107 | 2.17 |
| 25 | 479 | 3 | 39 | 147 | 2.98 |
| 26 | 503 | 3 | 44 | 144 | 2.92 |
| 27 | 533 | 3 | 48 | 197 | 4.00 |
| 28 | 573 | 3 | 61 | 226 | 4.59 |
| 29 | 599 | 3 | 69 | 243 | 4.93 |
| 30 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 167 | 3.39 |

Table 7.C.7 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 764 | 16.19 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 221 | 4.68 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 103 | 2.18 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 157 | 3.33 |
| 4 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 199 | 4.22 |
| 5 | 155 | 1 | 50 | 256 | 5.43 |
| 6 | 176 | 1 | 46 | 257 | 5.45 |
| 7 | 197 | 1 | 42 | 258 | 5.47 |
| 8 | 216 | 1 | 40 | 159 | 3.37 |
| 9 | 234 | 1 | 38 | 92 | 1.95 |
| 10 | 250 | 1 | 37 | 67 | 1.42 |
| 11 | 265 | 1 | 35 | 54 | 1.14 |
| 12 | 279 | 1 | 34 | 56 | 1.19 |
| 13 | 293 | 1 | 33 | 60 | 1.27 |
| 14 | 306 | 1 | 32 | 52 | 1.10 |
| 15 | 320 | 1 | 32 | 49 | 1.04 |
| 16 | 332 | 1 | 32 | 46 | 0.97 |
| 17 | 345 | 1 | 32 | 53 | 1.12 |
| 18 | 359 | 1 | 32 | 54 | 1.14 |
| 19 | 372 | 2 | 32 | 72 | 1.53 |
| 20 | 386 | 2 | 33 | 64 | 1.36 |
| 21 | 401 | 2 | 34 | 83 | 1.76 |
| 22 | 417 | 2 | 35 | 80 | 1.70 |
| 23 | 434 | 2 | 37 | 105 | 2.23 |
| 24 | 453 | 3 | 40 | 122 | 2.59 |
| 25 | 475 | 3 | 44 | 172 | 3.65 |
| 26 | 500 | 3 | 48 | 158 | 3.35 |
| 27 | 530 | 3 | 50 | 189 | 4.01 |
| 28 | 566 | 3 | 60 | 197 | 4.18 |
| 29 | 598 | 3 | 69 | 211 | 4.47 |
| 30 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 191 | 4.05 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 117 | 2.48 |

Table 7.C.8 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 779 | 15.60 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 227 | 4.54 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 125 | 2.50 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 136 | 2.72 |
| 4 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 203 | 4.06 |
| 5 | 155 | 1 | 50 | 317 | 6.35 |
| 6 | 176 | 1 | 46 | 295 | 5.91 |
| 7 | 197 | 1 | 42 | 286 | 5.73 |
| 8 | 216 | 1 | 40 | 183 | 3.66 |
| 9 | 234 | 1 | 38 | 137 | 2.74 |
| 10 | 250 | 1 | 37 | 94 | 1.88 |
| 11 | 265 | 1 | 35 | 81 | 1.62 |
| 12 | 279 | 1 | 34 | 72 | 1.44 |
| 13 | 293 | 1 | 33 | 52 | 1.04 |
| 14 | 306 | 1 | 32 | 75 | 1.50 |
| 15 | 320 | 1 | 32 | 49 | 0.98 |
| 16 | 332 | 1 | 32 | 57 | 1.14 |
| 17 | 345 | 1 | 32 | 55 | 1.10 |
| 18 | 359 | 1 | 32 | 62 | 1.24 |
| 19 | 372 | 2 | 32 | 55 | 1.10 |
| 20 | 386 | 2 | 33 | 86 | 1.72 |
| 21 | 401 | 2 | 34 | 79 | 1.58 |
| 22 | 417 | 2 | 35 | 82 | 1.64 |
| 23 | 434 | 2 | 37 | 101 | 2.02 |
| 24 | 453 | 3 | 40 | 100 | 2.00 |
| 25 | 475 | 3 | 44 | 160 | 3.20 |
| 26 | 500 | 3 | 48 | 127 | 2.54 |
| 27 | 530 | 3 | 50 | 179 | 3.58 |
| 28 | 566 | 3 | 60 | 189 | 3.78 |
| 29 | 598 | 3 | 69 | 205 | 4.10 |
| 30 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 194 | 3.88 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 153 | 3.06 |

Table 7.C.9 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 687 | 14.40 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 213 | 4.47 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 129 | 2.70 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 135 | 2.83 |
| 4 | 150 | 1 | 51 | 200 | 4.19 |
| 5 | 155 | 1 | 50 | 269 | 5.64 |
| 6 | 176 | 1 | 46 | 312 | 6.54 |
| 7 | 197 | 1 | 42 | 260 | 5.45 |
| 8 | 216 | 1 | 40 | 182 | 3.82 |
| 9 | 234 | 1 | 38 | 127 | 2.66 |
| 10 | 250 | 1 | 37 | 76 | 1.59 |
| 11 | 265 | 1 | 35 | 69 | 1.45 |
| 12 | 279 | 1 | 34 | 68 | 1.43 |
| 13 | 293 | 1 | 33 | 59 | 1.24 |
| 14 | 306 | 1 | 32 | 62 | 1.30 |
| 15 | 320 | 1 | 32 | 64 | 1.34 |
| 16 | 332 | 1 | 32 | 60 | 1.26 |
| 17 | 345 | 1 | 32 | 67 | 1.40 |
| 18 | 359 | 1 | 32 | 71 | 1.49 |
| 19 | 372 | 2 | 32 | 66 | 1.38 |
| 20 | 386 | 2 | 33 | 56 | 1.17 |
| 21 | 401 | 2 | 34 | 72 | 1.51 |
| 22 | 417 | 2 | 35 | 76 | 1.59 |
| 23 | 434 | 2 | 37 | 94 | 1.97 |
| 24 | 453 | 3 | 40 | 106 | 2.22 |
| 25 | 475 | 3 | 44 | 145 | 3.04 |
| 26 | 500 | 3 | 48 | 137 | 2.87 |
| 27 | 530 | 3 | 50 | 179 | 3.75 |
| 28 | 566 | 3 | 60 | 171 | 3.58 |
| 29 | 598 | 3 | 69 | 201 | 4.21 |
| 30 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 200 | 4.19 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 69 | 157 | 3.29 |

Table 7.C.10 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 1,456 | 13.94 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 625 | 5.98 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 563 | 5.39 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 677 | 6.48 |
| 4 | 155 | 1 | 48 | 890 | 8.52 |
| 5 | 180 | 1 | 43 | 939 | 8.99 |
| 6 | 201 | 1 | 39 | 804 | 7.70 |
| 7 | 219 | 1 | 37 | 523 | 5.01 |
| 8 | 236 | 1 | 35 | 295 | 2.82 |
| 9 | 252 | 1 | 34 | 206 | 1.97 |
| 10 | 266 | 1 | 32 | 182 | 1.74 |
| 11 | 279 | 1 | 31 | 135 | 1.29 |
| 12 | 292 | 1 | 30 | 117 | 1.12 |
| 13 | 304 | 1 | 30 | 108 | 1.03 |
| 14 | 316 | 1 | 29 | 124 | 1.19 |
| 15 | 327 | 1 | 29 | 104 | 1.00 |
| 16 | 340 | 1 | 29 | 75 | 0.72 |
| 17 | 351 | 1 | 29 | 79 | 0.76 |
| 18 | 364 | 1 | 30 | 104 | 1.00 |
| 19 | 376 | 2 | 31 | 103 | 0.99 |
| 20 | 389 | 2 | 32 | 99 | 0.95 |
| 21 | 403 | 2 | 32 | 117 | 1.12 |
| 22 | 418 | 2 | 34 | 125 | 1.20 |
| 23 | 433 | 2 | 35 | 125 | 1.20 |
| 24 | 450 | 3 | 37 | 156 | 1.49 |
| 25 | 469 | 3 | 40 | 158 | 1.51 |
| 26 | 491 | 3 | 44 | 199 | 1.90 |
| 27 | 516 | 3 | 49 | 223 | 2.13 |
| 28 | 548 | 3 | 56 | 252 | 2.41 |
| 29 | 590 | 3 | 68 | 305 | 2.92 |
| 30 | 599 | 3 | 71 | 330 | 3.16 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 71 | 250 | 2.39 |

Table 7.C.11 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 905 | 14.46 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 270 | 4.31 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 234 | 3.74 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 269 | 4.30 |
| 4 | 155 | 1 | 48 | 402 | 6.42 |
| 5 | 180 | 1 | 43 | 454 | 7.25 |
| 6 | 201 | 1 | 39 | 395 | 6.31 |
| 7 | 219 | 1 | 37 | 273 | 4.36 |
| 8 | 236 | 1 | 35 | 184 | 2.94 |
| 9 | 252 | 1 | 34 | 167 | 2.67 |
| 10 | 266 | 1 | 32 | 140 | 2.24 |
| 11 | 279 | 1 | 31 | 112 | 1.79 |
| 12 | 292 | 1 | 30 | 95 | 1.52 |
| 13 | 304 | 1 | 30 | 80 | 1.28 |
| 14 | 316 | 1 | 29 | 72 | 1.15 |
| 15 | 327 | 1 | 29 | 78 | 1.25 |
| 16 | 340 | 1 | 29 | 83 | 1.33 |
| 17 | 351 | 1 | 29 | 74 | 1.18 |
| 18 | 364 | 1 | 30 | 86 | 1.37 |
| 19 | 376 | 2 | 31 | 91 | 1.45 |
| 20 | 389 | 2 | 32 | 108 | 1.73 |
| 21 | 403 | 2 | 32 | 85 | 1.36 |
| 22 | 418 | 2 | 34 | 92 | 1.47 |
| 23 | 433 | 2 | 35 | 119 | 1.90 |
| 24 | 450 | 3 | 37 | 126 | 2.01 |
| 25 | 469 | 3 | 40 | 131 | 2.09 |
| 26 | 491 | 3 | 44 | 134 | 2.14 |
| 27 | 516 | 3 | 49 | 135 | 2.16 |
| 28 | 548 | 3 | 56 | 192 | 3.07 |
| 29 | 590 | 3 | 68 | 239 | 3.82 |
| 30 | 599 | 3 | 71 | 253 | 4.04 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 71 | 180 | 2.88 |

Table 7.C.12 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 749 | 14.24 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 241 | 4.58 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 204 | 3.88 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 224 | 4.26 |
| 4 | 155 | 1 | 48 | 358 | 6.81 |
| 5 | 180 | 1 | 43 | 339 | 6.44 |
| 6 | 201 | 1 | 39 | 293 | 5.57 |
| 7 | 219 | 1 | 37 | 201 | 3.82 |
| 8 | 236 | 1 | 35 | 138 | 2.62 |
| 9 | 252 | 1 | 34 | 114 | 2.17 |
| 10 | 266 | 1 | 32 | 72 | 1.37 |
| 11 | 279 | 1 | 31 | 81 | 1.54 |
| 12 | 292 | 1 | 30 | 79 | 1.50 |
| 13 | 304 | 1 | 30 | 69 | 1.31 |
| 14 | 316 | 1 | 29 | 79 | 1.50 |
| 15 | 327 | 1 | 29 | 61 | 1.16 |
| 16 | 340 | 1 | 29 | 67 | 1.27 |
| 17 | 351 | 1 | 29 | 48 | 0.91 |
| 18 | 364 | 1 | 30 | 71 | 1.35 |
| 19 | 376 | 2 | 31 | 67 | 1.27 |
| 20 | 389 | 2 | 32 | 80 | 1.52 |
| 21 | 403 | 2 | 32 | 85 | 1.62 |
| 22 | 418 | 2 | 34 | 77 | 1.46 |
| 23 | 433 | 2 | 35 | 87 | 1.65 |
| 24 | 450 | 3 | 37 | 95 | 1.81 |
| 25 | 469 | 3 | 40 | 118 | 2.24 |
| 26 | 491 | 3 | 44 | 126 | 2.40 |
| 27 | 516 | 3 | 49 | 166 | 3.16 |
| 28 | 548 | 3 | 56 | 205 | 3.90 |
| 29 | 590 | 3 | 68 | 259 | 4.92 |
| 30 | 599 | 3 | 71 | 242 | 4.60 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 71 | 165 | 3.14 |

Table 7.C.13 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Oral Language, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 457 | 13.40 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 145 | 4.25 |
| 2 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 119 | 3.49 |
| 3 | 150 | 1 | 49 | 121 | 3.55 |
| 4 | 155 | 1 | 48 | 190 | 5.57 |
| 5 | 180 | 1 | 43 | 208 | 6.10 |
| 6 | 201 | 1 | 39 | 176 | 5.16 |
| 7 | 219 | 1 | 37 | 114 | 3.34 |
| 8 | 236 | 1 | 35 | 87 | 2.55 |
| 9 | 252 | 1 | 34 | 61 | 1.79 |
| 10 | 266 | 1 | 32 | 50 | 1.47 |
| 11 | 279 | 1 | 31 | 46 | 1.35 |
| 12 | 292 | 1 | 30 | 58 | 1.70 |
| 13 | 304 | 1 | 30 | 37 | 1.08 |
| 14 | 316 | 1 | 29 | 32 | 0.94 |
| 15 | 327 | 1 | 29 | 41 | 1.20 |
| 16 | 340 | 1 | 29 | 29 | 0.85 |
| 17 | 351 | 1 | 29 | 36 | 1.06 |
| 18 | 364 | 1 | 30 | 44 | 1.29 |
| 19 | 376 | 2 | 31 | 54 | 1.58 |
| 20 | 389 | 2 | 32 | 47 | 1.38 |
| 21 | 403 | 2 | 32 | 47 | 1.38 |
| 22 | 418 | 2 | 34 | 56 | 1.64 |
| 23 | 433 | 2 | 35 | 57 | 1.67 |
| 24 | 450 | 3 | 37 | 60 | 1.76 |
| 25 | 469 | 3 | 40 | 99 | 2.90 |
| 26 | 491 | 3 | 44 | 94 | 2.76 |
| 27 | 516 | 3 | 49 | 138 | 4.05 |
| 28 | 548 | 3 | 56 | 130 | 3.81 |
| 29 | 590 | 3 | 68 | 204 | 5.98 |
| 30 | 599 | 3 | 71 | 191 | 5.60 |
| 31 | 600 | 3 | 71 | 183 | 5.36 |

Table 7.C.14 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 55 | 29,505 | 22.08 |
| 1 | 164 | 1 | 49 | 8,962 | 6.71 |
| 2 | 202 | 1 | 37 | 9,049 | 6.77 |
| 3 | 227 | 1 | 32 | 9,844 | 7.37 |
| 4 | 246 | 1 | 29 | 10,649 | 7.97 |
| 5 | 263 | 1 | 27 | 10,865 | 8.13 |
| 6 | 278 | 1 | 26 | 9,170 | 6.86 |
| 7 | 292 | 1 | 25 | 7,549 | 5.65 |
| 8 | 305 | 1 | 24 | 5,747 | 4.30 |
| 9 | 317 | 1 | 23 | 4,541 | 3.40 |
| 10 | 328 | 1 | 23 | 3,463 | 2.59 |
| 11 | 340 | 1 | 22 | 2,864 | 2.14 |
| 12 | 350 | 1 | 22 | 2,364 | 1.77 |
| 13 | 361 | 1 | 22 | 2,172 | 1.63 |
| 14 | 372 | 2 | 22 | 1,899 | 1.42 |
| 15 | 383 | 2 | 23 | 1,775 | 1.33 |
| 16 | 394 | 2 | 23 | 1,672 | 1.25 |
| 17 | 406 | 2 | 24 | 1,461 | 1.09 |
| 18 | 419 | 2 | 25 | 1,367 | 1.02 |
| 19 | 435 | 2 | 28 | 1,357 | 1.02 |
| 20 | 453 | 3 | 31 | 1,349 | 1.01 |
| 21 | 477 | 3 | 36 | 1,537 | 1.15 |
| 22 | 515 | 3 | 49 | 1,600 | 1.20 |
| 23 | 600 | 3 | 111 | 2,889 | 2.16 |

Table 7.C.15 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 69 | 3,298 | 26.15 |
| 1 | 190 | 1 | 46 | 624 | 4.95 |
| 2 | 226 | 1 | 34 | 543 | 4.31 |
| 3 | 248 | 1 | 29 | 618 | 4.90 |
| 4 | 265 | 1 | 26 | 659 | 5.23 |
| 5 | 280 | 1 | 24 | 601 | 4.77 |
| 6 | 292 | 1 | 23 | 568 | 4.50 |
| 7 | 303 | 1 | 22 | 459 | 3.64 |
| 8 | 314 | 1 | 21 | 454 | 3.60 |
| 9 | 323 | 1 | 20 | 360 | 2.85 |
| 10 | 332 | 1 | 20 | 315 | 2.50 |
| 11 | 341 | 1 | 20 | 273 | 2.16 |
| 12 | 350 | 1 | 20 | 260 | 2.06 |
| 13 | 359 | 1 | 20 | 255 | 2.02 |
| 14 | 369 | 1 | 21 | 249 | 1.97 |
| 15 | 379 | 2 | 21 | 238 | 1.89 |
| 16 | 389 | 2 | 22 | 217 | 1.72 |
| 17 | 401 | 2 | 23 | 264 | 2.09 |
| 18 | 414 | 2 | 25 | 272 | 2.16 |
| 19 | 429 | 2 | 27 | 337 | 2.67 |
| 20 | 448 | 2 | 30 | 349 | 2.77 |
| 21 | 472 | 3 | 36 | 379 | 3.01 |
| 22 | 511 | 3 | 48 | 422 | 3.35 |
| 23 | 600 | 3 | 112 | 598 | 4.74 |

Table 7.C.16 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 88 | 1,754 | 27.03 |
| 1 | 218 | 1 | 41 | 277 | 4.27 |
| 2 | 251 | 1 | 30 | 291 | 4.49 |
| 3 | 271 | 1 | 26 | 324 | 4.99 |
| 4 | 287 | 1 | 23 | 358 | 5.52 |
| 5 | 300 | 1 | 21 | 363 | 5.59 |
| 6 | 311 | 1 | 20 | 321 | 4.95 |
| 7 | 321 | 1 | 19 | 231 | 3.56 |
| 8 | 330 | 1 | 18 | 192 | 2.96 |
| 9 | 338 | 1 | 17 | 142 | 2.19 |
| 10 | 346 | 1 | 17 | 105 | 1.62 |
| 11 | 354 | 1 | 17 | 111 | 1.71 |
| 12 | 361 | 1 | 17 | 94 | 1.45 |
| 13 | 369 | 1 | 17 | 97 | 1.50 |
| 14 | 377 | 2 | 17 | 117 | 1.80 |
| 15 | 385 | 2 | 18 | 100 | 1.54 |
| 16 | 394 | 2 | 19 | 99 | 1.53 |
| 17 | 404 | 2 | 20 | 120 | 1.85 |
| 18 | 415 | 2 | 21 | 131 | 2.02 |
| 19 | 429 | 2 | 23 | 179 | 2.76 |
| 20 | 446 | 2 | 27 | 188 | 2.90 |
| 21 | 469 | 3 | 32 | 228 | 3.51 |
| 22 | 505 | 3 | 43 | 317 | 4.89 |
| 23 | 600 | 3 | 114 | 349 | 5.38 |

Table 7.C.17 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 2,554 | 44.74 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 463 | 8.11 |
| 2 | 154 | 1 | 56 | 333 | 5.83 |
| 3 | 190 | 1 | 47 | 351 | 6.15 |
| 4 | 217 | 1 | 42 | 254 | 4.45 |
| 5 | 239 | 1 | 39 | 183 | 3.21 |
| 6 | 259 | 1 | 37 | 114 | 2.00 |
| 7 | 276 | 1 | 35 | 87 | 1.52 |
| 8 | 293 | 1 | 34 | 88 | 1.54 |
| 9 | 309 | 1 | 34 | 82 | 1.44 |
| 10 | 324 | 1 | 34 | 88 | 1.54 |
| 11 | 339 | 1 | 34 | 105 | 1.84 |
| 12 | 355 | 1 | 34 | 102 | 1.79 |
| 13 | 370 | 2 | 34 | 115 | 2.01 |
| 14 | 387 | 2 | 35 | 98 | 1.72 |
| 15 | 404 | 2 | 36 | 89 | 1.56 |
| 16 | 422 | 2 | 38 | 111 | 1.94 |
| 17 | 443 | 2 | 40 | 101 | 1.77 |
| 18 | 465 | 3 | 43 | 95 | 1.66 |
| 19 | 493 | 3 | 47 | 111 | 1.94 |
| 20 | 528 | 3 | 56 | 98 | 1.72 |
| 21 | 584 | 3 | 76 | 61 | 1.07 |
| 22 | 600 | 3 | 84 | 26 | 0.46 |

Table 7.C.18 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Four

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 2,031 | 38.08 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 385 | 7.22 |
| 2 | 154 | 1 | 56 | 346 | 6.49 |
| 3 | 190 | 1 | 47 | 361 | 6.77 |
| 4 | 217 | 1 | 42 | 264 | 4.95 |
| 5 | 239 | 1 | 39 | 189 | 3.54 |
| 6 | 259 | 1 | 37 | 113 | 2.12 |
| 7 | 276 | 1 | 35 | 79 | 1.48 |
| 8 | 293 | 1 | 34 | 72 | 1.35 |
| 9 | 309 | 1 | 34 | 73 | 1.37 |
| 10 | 324 | 1 | 34 | 85 | 1.59 |
| 11 | 339 | 1 | 34 | 73 | 1.37 |
| 12 | 355 | 1 | 34 | 105 | 1.97 |
| 13 | 370 | 2 | 34 | 90 | 1.69 |
| 14 | 387 | 2 | 35 | 91 | 1.71 |
| 15 | 404 | 2 | 36 | 112 | 2.10 |
| 16 | 422 | 2 | 38 | 119 | 2.23 |
| 17 | 443 | 2 | 40 | 132 | 2.48 |
| 18 | 465 | 3 | 43 | 140 | 2.63 |
| 19 | 493 | 3 | 47 | 154 | 2.89 |
| 20 | 528 | 3 | 56 | 130 | 2.44 |
| 21 | 584 | 3 | 76 | 122 | 2.29 |
| 22 | 600 | 3 | 84 | 67 | 1.26 |

Table 7.C.19 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 1,653 | 33.55 |
| 1 | 150 | 1 | 57 | 368 | 7.47 |
| 2 | 154 | 1 | 56 | 312 | 6.33 |
| 3 | 190 | 1 | 47 | 380 | 7.71 |
| 4 | 217 | 1 | 42 | 256 | 5.20 |
| 5 | 239 | 1 | 39 | 178 | 3.61 |
| 6 | 259 | 1 | 37 | 134 | 2.72 |
| 7 | 276 | 1 | 35 | 79 | 1.60 |
| 8 | 293 | 1 | 34 | 81 | 1.64 |
| 9 | 309 | 1 | 34 | 60 | 1.22 |
| 10 | 324 | 1 | 34 | 71 | 1.44 |
| 11 | 339 | 1 | 34 | 68 | 1.38 |
| 12 | 355 | 1 | 34 | 104 | 2.11 |
| 13 | 370 | 2 | 34 | 76 | 1.54 |
| 14 | 387 | 2 | 35 | 88 | 1.79 |
| 15 | 404 | 2 | 36 | 89 | 1.81 |
| 16 | 422 | 2 | 38 | 116 | 2.35 |
| 17 | 443 | 2 | 40 | 131 | 2.66 |
| 18 | 465 | 3 | 43 | 130 | 2.64 |
| 19 | 493 | 3 | 47 | 140 | 2.84 |
| 20 | 528 | 3 | 56 | 155 | 3.15 |
| 21 | 584 | 3 | 76 | 145 | 2.94 |
| 22 | 600 | 3 | 84 | 113 | 2.29 |

Table 7.C.20 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 89 | 1,293 | 27.41 |
| 1 | 212 | 1 | 51 | 376 | 7.97 |
| 2 | 251 | 1 | 37 | 374 | 7.93 |
| 3 | 275 | 1 | 31 | 361 | 7.65 |
| 4 | 293 | 1 | 28 | 283 | 6.00 |
| 5 | 309 | 1 | 26 | 232 | 4.92 |
| 6 | 323 | 1 | 25 | 156 | 3.31 |
| 7 | 336 | 1 | 25 | 156 | 3.31 |
| 8 | 348 | 1 | 25 | 168 | 3.56 |
| 9 | 361 | 1 | 25 | 142 | 3.01 |
| 10 | 374 | 2 | 25 | 155 | 3.29 |
| 11 | 387 | 2 | 25 | 152 | 3.22 |
| 12 | 401 | 2 | 26 | 143 | 3.03 |
| 13 | 416 | 2 | 27 | 145 | 3.07 |
| 14 | 433 | 2 | 29 | 143 | 3.03 |
| 15 | 452 | 3 | 32 | 141 | 2.99 |
| 16 | 477 | 3 | 37 | 128 | 2.71 |
| 17 | 515 | 3 | 50 | 109 | 2.31 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 113 | 61 | 1.29 |

Table 7.C.21 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 89 | 1,285 | 25.73 |
| 1 | 212 | 1 | 51 | 457 | 9.15 |
| 2 | 251 | 1 | 37 | 419 | 8.39 |
| 3 | 275 | 1 | 31 | 412 | 8.25 |
| 4 | 293 | 1 | 28 | 332 | 6.65 |
| 5 | 309 | 1 | 26 | 210 | 4.20 |
| 6 | 323 | 1 | 25 | 171 | 3.42 |
| 7 | 336 | 1 | 25 | 162 | 3.24 |
| 8 | 348 | 1 | 25 | 153 | 3.06 |
| 9 | 361 | 1 | 25 | 181 | 3.62 |
| 10 | 374 | 2 | 25 | 138 | 2.76 |
| 11 | 387 | 2 | 25 | 165 | 3.30 |
| 12 | 401 | 2 | 26 | 133 | 2.66 |
| 13 | 416 | 2 | 27 | 136 | 2.72 |
| 14 | 433 | 2 | 29 | 145 | 2.90 |
| 15 | 452 | 3 | 32 | 117 | 2.34 |
| 16 | 477 | 3 | 37 | 139 | 2.78 |
| 17 | 515 | 3 | 50 | 144 | 2.88 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 113 | 96 | 1.92 |

Table 7.C.22 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 89 | 1,100 | 23.06 |
| 1 | 212 | 1 | 51 | 393 | 8.24 |
| 2 | 251 | 1 | 37 | 409 | 8.57 |
| 3 | 275 | 1 | 31 | 418 | 8.76 |
| 4 | 293 | 1 | 28 | 332 | 6.96 |
| 5 | 309 | 1 | 26 | 215 | 4.51 |
| 6 | 323 | 1 | 25 | 179 | 3.75 |
| 7 | 336 | 1 | 25 | 151 | 3.16 |
| 8 | 348 | 1 | 25 | 143 | 3.00 |
| 9 | 361 | 1 | 25 | 169 | 3.54 |
| 10 | 374 | 2 | 25 | 157 | 3.29 |
| 11 | 387 | 2 | 25 | 127 | 2.66 |
| 12 | 401 | 2 | 26 | 140 | 2.93 |
| 13 | 416 | 2 | 27 | 154 | 3.23 |
| 14 | 433 | 2 | 29 | 130 | 2.72 |
| 15 | 452 | 3 | 32 | 135 | 2.83 |
| 16 | 477 | 3 | 37 | 150 | 3.14 |
| 17 | 515 | 3 | 50 | 158 | 3.31 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 113 | 111 | 2.33 |

Table 7.C.23 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 72 | 2,076 | 19.87 |
| 1 | 163 | 1 | 67 | 967 | 9.26 |
| 2 | 213 | 1 | 48 | 1,103 | 10.56 |
| 3 | 243 | 1 | 40 | 1,222 | 11.70 |
| 4 | 266 | 1 | 35 | 1,019 | 9.75 |
| 5 | 284 | 1 | 33 | 668 | 6.39 |
| 6 | 300 | 1 | 31 | 415 | 3.97 |
| 7 | 315 | 1 | 30 | 256 | 2.45 |
| 8 | 330 | 1 | 30 | 258 | 2.47 |
| 9 | 345 | 1 | 30 | 228 | 2.18 |
| 10 | 360 | 1 | 31 | 256 | 2.45 |
| 11 | 376 | 2 | 32 | 233 | 2.23 |
| 12 | 393 | 2 | 33 | 236 | 2.26 |
| 13 | 411 | 2 | 35 | 262 | 2.51 |
| 14 | 432 | 2 | 37 | 279 | 2.67 |
| 15 | 457 | 3 | 41 | 290 | 2.78 |
| 16 | 490 | 3 | 49 | 271 | 2.59 |
| 17 | 540 | 3 | 66 | 247 | 2.36 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 100 | 162 | 1.55 |

Table 7.C.24 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 72 | 1,192 | 19.05 |
| 1 | 163 | 1 | 67 | 414 | 6.62 |
| 2 | 213 | 1 | 48 | 496 | 7.93 |
| 3 | 243 | 1 | 40 | 522 | 8.34 |
| 4 | 266 | 1 | 35 | 559 | 8.93 |
| 5 | 284 | 1 | 33 | 397 | 6.34 |
| 6 | 300 | 1 | 31 | 292 | 4.67 |
| 7 | 315 | 1 | 30 | 230 | 3.68 |
| 8 | 330 | 1 | 30 | 207 | 3.31 |
| 9 | 345 | 1 | 30 | 211 | 3.37 |
| 10 | 360 | 1 | 31 | 162 | 2.59 |
| 11 | 376 | 2 | 32 | 197 | 3.15 |
| 12 | 393 | 2 | 33 | 218 | 3.48 |
| 13 | 411 | 2 | 35 | 198 | 3.16 |
| 14 | 432 | 2 | 37 | 213 | 3.40 |
| 15 | 457 | 3 | 41 | 218 | 3.48 |
| 16 | 490 | 3 | 49 | 245 | 3.91 |
| 17 | 540 | 3 | 66 | 181 | 2.89 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 100 | 106 | 1.69 |

Table 7.C.25 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 72 | 1,015 | 19.29 |
| 1 | 163 | 1 | 67 | 300 | 5.70 |
| 2 | 213 | 1 | 48 | 372 | 7.07 |
| 3 | 243 | 1 | 40 | 423 | 8.04 |
| 4 | 266 | 1 | 35 | 378 | 7.18 |
| 5 | 284 | 1 | 33 | 300 | 5.70 |
| 6 | 300 | 1 | 31 | 250 | 4.75 |
| 7 | 315 | 1 | 30 | 177 | 3.36 |
| 8 | 330 | 1 | 30 | 160 | 3.04 |
| 9 | 345 | 1 | 30 | 165 | 3.14 |
| 10 | 360 | 1 | 31 | 169 | 3.21 |
| 11 | 376 | 2 | 32 | 174 | 3.31 |
| 12 | 393 | 2 | 33 | 173 | 3.29 |
| 13 | 411 | 2 | 35 | 187 | 3.55 |
| 14 | 432 | 2 | 37 | 209 | 3.97 |
| 15 | 457 | 3 | 41 | 228 | 4.33 |
| 16 | 490 | 3 | 49 | 263 | 5.00 |
| 17 | 540 | 3 | 66 | 200 | 3.80 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 100 | 118 | 2.24 |

Table 7.C.26 Raw-Score-to-Scale-Score Distribution—Written Language, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Raw Score** | **Scale Score** | **Level** | **CSEM** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 0 | 150 | 1 | 72 | 610 | 17.88 |
| 1 | 163 | 1 | 67 | 197 | 5.78 |
| 2 | 213 | 1 | 48 | 215 | 6.30 |
| 3 | 243 | 1 | 40 | 263 | 7.71 |
| 4 | 266 | 1 | 35 | 216 | 6.33 |
| 5 | 284 | 1 | 33 | 179 | 5.25 |
| 6 | 300 | 1 | 31 | 119 | 3.49 |
| 7 | 315 | 1 | 30 | 94 | 2.76 |
| 8 | 330 | 1 | 30 | 99 | 2.90 |
| 9 | 345 | 1 | 30 | 98 | 2.87 |
| 10 | 360 | 1 | 31 | 108 | 3.17 |
| 11 | 376 | 2 | 32 | 123 | 3.61 |
| 12 | 393 | 2 | 33 | 138 | 4.05 |
| 13 | 411 | 2 | 35 | 138 | 4.05 |
| 14 | 432 | 2 | 37 | 146 | 4.28 |
| 15 | 457 | 3 | 41 | 199 | 5.83 |
| 16 | 490 | 3 | 49 | 212 | 6.22 |
| 17 | 540 | 3 | 66 | 161 | 4.72 |
| 18 | 600 | 3 | 100 | 96 | 2.81 |

### Appendix 7.D: Overall Scale Scores and Performance Level Distribution

Table 7.D.1 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 18,065 | 13.52 |
| 151 | 1 | 3,294 | 2.46 |
| 155 | 1 | 2,283 | 1.71 |
| 156 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 |
| 158 | 1 | 1,705 | 1.28 |
| 160 | 1 | 1,152 | 0.86 |
| 161 | 1 | 750 | 0.56 |
| 163 | 1 | 427 | 0.32 |
| 164 | 1 | 282 | 0.21 |
| 166 | 1 | 176 | 0.13 |
| 167 | 1 | 110 | 0.08 |
| 168 | 1 | 1,354 | 1.01 |
| 169 | 1 | 563 | 0.42 |
| 170 | 1 | 62 | 0.05 |
| 171 | 1 | 41 | 0.03 |
| 172 | 1 | 31 | 0.02 |
| 173 | 1 | 509 | 0.38 |
| 174 | 1 | 24 | 0.02 |
| 176 | 1 | 484 | 0.36 |
| 177 | 1 | 12 | 0.01 |
| 178 | 1 | 345 | 0.26 |
| 179 | 1 | 259 | 0.19 |
| 180 | 1 | 2 | 0.00 |
| 181 | 1 | 160 | 0.12 |
| 182 | 1 | 85 | 0.06 |
| 183 | 1 | 2 | 0.00 |
| 184 | 1 | 72 | 0.05 |
| 185 | 1 | 57 | 0.04 |
| 186 | 1 | 21 | 0.02 |
| 187 | 1 | 21 | 0.02 |
| 188 | 1 | 14 | 0.01 |
| 189 | 1 | 13 | 0.01 |
| 190 | 1 | 1,363 | 1.02 |
| 191 | 1 | 560 | 0.42 |
| 192 | 1 | 7 | 0.01 |
| 194 | 1 | 5 | 0.00 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 195 | 1 | 556 | 0.42 |
| 197 | 1 | 544 | 0.41 |
| 198 | 1 | 4 | 0.00 |
| 199 | 1 | 447 | 0.33 |
| 201 | 1 | 301 | 0.23 |
| 202 | 1 | 183 | 0.14 |
| 204 | 1 | 137 | 0.10 |
| 205 | 1 | 76 | 0.06 |
| 206 | 1 | 65 | 0.05 |
| 207 | 1 | 43 | 0.03 |
| 208 | 1 | 1,225 | 0.92 |
| 209 | 1 | 571 | 0.43 |
| 210 | 1 | 23 | 0.02 |
| 211 | 1 | 26 | 0.02 |
| 212 | 1 | 10 | 0.01 |
| 213 | 1 | 542 | 0.41 |
| 214 | 1 | 14 | 0.01 |
| 215 | 1 | 534 | 0.40 |
| 217 | 1 | 466 | 0.35 |
| 218 | 1 | 3 | 0.00 |
| 219 | 1 | 314 | 0.23 |
| 220 | 1 | 195 | 0.15 |
| 222 | 1 | 134 | 0.10 |
| 223 | 1 | 79 | 0.06 |
| 224 | 1 | 82 | 0.06 |
| 225 | 1 | 1,026 | 0.77 |
| 226 | 1 | 463 | 0.35 |
| 227 | 1 | 26 | 0.02 |
| 228 | 1 | 30 | 0.02 |
| 229 | 1 | 29 | 0.02 |
| 230 | 1 | 479 | 0.36 |
| 231 | 1 | 14 | 0.01 |
| 232 | 1 | 497 | 0.37 |
| 233 | 1 | 8 | 0.01 |
| 234 | 1 | 424 | 0.32 |
| 235 | 1 | 9 | 0.01 |
| 236 | 1 | 318 | 0.24 |
| 238 | 1 | 230 | 0.17 |
| 239 | 1 | 906 | 0.68 |
| 240 | 1 | 92 | 0.07 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 241 | 1 | 424 | 0.32 |
| 243 | 1 | 57 | 0.04 |
| 244 | 1 | 427 | 0.32 |
| 245 | 1 | 28 | 0.02 |
| 246 | 1 | 24 | 0.02 |
| 247 | 1 | 486 | 0.36 |
| 248 | 1 | 17 | 0.01 |
| 249 | 1 | 477 | 0.36 |
| 250 | 1 | 371 | 0.28 |
| 252 | 1 | 256 | 0.19 |
| 253 | 1 | 878 | 0.66 |
| 254 | 1 | 329 | 0.25 |
| 255 | 1 | 119 | 0.09 |
| 256 | 1 | 65 | 0.05 |
| 257 | 1 | 62 | 0.05 |
| 258 | 1 | 384 | 0.29 |
| 259 | 1 | 37 | 0.03 |
| 260 | 1 | 533 | 0.40 |
| 261 | 1 | 29 | 0.02 |
| 262 | 1 | 510 | 0.38 |
| 264 | 1 | 359 | 0.27 |
| 265 | 1 | 881 | 0.66 |
| 266 | 1 | 9 | 0.01 |
| 267 | 1 | 528 | 0.40 |
| 268 | 1 | 138 | 0.10 |
| 269 | 1 | 88 | 0.07 |
| 270 | 1 | 429 | 0.32 |
| 271 | 1 | 1 | 0.00 |
| 272 | 1 | 54 | 0.04 |
| 273 | 1 | 485 | 0.36 |
| 274 | 1 | 30 | 0.02 |
| 275 | 1 | 492 | 0.37 |
| 276 | 1 | 26 | 0.02 |
| 277 | 1 | 406 | 0.30 |
| 278 | 1 | 851 | 0.64 |
| 279 | 1 | 503 | 0.38 |
| 280 | 1 | 11 | 0.01 |
| 281 | 1 | 160 | 0.12 |
| 282 | 1 | 102 | 0.08 |
| 283 | 1 | 433 | 0.32 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 284 | 1 | 52 | 0.04 |
| 285 | 1 | 41 | 0.03 |
| 286 | 1 | 494 | 0.37 |
| 287 | 1 | 551 | 0.41 |
| 289 | 1 | 1,021 | 0.76 |
| 290 | 1 | 255 | 0.19 |
| 291 | 1 | 351 | 0.26 |
| 292 | 1 | 241 | 0.18 |
| 293 | 1 | 152 | 0.11 |
| 294 | 1 | 396 | 0.30 |
| 295 | 1 | 120 | 0.09 |
| 296 | 1 | 541 | 0.40 |
| 297 | 1 | 69 | 0.05 |
| 298 | 1 | 590 | 0.44 |
| 299 | 1 | 32 | 0.02 |
| 300 | 1 | 1,031 | 0.77 |
| 301 | 1 | 375 | 0.28 |
| 302 | 1 | 328 | 0.25 |
| 303 | 1 | 245 | 0.18 |
| 304 | 1 | 162 | 0.12 |
| 305 | 1 | 143 | 0.11 |
| 306 | 1 | 494 | 0.37 |
| 308 | 1 | 526 | 0.39 |
| 309 | 1 | 54 | 0.04 |
| 310 | 1 | 615 | 0.46 |
| 311 | 1 | 488 | 0.37 |
| 312 | 1 | 565 | 0.42 |
| 313 | 1 | 686 | 0.51 |
| 314 | 1 | 34 | 0.03 |
| 315 | 1 | 278 | 0.21 |
| 316 | 1 | 545 | 0.41 |
| 317 | 1 | 145 | 0.11 |
| 318 | 1 | 106 | 0.08 |
| 319 | 1 | 536 | 0.40 |
| 320 | 1 | 66 | 0.05 |
| 321 | 1 | 600 | 0.45 |
| 322 | 1 | 509 | 0.38 |
| 323 | 1 | 433 | 0.32 |
| 324 | 1 | 700 | 0.52 |
| 325 | 1 | 386 | 0.29 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 326 | 1 | 28 | 0.02 |
| 327 | 1 | 259 | 0.19 |
| 328 | 1 | 508 | 0.38 |
| 329 | 1 | 141 | 0.11 |
| 330 | 1 | 112 | 0.08 |
| 331 | 1 | 559 | 0.42 |
| 332 | 1 | 577 | 0.43 |
| 333 | 1 | 77 | 0.06 |
| 334 | 1 | 1,023 | 0.77 |
| 335 | 1 | 192 | 0.14 |
| 336 | 1 | 523 | 0.39 |
| 337 | 1 | 419 | 0.31 |
| 338 | 1 | 258 | 0.19 |
| 339 | 1 | 303 | 0.23 |
| 340 | 1 | 198 | 0.15 |
| 341 | 1 | 596 | 0.45 |
| 342 | 1 | 97 | 0.07 |
| 343 | 1 | 631 | 0.47 |
| 344 | 1 | 120 | 0.09 |
| 345 | 1 | 979 | 0.73 |
| 346 | 1 | 539 | 0.40 |
| 347 | 1 | 257 | 0.19 |
| 348 | 1 | 451 | 0.34 |
| 349 | 1 | 289 | 0.22 |
| 350 | 1 | 249 | 0.19 |
| 351 | 1 | 460 | 0.34 |
| 353 | 1 | 550 | 0.41 |
| 354 | 1 | 96 | 0.07 |
| 355 | 1 | 602 | 0.45 |
| 356 | 1 | 119 | 0.09 |
| 357 | 1 | 1,031 | 0.77 |
| 358 | 1 | 777 | 0.58 |
| 359 | 1 | 75 | 0.06 |
| 360 | 1 | 423 | 0.32 |
| 361 | 1 | 381 | 0.29 |
| 362 | 1 | 560 | 0.42 |
| 363 | 1 | 162 | 0.12 |
| 364 | 1 | 194 | 0.15 |
| 365 | 1 | 499 | 0.37 |
| 366 | 1 | 138 | 0.10 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 367 | 1 | 546 | 0.41 |
| 368 | 1 | 720 | 0.54 |
| 369 | 1 | 72 | 0.05 |
| 370 | 2 | 988 | 0.74 |
| 371 | 2 | 687 | 0.51 |
| 372 | 2 | 37 | 0.03 |
| 373 | 2 | 349 | 0.26 |
| 374 | 2 | 329 | 0.25 |
| 375 | 2 | 437 | 0.33 |
| 376 | 2 | 184 | 0.14 |
| 377 | 2 | 438 | 0.33 |
| 378 | 2 | 150 | 0.11 |
| 379 | 2 | 591 | 0.44 |
| 380 | 2 | 78 | 0.06 |
| 381 | 2 | 715 | 0.53 |
| 382 | 2 | 603 | 0.45 |
| 383 | 2 | 58 | 0.04 |
| 384 | 2 | 771 | 0.58 |
| 385 | 2 | 484 | 0.36 |
| 386 | 2 | 348 | 0.26 |
| 387 | 2 | 287 | 0.21 |
| 389 | 2 | 419 | 0.31 |
| 390 | 2 | 251 | 0.19 |
| 391 | 2 | 149 | 0.11 |
| 392 | 2 | 362 | 0.27 |
| 393 | 2 | 106 | 0.08 |
| 394 | 2 | 614 | 0.46 |
| 395 | 2 | 696 | 0.52 |
| 397 | 2 | 701 | 0.52 |
| 398 | 2 | 587 | 0.44 |
| 399 | 2 | 208 | 0.16 |
| 400 | 2 | 461 | 0.34 |
| 401 | 2 | 431 | 0.32 |
| 402 | 2 | 379 | 0.28 |
| 403 | 2 | 178 | 0.13 |
| 404 | 2 | 158 | 0.12 |
| 405 | 2 | 302 | 0.23 |
| 406 | 2 | 179 | 0.13 |
| 407 | 2 | 322 | 0.24 |
| 408 | 2 | 110 | 0.08 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 409 | 2 | 353 | 0.26 |
| 410 | 2 | 88 | 0.07 |
| 411 | 2 | 646 | 0.48 |
| 412 | 2 | 562 | 0.42 |
| 413 | 2 | 82 | 0.06 |
| 414 | 2 | 624 | 0.47 |
| 415 | 2 | 474 | 0.35 |
| 416 | 2 | 489 | 0.37 |
| 417 | 2 | 435 | 0.33 |
| 418 | 2 | 199 | 0.15 |
| 419 | 2 | 186 | 0.14 |
| 420 | 2 | 159 | 0.12 |
| 421 | 2 | 202 | 0.15 |
| 422 | 2 | 141 | 0.11 |
| 423 | 2 | 286 | 0.21 |
| 424 | 2 | 125 | 0.09 |
| 425 | 2 | 385 | 0.29 |
| 426 | 2 | 104 | 0.08 |
| 427 | 2 | 467 | 0.35 |
| 428 | 2 | 614 | 0.46 |
| 429 | 2 | 87 | 0.07 |
| 430 | 2 | 591 | 0.44 |
| 431 | 2 | 440 | 0.33 |
| 432 | 2 | 424 | 0.32 |
| 433 | 2 | 255 | 0.19 |
| 435 | 2 | 203 | 0.15 |
| 436 | 2 | 385 | 0.29 |
| 437 | 2 | 162 | 0.12 |
| 438 | 2 | 232 | 0.17 |
| 439 | 2 | 151 | 0.11 |
| 440 | 2 | 154 | 0.12 |
| 441 | 2 | 231 | 0.17 |
| 442 | 2 | 123 | 0.09 |
| 444 | 2 | 345 | 0.26 |
| 446 | 2 | 342 | 0.26 |
| 448 | 2 | 509 | 0.38 |
| 449 | 2 | 397 | 0.30 |
| 450 | 3 | 407 | 0.30 |
| 452 | 3 | 499 | 0.37 |
| 453 | 3 | 311 | 0.23 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation seven)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 454 | 3 | 245 | 0.18 |
| 455 | 3 | 214 | 0.16 |
| 456 | 3 | 189 | 0.14 |
| 457 | 3 | 159 | 0.12 |
| 458 | 3 | 169 | 0.13 |
| 460 | 3 | 166 | 0.12 |
| 461 | 3 | 311 | 0.23 |
| 462 | 3 | 203 | 0.15 |
| 463 | 3 | 137 | 0.10 |
| 464 | 3 | 46 | 0.03 |
| 465 | 3 | 133 | 0.10 |
| 467 | 3 | 140 | 0.10 |
| 468 | 3 | 89 | 0.07 |
| 469 | 3 | 176 | 0.13 |
| 470 | 3 | 87 | 0.07 |
| 472 | 3 | 153 | 0.11 |
| 473 | 3 | 130 | 0.10 |
| 474 | 3 | 314 | 0.23 |
| 475 | 3 | 341 | 0.26 |
| 477 | 3 | 393 | 0.29 |
| 478 | 3 | 362 | 0.27 |
| 479 | 3 | 290 | 0.22 |
| 480 | 3 | 243 | 0.18 |
| 481 | 3 | 486 | 0.36 |
| 482 | 3 | 186 | 0.14 |
| 483 | 3 | 189 | 0.14 |
| 485 | 3 | 156 | 0.12 |
| 486 | 3 | 157 | 0.12 |
| 487 | 3 | 147 | 0.11 |
| 488 | 3 | 142 | 0.11 |
| 489 | 3 | 141 | 0.11 |
| 491 | 3 | 124 | 0.09 |
| 493 | 3 | 166 | 0.12 |
| 495 | 3 | 162 | 0.12 |
| 496 | 3 | 67 | 0.05 |
| 497 | 3 | 34 | 0.03 |
| 499 | 3 | 179 | 0.13 |
| 501 | 3 | 65 | 0.05 |
| 503 | 3 | 54 | 0.04 |
| 505 | 3 | 93 | 0.07 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation eight)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 507 | 3 | 561 | 0.42 |
| 508 | 3 | 265 | 0.20 |
| 510 | 3 | 306 | 0.23 |
| 511 | 3 | 260 | 0.19 |
| 512 | 3 | 261 | 0.20 |
| 513 | 3 | 231 | 0.17 |
| 515 | 3 | 214 | 0.16 |
| 516 | 3 | 163 | 0.12 |
| 517 | 3 | 156 | 0.12 |
| 518 | 3 | 158 | 0.12 |
| 519 | 3 | 178 | 0.13 |
| 520 | 3 | 157 | 0.12 |
| 521 | 3 | 166 | 0.12 |
| 523 | 3 | 135 | 0.10 |
| 524 | 3 | 164 | 0.12 |
| 526 | 3 | 146 | 0.11 |
| 528 | 3 | 195 | 0.15 |
| 532 | 3 | 255 | 0.19 |
| 541 | 3 | 445 | 0.33 |
| 550 | 3 | 41 | 0.03 |
| 551 | 3 | 16 | 0.01 |
| 555 | 3 | 48 | 0.04 |
| 556 | 3 | 4 | 0.00 |
| 557 | 3 | 29 | 0.02 |
| 559 | 3 | 60 | 0.04 |
| 560 | 3 | 11 | 0.01 |
| 561 | 3 | 127 | 0.10 |
| 562 | 3 | 174 | 0.13 |
| 563 | 3 | 11 | 0.01 |
| 564 | 3 | 209 | 0.16 |
| 565 | 3 | 243 | 0.18 |
| 566 | 3 | 270 | 0.20 |
| 567 | 3 | 158 | 0.12 |
| 568 | 3 | 69 | 0.05 |
| 569 | 3 | 263 | 0.20 |
| 570 | 3 | 126 | 0.09 |
| 571 | 3 | 273 | 0.20 |
| 572 | 3 | 243 | 0.18 |
| 573 | 3 | 235 | 0.18 |
| 574 | 3 | 235 | 0.18 |

Table 7.D.1 *(continuation nine)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 575 | 3 | 222 | 0.17 |
| 576 | 3 | 84 | 0.06 |
| 577 | 3 | 206 | 0.15 |
| 578 | 3 | 204 | 0.15 |
| 579 | 3 | 95 | 0.07 |
| 580 | 3 | 149 | 0.11 |
| 581 | 3 | 101 | 0.08 |
| 582 | 3 | 301 | 0.23 |
| 584 | 3 | 99 | 0.07 |
| 585 | 3 | 105 | 0.08 |
| 586 | 3 | 257 | 0.19 |
| 588 | 3 | 164 | 0.12 |
| 592 | 3 | 217 | 0.16 |
| 595 | 3 | 581 | 0.43 |
| 600 | 3 | 671 | 0.50 |

Table 7.D.2 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 2,310 | 18.32 |
| 151 | 1 | 262 | 2.08 |
| 162 | 1 | 195 | 1.55 |
| 163 | 1 | 73 | 0.58 |
| 165 | 1 | 136 | 1.08 |
| 173 | 1 | 119 | 0.94 |
| 174 | 1 | 58 | 0.46 |
| 177 | 1 | 72 | 0.57 |
| 179 | 1 | 110 | 0.87 |
| 181 | 1 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 185 | 1 | 74 | 0.59 |
| 186 | 1 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 187 | 1 | 139 | 1.10 |
| 188 | 1 | 59 | 0.47 |
| 189 | 1 | 50 | 0.40 |
| 190 | 1 | 31 | 0.25 |
| 193 | 1 | 35 | 0.28 |
| 194 | 1 | 59 | 0.47 |
| 196 | 1 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 197 | 1 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 199 | 1 | 103 | 0.82 |
| 201 | 1 | 13 | 0.10 |
| 202 | 1 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 203 | 1 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 204 | 1 | 144 | 1.14 |
| 205 | 1 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 206 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 207 | 1 | 26 | 0.21 |
| 209 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 210 | 1 | 45 | 0.36 |
| 211 | 1 | 13 | 0.10 |
| 213 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 214 | 1 | 10 | 0.08 |
| 216 | 1 | 46 | 0.36 |
| 217 | 1 | 142 | 1.13 |
| 219 | 1 | 11 | 0.09 |
| 222 | 1 | 63 | 0.50 |
| 225 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 226 | 1 | 42 | 0.33 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 227 | 1 | 40 | 0.32 |
| 228 | 1 | 55 | 0.44 |
| 229 | 1 | 41 | 0.33 |
| 230 | 1 | 30 | 0.24 |
| 233 | 1 | 78 | 0.62 |
| 234 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 236 | 1 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 238 | 1 | 96 | 0.76 |
| 239 | 1 | 10 | 0.08 |
| 240 | 1 | 71 | 0.56 |
| 242 | 1 | 5 | 0.04 |
| 243 | 1 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 244 | 1 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 247 | 1 | 98 | 0.78 |
| 250 | 1 | 39 | 0.31 |
| 251 | 1 | 26 | 0.21 |
| 252 | 1 | 43 | 0.34 |
| 253 | 1 | 20 | 0.16 |
| 255 | 1 | 23 | 0.18 |
| 256 | 1 | 48 | 0.38 |
| 258 | 1 | 28 | 0.22 |
| 259 | 1 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 260 | 1 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 261 | 1 | 26 | 0.21 |
| 263 | 1 | 62 | 0.49 |
| 264 | 1 | 6 | 0.05 |
| 266 | 1 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 267 | 1 | 41 | 0.33 |
| 268 | 1 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 269 | 1 | 56 | 0.44 |
| 270 | 1 | 6 | 0.05 |
| 271 | 1 | 30 | 0.24 |
| 272 | 1 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 273 | 1 | 29 | 0.23 |
| 274 | 1 | 26 | 0.21 |
| 275 | 1 | 22 | 0.17 |
| 276 | 1 | 41 | 0.33 |
| 277 | 1 | 34 | 0.27 |
| 278 | 1 | 24 | 0.19 |
| 279 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 280 | 1 | 18 | 0.14 |
| 281 | 1 | 61 | 0.48 |
| 283 | 1 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 284 | 1 | 47 | 0.37 |
| 286 | 1 | 40 | 0.32 |
| 287 | 1 | 11 | 0.09 |
| 288 | 1 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 289 | 1 | 20 | 0.16 |
| 290 | 1 | 44 | 0.35 |
| 291 | 1 | 9 | 0.07 |
| 292 | 1 | 37 | 0.29 |
| 293 | 1 | 24 | 0.19 |
| 294 | 1 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 295 | 1 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 296 | 1 | 40 | 0.32 |
| 297 | 1 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 298 | 1 | 43 | 0.34 |
| 299 | 1 | 24 | 0.19 |
| 300 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 301 | 1 | 23 | 0.18 |
| 302 | 1 | 28 | 0.22 |
| 303 | 1 | 14 | 0.11 |
| 304 | 1 | 43 | 0.34 |
| 305 | 1 | 42 | 0.33 |
| 306 | 1 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 307 | 1 | 29 | 0.23 |
| 308 | 1 | 28 | 0.22 |
| 309 | 1 | 16 | 0.13 |
| 310 | 1 | 18 | 0.14 |
| 311 | 1 | 29 | 0.23 |
| 312 | 1 | 60 | 0.48 |
| 313 | 1 | 10 | 0.08 |
| 314 | 1 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 315 | 1 | 75 | 0.59 |
| 317 | 1 | 16 | 0.13 |
| 318 | 1 | 53 | 0.42 |
| 319 | 1 | 55 | 0.44 |
| 320 | 1 | 11 | 0.09 |
| 321 | 1 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 322 | 1 | 48 | 0.38 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 323 | 1 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 324 | 1 | 17 | 0.13 |
| 325 | 1 | 58 | 0.46 |
| 326 | 1 | 55 | 0.44 |
| 327 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 328 | 1 | 23 | 0.18 |
| 329 | 1 | 46 | 0.36 |
| 330 | 1 | 7 | 0.06 |
| 331 | 1 | 53 | 0.42 |
| 332 | 1 | 20 | 0.16 |
| 333 | 1 | 53 | 0.42 |
| 334 | 1 | 10 | 0.08 |
| 335 | 1 | 60 | 0.48 |
| 336 | 1 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 338 | 1 | 33 | 0.26 |
| 339 | 1 | 60 | 0.48 |
| 340 | 1 | 24 | 0.19 |
| 341 | 1 | 12 | 0.10 |
| 342 | 1 | 72 | 0.57 |
| 343 | 1 | 7 | 0.06 |
| 344 | 1 | 12 | 0.10 |
| 345 | 1 | 44 | 0.35 |
| 346 | 1 | 64 | 0.51 |
| 347 | 1 | 22 | 0.17 |
| 348 | 1 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 349 | 1 | 66 | 0.52 |
| 350 | 1 | 11 | 0.09 |
| 351 | 1 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 352 | 1 | 14 | 0.11 |
| 353 | 1 | 70 | 0.56 |
| 354 | 1 | 17 | 0.13 |
| 355 | 1 | 41 | 0.33 |
| 356 | 1 | 52 | 0.41 |
| 357 | 1 | 28 | 0.22 |
| 358 | 1 | 30 | 0.24 |
| 359 | 1 | 13 | 0.10 |
| 360 | 1 | 38 | 0.30 |
| 361 | 1 | 42 | 0.33 |
| 362 | 1 | 57 | 0.45 |
| 363 | 1 | 9 | 0.07 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 364 | 1 | 49 | 0.39 |
| 365 | 1 | 50 | 0.40 |
| 366 | 1 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 367 | 1 | 37 | 0.29 |
| 368 | 1 | 30 | 0.24 |
| 369 | 1 | 31 | 0.25 |
| 370 | 2 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 372 | 2 | 40 | 0.32 |
| 373 | 2 | 56 | 0.44 |
| 374 | 2 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 375 | 2 | 54 | 0.43 |
| 376 | 2 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 377 | 2 | 31 | 0.25 |
| 378 | 2 | 51 | 0.40 |
| 379 | 2 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 380 | 2 | 45 | 0.36 |
| 381 | 2 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 382 | 2 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 383 | 2 | 60 | 0.48 |
| 384 | 2 | 14 | 0.11 |
| 386 | 2 | 52 | 0.41 |
| 387 | 2 | 52 | 0.41 |
| 388 | 2 | 28 | 0.22 |
| 389 | 2 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 390 | 2 | 53 | 0.42 |
| 391 | 2 | 33 | 0.26 |
| 393 | 2 | 47 | 0.37 |
| 394 | 2 | 42 | 0.33 |
| 396 | 2 | 26 | 0.21 |
| 397 | 2 | 42 | 0.33 |
| 398 | 2 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 399 | 2 | 18 | 0.14 |
| 400 | 2 | 59 | 0.47 |
| 401 | 2 | 37 | 0.29 |
| 402 | 2 | 14 | 0.11 |
| 403 | 2 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 404 | 2 | 22 | 0.17 |
| 405 | 2 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 406 | 2 | 38 | 0.30 |
| 407 | 2 | 34 | 0.27 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 408 | 2 | 36 | 0.29 |
| 409 | 2 | 36 | 0.29 |
| 410 | 2 | 20 | 0.16 |
| 411 | 2 | 31 | 0.25 |
| 412 | 2 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 413 | 2 | 36 | 0.29 |
| 414 | 2 | 33 | 0.26 |
| 415 | 2 | 22 | 0.17 |
| 416 | 2 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 417 | 2 | 19 | 0.15 |
| 418 | 2 | 16 | 0.13 |
| 419 | 2 | 38 | 0.30 |
| 420 | 2 | 18 | 0.14 |
| 422 | 2 | 36 | 0.29 |
| 423 | 2 | 35 | 0.28 |
| 424 | 2 | 18 | 0.14 |
| 425 | 2 | 39 | 0.31 |
| 426 | 2 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 427 | 2 | 14 | 0.11 |
| 428 | 2 | 46 | 0.36 |
| 429 | 2 | 25 | 0.20 |
| 431 | 2 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 432 | 2 | 12 | 0.10 |
| 433 | 2 | 60 | 0.48 |
| 434 | 2 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 435 | 2 | 13 | 0.10 |
| 437 | 2 | 47 | 0.37 |
| 438 | 2 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 440 | 2 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 441 | 2 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 442 | 2 | 22 | 0.17 |
| 443 | 2 | 43 | 0.34 |
| 444 | 2 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 445 | 2 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 446 | 2 | 12 | 0.10 |
| 447 | 2 | 13 | 0.10 |
| 449 | 2 | 51 | 0.40 |
| 450 | 3 | 37 | 0.29 |
| 452 | 3 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 453 | 3 | 32 | 0.25 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 454 | 3 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 455 | 3 | 7 | 0.06 |
| 456 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 457 | 3 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 458 | 3 | 16 | 0.13 |
| 460 | 3 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 461 | 3 | 51 | 0.40 |
| 462 | 3 | 48 | 0.38 |
| 464 | 3 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 465 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 467 | 3 | 35 | 0.28 |
| 468 | 3 | 32 | 0.25 |
| 469 | 3 | 10 | 0.08 |
| 470 | 3 | 7 | 0.06 |
| 471 | 3 | 20 | 0.16 |
| 473 | 3 | 43 | 0.34 |
| 474 | 3 | 41 | 0.33 |
| 476 | 3 | 46 | 0.36 |
| 478 | 3 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 479 | 3 | 18 | 0.14 |
| 482 | 3 | 49 | 0.39 |
| 484 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 486 | 3 | 60 | 0.48 |
| 487 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 489 | 3 | 74 | 0.59 |
| 490 | 3 | 33 | 0.26 |
| 492 | 3 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 494 | 3 | 27 | 0.21 |
| 495 | 3 | 4 | 0.03 |
| 498 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 500 | 3 | 65 | 0.52 |
| 501 | 3 | 55 | 0.44 |
| 504 | 3 | 7 | 0.06 |
| 507 | 3 | 57 | 0.45 |
| 510 | 3 | 15 | 0.12 |
| 511 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 513 | 3 | 45 | 0.36 |
| 514 | 3 | 14 | 0.11 |
| 516 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 519 | 3 | 65 | 0.52 |

Table 7.D.2 *(continuation seven)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 524 | 3 | 34 | 0.27 |
| 527 | 3 | 63 | 0.50 |
| 528 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 530 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 532 | 3 | 47 | 0.37 |
| 533 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 534 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 536 | 3 | 8 | 0.06 |
| 537 | 3 | 3 | 0.02 |
| 540 | 3 | 10 | 0.08 |
| 543 | 3 | 57 | 0.45 |
| 544 | 3 | 17 | 0.13 |
| 545 | 3 | 90 | 0.71 |
| 548 | 3 | 21 | 0.17 |
| 549 | 3 | 5 | 0.04 |
| 554 | 3 | 29 | 0.23 |
| 561 | 3 | 34 | 0.27 |
| 562 | 3 | 23 | 0.18 |
| 570 | 3 | 105 | 0.83 |
| 573 | 3 | 91 | 0.72 |
| 599 | 3 | 109 | 0.86 |
| 600 | 3 | 100 | 0.79 |

Table 7.D.3 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 1,280 | 19.73 |
| 184 | 1 | 139 | 2.14 |
| 186 | 1 | 157 | 2.42 |
| 201 | 1 | 137 | 2.11 |
| 204 | 1 | 56 | 0.86 |
| 211 | 1 | 113 | 1.74 |
| 215 | 1 | 43 | 0.66 |
| 219 | 1 | 130 | 2.00 |
| 220 | 1 | 38 | 0.59 |
| 224 | 1 | 59 | 0.91 |
| 225 | 1 | 142 | 2.19 |
| 230 | 1 | 47 | 0.72 |
| 231 | 1 | 97 | 1.50 |
| 236 | 1 | 83 | 1.28 |
| 237 | 1 | 26 | 0.40 |
| 238 | 1 | 15 | 0.23 |
| 240 | 1 | 67 | 1.03 |
| 244 | 1 | 39 | 0.60 |
| 247 | 1 | 25 | 0.39 |
| 248 | 1 | 20 | 0.31 |
| 249 | 1 | 19 | 0.29 |
| 250 | 1 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 252 | 1 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 253 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 254 | 1 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 255 | 1 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 256 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 258 | 1 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 259 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 260 | 1 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 261 | 1 | 33 | 0.51 |
| 264 | 1 | 54 | 0.83 |
| 266 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 267 | 1 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 268 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 270 | 1 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 272 | 1 | 41 | 0.63 |
| 274 | 1 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 276 | 1 | 43 | 0.66 |

Table 7.D.3 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 277 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 278 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 279 | 1 | 23 | 0.35 |
| 280 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 281 | 1 | 27 | 0.42 |
| 282 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 283 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 284 | 1 | 80 | 1.23 |
| 286 | 1 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 287 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 288 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 289 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 290 | 1 | 33 | 0.51 |
| 291 | 1 | 42 | 0.65 |
| 292 | 1 | 31 | 0.48 |
| 293 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 294 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 295 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 296 | 1 | 38 | 0.59 |
| 298 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 299 | 1 | 61 | 0.94 |
| 300 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 301 | 1 | 35 | 0.54 |
| 302 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 304 | 1 | 60 | 0.92 |
| 305 | 1 | 44 | 0.68 |
| 306 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 307 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 308 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 309 | 1 | 38 | 0.59 |
| 311 | 1 | 53 | 0.82 |
| 313 | 1 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 314 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 315 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 316 | 1 | 38 | 0.59 |
| 317 | 1 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 318 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 319 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 320 | 1 | 21 | 0.32 |
| 321 | 1 | 30 | 0.46 |

Table 7.D.3 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 322 | 1 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 323 | 1 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 324 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 325 | 1 | 15 | 0.23 |
| 326 | 1 | 32 | 0.49 |
| 327 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 328 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 329 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 330 | 1 | 20 | 0.31 |
| 331 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 332 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 333 | 1 | 15 | 0.23 |
| 334 | 1 | 36 | 0.55 |
| 335 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 336 | 1 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 337 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 338 | 1 | 32 | 0.49 |
| 339 | 1 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 340 | 1 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 341 | 1 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 342 | 1 | 18 | 0.28 |
| 343 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 344 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 345 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 346 | 1 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 347 | 1 | 20 | 0.31 |
| 348 | 1 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 349 | 1 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 350 | 1 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 351 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 352 | 1 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 353 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 354 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 355 | 1 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 356 | 1 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 357 | 1 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 358 | 1 | 18 | 0.28 |
| 359 | 1 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 360 | 1 | 15 | 0.23 |
| 361 | 1 | 22 | 0.34 |

Table 7.D.3 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 362 | 1 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 363 | 1 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 364 | 1 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 365 | 1 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 366 | 1 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 367 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 368 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 369 | 1 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 370 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 371 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 372 | 2 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 373 | 2 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 374 | 2 | 15 | 0.23 |
| 375 | 2 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 376 | 2 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 377 | 2 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 378 | 2 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 379 | 2 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 380 | 2 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 381 | 2 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 382 | 2 | 18 | 0.28 |
| 383 | 2 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 384 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 385 | 2 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 386 | 2 | 15 | 0.23 |
| 387 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 388 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 389 | 2 | 18 | 0.28 |
| 390 | 2 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 391 | 2 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 392 | 2 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 393 | 2 | 24 | 0.37 |
| 394 | 2 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 395 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 396 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 397 | 2 | 33 | 0.51 |
| 398 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 399 | 2 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 400 | 2 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 401 | 2 | 18 | 0.28 |

Table 7.D.3 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 402 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 403 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 404 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 405 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 406 | 2 | 18 | 0.28 |
| 407 | 2 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 408 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 409 | 2 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 410 | 2 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 411 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 412 | 2 | 28 | 0.43 |
| 413 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 414 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 415 | 2 | 6 | 0.09 |
| 416 | 2 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 418 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 419 | 2 | 25 | 0.39 |
| 420 | 2 | 27 | 0.42 |
| 421 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 423 | 2 | 32 | 0.49 |
| 424 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 425 | 2 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 426 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 427 | 2 | 32 | 0.49 |
| 429 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 431 | 2 | 35 | 0.54 |
| 432 | 2 | 19 | 0.29 |
| 433 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 435 | 2 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 436 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 437 | 2 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 438 | 2 | 28 | 0.43 |
| 439 | 2 | 12 | 0.18 |
| 440 | 2 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 441 | 2 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 442 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 443 | 2 | 16 | 0.25 |
| 444 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 445 | 2 | 20 | 0.31 |
| 446 | 2 | 35 | 0.54 |

Table 7.D.3 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 447 | 2 | 17 | 0.26 |
| 448 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 450 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 452 | 3 | 29 | 0.45 |
| 453 | 3 | 46 | 0.71 |
| 456 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 457 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 458 | 3 | 24 | 0.37 |
| 460 | 3 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 461 | 3 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 462 | 3 | 19 | 0.29 |
| 465 | 3 | 52 | 0.80 |
| 469 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 470 | 3 | 25 | 0.39 |
| 473 | 3 | 64 | 0.99 |
| 475 | 3 | 8 | 0.12 |
| 476 | 3 | 10 | 0.15 |
| 477 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 481 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 482 | 3 | 18 | 0.28 |
| 483 | 3 | 25 | 0.39 |
| 485 | 3 | 50 | 0.77 |
| 489 | 3 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 491 | 3 | 56 | 0.86 |
| 493 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 497 | 3 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 501 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 502 | 3 | 43 | 0.66 |
| 503 | 3 | 77 | 1.19 |
| 504 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 508 | 3 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 512 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 515 | 3 | 13 | 0.20 |
| 517 | 3 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 520 | 3 | 77 | 1.19 |
| 523 | 3 | 30 | 0.46 |
| 530 | 3 | 11 | 0.17 |
| 535 | 3 | 31 | 0.48 |
| 539 | 3 | 27 | 0.42 |
| 550 | 3 | 55 | 0.85 |

Table 7.D.3 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 553 | 3 | 62 | 0.96 |
| 568 | 3 | 93 | 1.43 |
| 600 | 3 | 135 | 2.08 |

Table 7.D.4 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 1,897 | 33.23 |
| 151 | 1 | 151 | 2.64 |
| 152 | 1 | 86 | 1.51 |
| 153 | 1 | 25 | 0.44 |
| 158 | 1 | 190 | 3.33 |
| 160 | 1 | 28 | 0.49 |
| 170 | 1 | 62 | 1.09 |
| 171 | 1 | 28 | 0.49 |
| 172 | 1 | 177 | 3.10 |
| 174 | 1 | 31 | 0.54 |
| 178 | 1 | 44 | 0.77 |
| 184 | 1 | 200 | 3.50 |
| 186 | 1 | 33 | 0.58 |
| 192 | 1 | 73 | 1.28 |
| 194 | 1 | 94 | 1.65 |
| 195 | 1 | 33 | 0.58 |
| 196 | 1 | 19 | 0.33 |
| 202 | 1 | 70 | 1.23 |
| 203 | 1 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 204 | 1 | 39 | 0.68 |
| 205 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 206 | 1 | 18 | 0.32 |
| 210 | 1 | 41 | 0.72 |
| 212 | 1 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 213 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 214 | 1 | 24 | 0.42 |
| 217 | 1 | 64 | 1.12 |
| 219 | 1 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 222 | 1 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 224 | 1 | 28 | 0.49 |
| 226 | 1 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 227 | 1 | 21 | 0.37 |
| 228 | 1 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 230 | 1 | 39 | 0.68 |
| 232 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 236 | 1 | 23 | 0.40 |
| 237 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |

Table 7.D.4 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 238 | 1 | 19 | 0.33 |
| 242 | 1 | 17 | 0.30 |
| 243 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 244 | 1 | 14 | 0.25 |
| 247 | 1 | 30 | 0.53 |
| 248 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 249 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 250 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 251 | 1 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 252 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 253 | 1 | 21 | 0.37 |
| 254 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 255 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 256 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 257 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 258 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 259 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 260 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 262 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 263 | 1 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 264 | 1 | 22 | 0.39 |
| 265 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 266 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 267 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 268 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 269 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 270 | 1 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 272 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 273 | 1 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 274 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 275 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 276 | 1 | 18 | 0.32 |
| 278 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 280 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 281 | 1 | 11 | 0.19 |
| 282 | 1 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 284 | 1 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 286 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 287 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 289 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |

Table 7.D.4 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 290 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 291 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 292 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 296 | 1 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 297 | 1 | 11 | 0.19 |
| 298 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 299 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 302 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 303 | 1 | 24 | 0.42 |
| 305 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 307 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 308 | 1 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 309 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 310 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 312 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 313 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 314 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 315 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 316 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 317 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 318 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 319 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 320 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 321 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 322 | 1 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 324 | 1 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 325 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 326 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 327 | 1 | 11 | 0.19 |
| 328 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 329 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 330 | 1 | 16 | 0.28 |
| 332 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 333 | 1 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 334 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 335 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 337 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 338 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 339 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 340 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |

Table 7.D.4 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 341 | 1 | 11 | 0.19 |
| 342 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 343 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 345 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 347 | 1 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 348 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 349 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 350 | 1 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 351 | 1 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 352 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 353 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 354 | 1 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 355 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 357 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 358 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 359 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 360 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 361 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 362 | 1 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 363 | 1 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 364 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 366 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 368 | 1 | 24 | 0.42 |
| 369 | 1 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 370 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 371 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 372 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 375 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 376 | 2 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 377 | 2 | 19 | 0.33 |
| 378 | 2 | 14 | 0.25 |
| 380 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 381 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 382 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 383 | 2 | 19 | 0.33 |
| 385 | 2 | 18 | 0.32 |
| 386 | 2 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 388 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 390 | 2 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 391 | 2 | 20 | 0.35 |

Table 7.D.4 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 392 | 2 | 21 | 0.37 |
| 394 | 2 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 395 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 396 | 2 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 397 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 398 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 399 | 2 | 17 | 0.30 |
| 400 | 2 | 17 | 0.30 |
| 401 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 402 | 2 | 11 | 0.19 |
| 405 | 2 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 406 | 2 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 407 | 2 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 408 | 2 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 409 | 2 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 413 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 414 | 2 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 415 | 2 | 22 | 0.39 |
| 416 | 2 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 417 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 418 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 420 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 421 | 2 | 22 | 0.39 |
| 423 | 2 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 424 | 2 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 425 | 2 | 27 | 0.47 |
| 427 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 429 | 2 | 25 | 0.44 |
| 432 | 2 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 433 | 2 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 435 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 436 | 2 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 437 | 2 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 438 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 440 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 441 | 2 | 12 | 0.21 |
| 442 | 2 | 15 | 0.26 |
| 443 | 2 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 444 | 2 | 9 | 0.16 |
| 445 | 2 | 13 | 0.23 |

Table 7.D.4 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 446 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 447 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 449 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 451 | 3 | 14 | 0.25 |
| 452 | 3 | 18 | 0.32 |
| 454 | 3 | 19 | 0.33 |
| 455 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 456 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 460 | 3 | 18 | 0.32 |
| 461 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 462 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 463 | 3 | 27 | 0.47 |
| 464 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 468 | 3 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 469 | 3 | 19 | 0.33 |
| 472 | 3 | 16 | 0.28 |
| 473 | 3 | 14 | 0.25 |
| 477 | 3 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 478 | 3 | 20 | 0.35 |
| 480 | 3 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 484 | 3 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 485 | 3 | 11 | 0.19 |
| 486 | 3 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 488 | 3 | 21 | 0.37 |
| 489 | 3 | 10 | 0.18 |
| 493 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 494 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 498 | 3 | 29 | 0.51 |
| 499 | 3 | 20 | 0.35 |
| 502 | 3 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 504 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 508 | 3 | 24 | 0.42 |
| 511 | 3 | 14 | 0.25 |
| 513 | 3 | 18 | 0.32 |
| 516 | 3 | 7 | 0.12 |
| 519 | 3 | 20 | 0.35 |
| 521 | 3 | 16 | 0.28 |
| 522 | 3 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 530 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 531 | 3 | 16 | 0.28 |

Table 7.D.4 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 532 | 3 | 16 | 0.28 |
| 533 | 3 | 28 | 0.49 |
| 544 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 546 | 3 | 23 | 0.40 |
| 547 | 3 | 16 | 0.28 |
| 551 | 3 | 24 | 0.42 |
| 552 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 559 | 3 | 8 | 0.14 |
| 564 | 3 | 36 | 0.63 |
| 567 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 579 | 3 | 13 | 0.23 |
| 587 | 3 | 4 | 0.07 |
| 592 | 3 | 28 | 0.49 |
| 600 | 3 | 17 | 0.30 |

Table 7.D.5 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Four

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 1,537 | 28.82 |
| 151 | 1 | 109 | 2.04 |
| 152 | 1 | 97 | 1.82 |
| 153 | 1 | 26 | 0.49 |
| 158 | 1 | 169 | 3.17 |
| 160 | 1 | 38 | 0.71 |
| 170 | 1 | 84 | 1.58 |
| 171 | 1 | 33 | 0.62 |
| 172 | 1 | 180 | 3.38 |
| 174 | 1 | 39 | 0.73 |
| 178 | 1 | 43 | 0.81 |
| 184 | 1 | 204 | 3.83 |
| 186 | 1 | 39 | 0.73 |
| 192 | 1 | 70 | 1.31 |
| 194 | 1 | 73 | 1.37 |
| 195 | 1 | 33 | 0.62 |
| 196 | 1 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 202 | 1 | 44 | 0.83 |
| 203 | 1 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 204 | 1 | 53 | 0.99 |
| 205 | 1 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 206 | 1 | 28 | 0.53 |
| 210 | 1 | 43 | 0.81 |
| 212 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 213 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 214 | 1 | 22 | 0.41 |
| 217 | 1 | 61 | 1.14 |
| 219 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 221 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 222 | 1 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 224 | 1 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 226 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 227 | 1 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 228 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 230 | 1 | 28 | 0.53 |
| 232 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 235 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 236 | 1 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 237 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |

Table 7.D.5 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 238 | 1 | 27 | 0.51 |
| 242 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 243 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 244 | 1 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 245 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 247 | 1 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 248 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 249 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 250 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 251 | 1 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 253 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 254 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 255 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 256 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 257 | 1 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 258 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 260 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 262 | 1 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 263 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 264 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 265 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 266 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 267 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 268 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 269 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 270 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 272 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 273 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 274 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 275 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 276 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 278 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 280 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 281 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 284 | 1 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 286 | 1 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 287 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 289 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 290 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 291 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |

Table 7.D.5 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 292 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 293 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 296 | 1 | 15 | 0.28 |
| 297 | 1 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 299 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 302 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 303 | 1 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 304 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 305 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 307 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 308 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 309 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 310 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 313 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 314 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 315 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 316 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 317 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 318 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 319 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 320 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 321 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 322 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 323 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 324 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 325 | 1 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 326 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 327 | 1 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 329 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 330 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 332 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 333 | 1 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 334 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 335 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 337 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 338 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 339 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 340 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 341 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 342 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.5 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 343 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 344 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 345 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 346 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 347 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 348 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 349 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 350 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 351 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 352 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 353 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 354 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 355 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 357 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 358 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 359 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 360 | 1 | 15 | 0.28 |
| 361 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 362 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 363 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 364 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 366 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 368 | 1 | 18 | 0.34 |
| 369 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 370 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 371 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 372 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 374 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 375 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 376 | 2 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 377 | 2 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 378 | 2 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 380 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 381 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 383 | 2 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 385 | 2 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 386 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 390 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 391 | 2 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 392 | 2 | 17 | 0.32 |

Table 7.D.5 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 394 | 2 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 396 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 397 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 398 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 399 | 2 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 400 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 401 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 402 | 2 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 403 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 405 | 2 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 406 | 2 | 20 | 0.38 |
| 407 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 408 | 2 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 409 | 2 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 410 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 412 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 413 | 2 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 414 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 415 | 2 | 18 | 0.34 |
| 416 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 417 | 2 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 418 | 2 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 421 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 422 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 423 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 424 | 2 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 425 | 2 | 23 | 0.43 |
| 427 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 429 | 2 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 432 | 2 | 22 | 0.41 |
| 433 | 2 | 18 | 0.34 |
| 435 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 436 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 437 | 2 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 441 | 2 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 442 | 2 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 443 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 444 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 445 | 2 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 446 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.5 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 447 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 449 | 2 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 451 | 3 | 15 | 0.28 |
| 452 | 3 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 454 | 3 | 29 | 0.54 |
| 456 | 3 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 460 | 3 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 461 | 3 | 18 | 0.34 |
| 462 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 463 | 3 | 31 | 0.58 |
| 464 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 468 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 469 | 3 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 471 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 472 | 3 | 25 | 0.47 |
| 473 | 3 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 477 | 3 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 478 | 3 | 15 | 0.28 |
| 480 | 3 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 484 | 3 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 485 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 486 | 3 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 487 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 488 | 3 | 33 | 0.62 |
| 489 | 3 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 493 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 494 | 3 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 498 | 3 | 33 | 0.62 |
| 499 | 3 | 27 | 0.51 |
| 502 | 3 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 504 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 506 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 508 | 3 | 30 | 0.56 |
| 511 | 3 | 20 | 0.38 |
| 513 | 3 | 25 | 0.47 |
| 516 | 3 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 519 | 3 | 28 | 0.53 |
| 521 | 3 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 522 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 531 | 3 | 20 | 0.38 |

Table 7.D.5 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 532 | 3 | 23 | 0.43 |
| 533 | 3 | 52 | 0.98 |
| 540 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 544 | 3 | 5 | 0.09 |
| 546 | 3 | 32 | 0.60 |
| 547 | 3 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 551 | 3 | 26 | 0.49 |
| 552 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 559 | 3 | 14 | 0.26 |
| 564 | 3 | 59 | 1.11 |
| 567 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 579 | 3 | 29 | 0.54 |
| 587 | 3 | 13 | 0.24 |
| 592 | 3 | 65 | 1.22 |
| 600 | 3 | 47 | 0.88 |

Table 7.D.6 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Five

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 1,212 | 24.59 |
| 151 | 1 | 114 | 2.31 |
| 152 | 1 | 76 | 1.54 |
| 153 | 1 | 28 | 0.57 |
| 158 | 1 | 149 | 3.02 |
| 160 | 1 | 41 | 0.83 |
| 170 | 1 | 69 | 1.40 |
| 171 | 1 | 39 | 0.79 |
| 172 | 1 | 157 | 3.19 |
| 174 | 1 | 32 | 0.65 |
| 178 | 1 | 34 | 0.69 |
| 184 | 1 | 180 | 3.65 |
| 186 | 1 | 29 | 0.59 |
| 192 | 1 | 71 | 1.44 |
| 194 | 1 | 68 | 1.38 |
| 195 | 1 | 40 | 0.81 |
| 196 | 1 | 26 | 0.53 |
| 202 | 1 | 54 | 1.10 |
| 203 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 204 | 1 | 50 | 1.01 |
| 205 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 206 | 1 | 27 | 0.55 |
| 210 | 1 | 28 | 0.57 |
| 212 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 213 | 1 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 214 | 1 | 34 | 0.69 |
| 217 | 1 | 66 | 1.34 |
| 219 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 221 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 222 | 1 | 24 | 0.49 |
| 224 | 1 | 20 | 0.41 |
| 226 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 227 | 1 | 24 | 0.49 |
| 228 | 1 | 20 | 0.41 |
| 230 | 1 | 39 | 0.79 |
| 232 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 235 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 236 | 1 | 24 | 0.49 |
| 237 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |

Table 7.D.6 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 238 | 1 | 25 | 0.51 |
| 242 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 243 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 244 | 1 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 247 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 248 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 249 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 250 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 251 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 252 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 253 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 254 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 255 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 256 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 257 | 1 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 258 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 260 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 262 | 1 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 263 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 264 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 265 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 266 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 267 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 268 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 269 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 270 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 272 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 273 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 274 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 275 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 276 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 278 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 280 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 281 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 282 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 284 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 285 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 286 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 287 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 289 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |

Table 7.D.6 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 290 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 291 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 292 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 293 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 295 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 296 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 297 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 298 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 299 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 301 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 302 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 303 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 304 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 305 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 307 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 308 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 309 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 310 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 311 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 313 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 314 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 315 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 316 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 317 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 318 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 319 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 320 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 321 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 322 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 324 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 326 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 327 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 329 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 330 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 332 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 333 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 334 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 335 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 336 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 337 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |

Table 7.D.6 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 338 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 339 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 340 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 341 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 343 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 344 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 345 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 347 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 348 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 349 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 350 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 351 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 352 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 354 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 355 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 357 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 358 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 359 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 360 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 361 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 362 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 363 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 364 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 366 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 368 | 1 | 21 | 0.43 |
| 369 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 370 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 371 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 372 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 375 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 376 | 2 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 377 | 2 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 378 | 2 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 380 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 381 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 382 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 383 | 2 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 385 | 2 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 386 | 2 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 388 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.6 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 390 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 391 | 2 | 19 | 0.39 |
| 392 | 2 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 394 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 397 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 398 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 399 | 2 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 400 | 2 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 401 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 402 | 2 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 403 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 405 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 406 | 2 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 407 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 408 | 2 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 409 | 2 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 410 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 412 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 413 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 414 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 415 | 2 | 19 | 0.39 |
| 416 | 2 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 417 | 2 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 418 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 421 | 2 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 423 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 424 | 2 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 425 | 2 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 429 | 2 | 21 | 0.43 |
| 432 | 2 | 21 | 0.43 |
| 433 | 2 | 22 | 0.45 |
| 434 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 435 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 436 | 2 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 437 | 2 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 438 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 440 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 441 | 2 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 442 | 2 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 443 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |

Table 7.D.6 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 444 | 2 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 445 | 2 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 446 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 449 | 2 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 451 | 3 | 23 | 0.47 |
| 452 | 3 | 20 | 0.41 |
| 454 | 3 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 456 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 459 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 460 | 3 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 461 | 3 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 462 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 463 | 3 | 22 | 0.45 |
| 464 | 3 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 465 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 468 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 469 | 3 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 472 | 3 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 473 | 3 | 18 | 0.37 |
| 477 | 3 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 478 | 3 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 480 | 3 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 484 | 3 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 485 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 486 | 3 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 488 | 3 | 28 | 0.57 |
| 489 | 3 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 493 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 494 | 3 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 495 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 498 | 3 | 34 | 0.69 |
| 499 | 3 | 25 | 0.51 |
| 502 | 3 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 504 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 508 | 3 | 18 | 0.37 |
| 511 | 3 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 513 | 3 | 24 | 0.49 |
| 516 | 3 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 519 | 3 | 29 | 0.59 |
| 521 | 3 | 27 | 0.55 |

Table 7.D.6 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 522 | 3 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 530 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 531 | 3 | 24 | 0.49 |
| 532 | 3 | 20 | 0.41 |
| 533 | 3 | 44 | 0.89 |
| 540 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 544 | 3 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 546 | 3 | 33 | 0.67 |
| 547 | 3 | 21 | 0.43 |
| 551 | 3 | 42 | 0.85 |
| 552 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 559 | 3 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 564 | 3 | 73 | 1.48 |
| 567 | 3 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 579 | 3 | 29 | 0.59 |
| 587 | 3 | 18 | 0.37 |
| 592 | 3 | 93 | 1.89 |
| 600 | 3 | 77 | 1.56 |

Table 7.D.7 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 913 | 19.35 |
| 153 | 1 | 90 | 1.91 |
| 163 | 1 | 90 | 1.91 |
| 174 | 1 | 76 | 1.61 |
| 181 | 1 | 188 | 3.98 |
| 183 | 1 | 55 | 1.17 |
| 184 | 1 | 39 | 0.83 |
| 192 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 194 | 1 | 37 | 0.78 |
| 200 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 201 | 1 | 132 | 2.80 |
| 203 | 1 | 35 | 0.74 |
| 205 | 1 | 39 | 0.83 |
| 208 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 213 | 1 | 100 | 2.12 |
| 214 | 1 | 68 | 1.44 |
| 215 | 1 | 57 | 1.21 |
| 222 | 1 | 65 | 1.38 |
| 223 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 224 | 1 | 76 | 1.61 |
| 226 | 1 | 40 | 0.85 |
| 228 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 230 | 1 | 33 | 0.70 |
| 231 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 232 | 1 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 234 | 1 | 27 | 0.57 |
| 235 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 236 | 1 | 43 | 0.91 |
| 237 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 239 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 241 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 243 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 245 | 1 | 32 | 0.68 |
| 246 | 1 | 29 | 0.61 |
| 248 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 249 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 250 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 251 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 253 | 1 | 13 | 0.28 |

Table 7.D.7 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 255 | 1 | 29 | 0.61 |
| 256 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 258 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 259 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 260 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 261 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 263 | 1 | 21 | 0.45 |
| 264 | 1 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 265 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 266 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 267 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 268 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 270 | 1 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 272 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 277 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 279 | 1 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 280 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 284 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 285 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 286 | 1 | 13 | 0.28 |
| 287 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 289 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 291 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 292 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 293 | 1 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 294 | 1 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 298 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 299 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 300 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 301 | 1 | 23 | 0.49 |
| 304 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 305 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 306 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 307 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 308 | 1 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 310 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 312 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 313 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 314 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 315 | 1 | 15 | 0.32 |

Table 7.D.7 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 317 | 1 | 5 | 0.11 |
| 319 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 320 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 321 | 1 | 21 | 0.45 |
| 322 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 323 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 324 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 325 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 326 | 1 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 327 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 328 | 1 | 13 | 0.28 |
| 331 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 333 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 334 | 1 | 31 | 0.66 |
| 338 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 340 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 341 | 1 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 346 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 347 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 348 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 353 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 354 | 1 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 355 | 1 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 360 | 1 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 361 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 362 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 363 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 364 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 366 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 367 | 1 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 369 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 370 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 372 | 2 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 373 | 2 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 374 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 375 | 2 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 377 | 2 | 13 | 0.28 |
| 379 | 2 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 380 | 2 | 5 | 0.11 |
| 381 | 2 | 19 | 0.40 |

Table 7.D.7 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 383 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 384 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 385 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 387 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 388 | 2 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 389 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 391 | 2 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 392 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 394 | 2 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 395 | 2 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 396 | 2 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 397 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 398 | 2 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 399 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 401 | 2 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 402 | 2 | 5 | 0.11 |
| 403 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 404 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 405 | 2 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 406 | 2 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 407 | 2 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 409 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 410 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 411 | 2 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 412 | 2 | 25 | 0.53 |
| 414 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 417 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 418 | 2 | 34 | 0.72 |
| 420 | 2 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 424 | 2 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 425 | 2 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 427 | 2 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 430 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 431 | 2 | 31 | 0.66 |
| 433 | 2 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 434 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 435 | 2 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 437 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 438 | 2 | 22 | 0.47 |
| 439 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |

Table 7.D.7 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 443 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 444 | 2 | 25 | 0.53 |
| 445 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 446 | 2 | 32 | 0.68 |
| 447 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 451 | 3 | 22 | 0.47 |
| 452 | 3 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 454 | 3 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 457 | 3 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 458 | 3 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 459 | 3 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 461 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 464 | 3 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 465 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 466 | 3 | 21 | 0.45 |
| 467 | 3 | 23 | 0.49 |
| 468 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 470 | 3 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 473 | 3 | 31 | 0.66 |
| 474 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 476 | 3 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 477 | 3 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 480 | 3 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 481 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 482 | 3 | 15 | 0.32 |
| 484 | 3 | 25 | 0.53 |
| 486 | 3 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 487 | 3 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 489 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 491 | 3 | 43 | 0.91 |
| 493 | 3 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 494 | 3 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 495 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 500 | 3 | 45 | 0.95 |
| 501 | 3 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 504 | 3 | 13 | 0.28 |
| 507 | 3 | 29 | 0.61 |
| 508 | 3 | 27 | 0.57 |
| 509 | 3 | 25 | 0.53 |
| 516 | 3 | 23 | 0.49 |

Table 7.D.7 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 517 | 3 | 34 | 0.72 |
| 518 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 522 | 3 | 14 | 0.30 |
| 523 | 3 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 525 | 3 | 30 | 0.64 |
| 526 | 3 | 48 | 1.02 |
| 538 | 3 | 33 | 0.70 |
| 539 | 3 | 59 | 1.25 |
| 541 | 3 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 557 | 3 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 558 | 3 | 59 | 1.25 |
| 565 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 583 | 3 | 5 | 0.11 |
| 599 | 3 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 600 | 3 | 43 | 0.91 |

Table 7.D.8 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 901 | 18.04 |
| 153 | 1 | 101 | 2.02 |
| 163 | 1 | 87 | 1.74 |
| 174 | 1 | 79 | 1.58 |
| 181 | 1 | 208 | 4.16 |
| 183 | 1 | 47 | 0.94 |
| 184 | 1 | 59 | 1.18 |
| 192 | 1 | 32 | 0.64 |
| 194 | 1 | 48 | 0.96 |
| 200 | 1 | 18 | 0.36 |
| 201 | 1 | 132 | 2.64 |
| 203 | 1 | 58 | 1.16 |
| 205 | 1 | 49 | 0.98 |
| 208 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 213 | 1 | 119 | 2.38 |
| 214 | 1 | 84 | 1.68 |
| 215 | 1 | 55 | 1.10 |
| 222 | 1 | 64 | 1.28 |
| 223 | 1 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 224 | 1 | 82 | 1.64 |
| 226 | 1 | 43 | 0.86 |
| 228 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 230 | 1 | 32 | 0.64 |
| 231 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 232 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 234 | 1 | 28 | 0.56 |
| 235 | 1 | 36 | 0.72 |
| 236 | 1 | 45 | 0.90 |
| 237 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 239 | 1 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 241 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 243 | 1 | 40 | 0.80 |
| 245 | 1 | 30 | 0.60 |
| 246 | 1 | 43 | 0.86 |
| 249 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 250 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 251 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 253 | 1 | 20 | 0.40 |
| 255 | 1 | 59 | 1.18 |

Table 7.D.8 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 256 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 258 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 259 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 260 | 1 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 261 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 262 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 263 | 1 | 28 | 0.56 |
| 264 | 1 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 265 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 266 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 267 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 270 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 272 | 1 | 30 | 0.60 |
| 276 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 277 | 1 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 279 | 1 | 29 | 0.58 |
| 280 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 282 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 284 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 285 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 286 | 1 | 17 | 0.34 |
| 287 | 1 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 289 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 291 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 292 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 293 | 1 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 294 | 1 | 18 | 0.36 |
| 295 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 298 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 299 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 300 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 301 | 1 | 19 | 0.38 |
| 302 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 304 | 1 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 305 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 306 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 307 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 308 | 1 | 27 | 0.54 |
| 310 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 312 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |

Table 7.D.8 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 313 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 314 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 315 | 1 | 21 | 0.42 |
| 317 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 319 | 1 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 320 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 321 | 1 | 22 | 0.44 |
| 322 | 1 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 324 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 326 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 327 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 328 | 1 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 331 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 333 | 1 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 334 | 1 | 27 | 0.54 |
| 338 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 340 | 1 | 18 | 0.36 |
| 341 | 1 | 36 | 0.72 |
| 346 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 347 | 1 | 22 | 0.44 |
| 348 | 1 | 22 | 0.44 |
| 352 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 353 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 354 | 1 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 355 | 1 | 22 | 0.44 |
| 360 | 1 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 361 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 362 | 1 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 363 | 1 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 364 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 366 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 367 | 1 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 369 | 1 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 370 | 2 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 372 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 373 | 2 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 374 | 2 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 375 | 2 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 377 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 379 | 2 | 8 | 0.16 |

Table 7.D.8 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 380 | 2 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 381 | 2 | 23 | 0.46 |
| 383 | 2 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 384 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 385 | 2 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 387 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 388 | 2 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 389 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 391 | 2 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 392 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 394 | 2 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 395 | 2 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 396 | 2 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 398 | 2 | 21 | 0.42 |
| 399 | 2 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 401 | 2 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 402 | 2 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 403 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 404 | 2 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 405 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 406 | 2 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 407 | 2 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 409 | 2 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 410 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 411 | 2 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 412 | 2 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 414 | 2 | 17 | 0.34 |
| 417 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 418 | 2 | 28 | 0.56 |
| 419 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 420 | 2 | 10 | 0.20 |
| 424 | 2 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 425 | 2 | 21 | 0.42 |
| 427 | 2 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 430 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 431 | 2 | 49 | 0.98 |
| 432 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 433 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 434 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 435 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |

Table 7.D.8 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 437 | 2 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 438 | 2 | 9 | 0.18 |
| 439 | 2 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 443 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 444 | 2 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 446 | 2 | 34 | 0.68 |
| 451 | 3 | 23 | 0.46 |
| 452 | 3 | 23 | 0.46 |
| 453 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 454 | 3 | 19 | 0.38 |
| 457 | 3 | 7 | 0.14 |
| 458 | 3 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 459 | 3 | 22 | 0.44 |
| 464 | 3 | 12 | 0.24 |
| 466 | 3 | 22 | 0.44 |
| 467 | 3 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 470 | 3 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 473 | 3 | 24 | 0.48 |
| 474 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 476 | 3 | 8 | 0.16 |
| 477 | 3 | 24 | 0.48 |
| 480 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 481 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 482 | 3 | 19 | 0.38 |
| 484 | 3 | 17 | 0.34 |
| 486 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 487 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 489 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 491 | 3 | 42 | 0.84 |
| 493 | 3 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 494 | 3 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 495 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 500 | 3 | 43 | 0.86 |
| 501 | 3 | 16 | 0.32 |
| 504 | 3 | 14 | 0.28 |
| 507 | 3 | 23 | 0.46 |
| 508 | 3 | 33 | 0.66 |
| 509 | 3 | 25 | 0.50 |
| 516 | 3 | 31 | 0.62 |
| 517 | 3 | 35 | 0.70 |

Table 7.D.8 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 522 | 3 | 18 | 0.36 |
| 523 | 3 | 6 | 0.12 |
| 525 | 3 | 29 | 0.58 |
| 526 | 3 | 33 | 0.66 |
| 538 | 3 | 29 | 0.58 |
| 539 | 3 | 70 | 1.40 |
| 541 | 3 | 15 | 0.30 |
| 550 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 557 | 3 | 26 | 0.52 |
| 558 | 3 | 86 | 1.72 |
| 565 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 583 | 3 | 11 | 0.22 |
| 599 | 3 | 13 | 0.26 |
| 600 | 3 | 66 | 1.32 |

Table 7.D.9 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 787 | 16.50 |
| 153 | 1 | 71 | 1.49 |
| 163 | 1 | 79 | 1.66 |
| 174 | 1 | 59 | 1.24 |
| 181 | 1 | 186 | 3.90 |
| 183 | 1 | 36 | 0.75 |
| 184 | 1 | 44 | 0.92 |
| 192 | 1 | 23 | 0.48 |
| 194 | 1 | 48 | 1.01 |
| 200 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 201 | 1 | 147 | 3.08 |
| 203 | 1 | 54 | 1.13 |
| 205 | 1 | 41 | 0.86 |
| 208 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 213 | 1 | 121 | 2.54 |
| 214 | 1 | 73 | 1.53 |
| 215 | 1 | 56 | 1.17 |
| 222 | 1 | 83 | 1.74 |
| 223 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 224 | 1 | 83 | 1.74 |
| 226 | 1 | 64 | 1.34 |
| 228 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 230 | 1 | 31 | 0.65 |
| 231 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 232 | 1 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 234 | 1 | 34 | 0.71 |
| 235 | 1 | 40 | 0.84 |
| 236 | 1 | 52 | 1.09 |
| 237 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 239 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 243 | 1 | 38 | 0.80 |
| 245 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 246 | 1 | 38 | 0.80 |
| 248 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 249 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 250 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 251 | 1 | 14 | 0.29 |
| 253 | 1 | 21 | 0.44 |
| 255 | 1 | 63 | 1.32 |

Table 7.D.9 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 256 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 258 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 259 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 260 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 261 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 263 | 1 | 26 | 0.54 |
| 264 | 1 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 265 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 266 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 267 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 269 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 270 | 1 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 272 | 1 | 33 | 0.69 |
| 276 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 277 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 279 | 1 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 280 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 282 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 284 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 285 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 286 | 1 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 287 | 1 | 21 | 0.44 |
| 291 | 1 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 292 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 293 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 294 | 1 | 13 | 0.27 |
| 295 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 298 | 1 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 299 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 300 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 301 | 1 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 304 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 305 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 306 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 307 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 308 | 1 | 29 | 0.61 |
| 310 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 312 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 313 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 314 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |

Table 7.D.9 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 315 | 1 | 27 | 0.57 |
| 317 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 318 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 319 | 1 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 320 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 321 | 1 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 322 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 324 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 326 | 1 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 327 | 1 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 328 | 1 | 22 | 0.46 |
| 331 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 333 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 334 | 1 | 30 | 0.63 |
| 338 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 340 | 1 | 14 | 0.29 |
| 341 | 1 | 35 | 0.73 |
| 343 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 346 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 347 | 1 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 348 | 1 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 352 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 353 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 354 | 1 | 15 | 0.31 |
| 355 | 1 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 356 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 360 | 1 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 361 | 1 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 362 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 363 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 364 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 366 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 367 | 1 | 19 | 0.40 |
| 369 | 1 | 11 | 0.23 |
| 370 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 372 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 373 | 2 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 374 | 2 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 375 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 377 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |

Table 7.D.9 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 379 | 2 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 380 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 381 | 2 | 14 | 0.29 |
| 383 | 2 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 384 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 385 | 2 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 387 | 2 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 388 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 389 | 2 | 13 | 0.27 |
| 391 | 2 | 13 | 0.27 |
| 392 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 394 | 2 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 395 | 2 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 396 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 398 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 399 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 401 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 402 | 2 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 404 | 2 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 405 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 406 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 407 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 409 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 411 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 412 | 2 | 14 | 0.29 |
| 414 | 2 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 417 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 418 | 2 | 38 | 0.80 |
| 419 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 420 | 2 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 424 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 425 | 2 | 27 | 0.57 |
| 427 | 2 | 13 | 0.27 |
| 430 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 431 | 2 | 37 | 0.78 |
| 433 | 2 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 434 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 435 | 2 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 437 | 2 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 438 | 2 | 20 | 0.42 |

Table 7.D.9 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 439 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 443 | 2 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 444 | 2 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 445 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 446 | 2 | 30 | 0.63 |
| 447 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 451 | 3 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 452 | 3 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 453 | 3 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 454 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 455 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 457 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 458 | 3 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 459 | 3 | 25 | 0.52 |
| 462 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 464 | 3 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 465 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 466 | 3 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 467 | 3 | 17 | 0.36 |
| 468 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 470 | 3 | 15 | 0.31 |
| 473 | 3 | 28 | 0.59 |
| 474 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 475 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 476 | 3 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 477 | 3 | 6 | 0.13 |
| 480 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 481 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 482 | 3 | 25 | 0.52 |
| 484 | 3 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 486 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 487 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 489 | 3 | 10 | 0.21 |
| 491 | 3 | 35 | 0.73 |
| 493 | 3 | 7 | 0.15 |
| 494 | 3 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 495 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 500 | 3 | 40 | 0.84 |
| 501 | 3 | 21 | 0.44 |
| 504 | 3 | 14 | 0.29 |

Table 7.D.9 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 507 | 3 | 27 | 0.57 |
| 508 | 3 | 25 | 0.52 |
| 509 | 3 | 25 | 0.52 |
| 516 | 3 | 22 | 0.46 |
| 517 | 3 | 34 | 0.71 |
| 522 | 3 | 20 | 0.42 |
| 523 | 3 | 12 | 0.25 |
| 525 | 3 | 31 | 0.65 |
| 526 | 3 | 42 | 0.88 |
| 538 | 3 | 38 | 0.80 |
| 539 | 3 | 65 | 1.36 |
| 541 | 3 | 18 | 0.38 |
| 550 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 557 | 3 | 34 | 0.71 |
| 558 | 3 | 85 | 1.78 |
| 565 | 3 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 583 | 3 | 8 | 0.17 |
| 599 | 3 | 16 | 0.34 |
| 600 | 3 | 74 | 1.55 |

Table 7.D.10 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 1,564 | 14.97 |
| 153 | 1 | 130 | 1.24 |
| 157 | 1 | 492 | 4.71 |
| 159 | 1 | 123 | 1.18 |
| 165 | 1 | 126 | 1.21 |
| 172 | 1 | 135 | 1.29 |
| 176 | 1 | 98 | 0.94 |
| 182 | 1 | 478 | 4.58 |
| 184 | 1 | 178 | 1.70 |
| 185 | 1 | 82 | 0.78 |
| 191 | 1 | 56 | 0.54 |
| 193 | 1 | 30 | 0.29 |
| 197 | 1 | 538 | 5.15 |
| 199 | 1 | 196 | 1.88 |
| 200 | 1 | 22 | 0.21 |
| 201 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 207 | 1 | 157 | 1.50 |
| 208 | 1 | 294 | 2.81 |
| 211 | 1 | 143 | 1.37 |
| 212 | 1 | 198 | 1.90 |
| 215 | 1 | 17 | 0.16 |
| 216 | 1 | 97 | 0.93 |
| 217 | 1 | 158 | 1.51 |
| 220 | 1 | 68 | 0.65 |
| 221 | 1 | 8 | 0.08 |
| 222 | 1 | 169 | 1.62 |
| 223 | 1 | 146 | 1.40 |
| 225 | 1 | 120 | 1.15 |
| 227 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 228 | 1 | 41 | 0.39 |
| 231 | 1 | 106 | 1.01 |
| 232 | 1 | 97 | 0.93 |
| 233 | 1 | 48 | 0.46 |
| 234 | 1 | 141 | 1.35 |
| 235 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 239 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 240 | 1 | 120 | 1.15 |
| 243 | 1 | 163 | 1.56 |
| 246 | 1 | 5 | 0.05 |

Table 7.D.10 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 248 | 1 | 55 | 0.53 |
| 250 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 251 | 1 | 94 | 0.90 |
| 252 | 1 | 50 | 0.48 |
| 253 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 255 | 1 | 34 | 0.33 |
| 257 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 258 | 1 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 259 | 1 | 45 | 0.43 |
| 260 | 1 | 66 | 0.63 |
| 261 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 263 | 1 | 4 | 0.04 |
| 265 | 1 | 5 | 0.05 |
| 266 | 1 | 44 | 0.42 |
| 267 | 1 | 11 | 0.11 |
| 268 | 1 | 47 | 0.45 |
| 270 | 1 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 273 | 1 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 274 | 1 | 9 | 0.09 |
| 275 | 1 | 24 | 0.23 |
| 276 | 1 | 27 | 0.26 |
| 277 | 1 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 279 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 280 | 1 | 11 | 0.11 |
| 281 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 282 | 1 | 29 | 0.28 |
| 283 | 1 | 33 | 0.32 |
| 284 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 285 | 1 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 288 | 1 | 17 | 0.16 |
| 289 | 1 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 290 | 1 | 20 | 0.19 |
| 291 | 1 | 37 | 0.35 |
| 292 | 1 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 294 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 296 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 297 | 1 | 36 | 0.34 |
| 298 | 1 | 12 | 0.11 |
| 299 | 1 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 300 | 1 | 22 | 0.21 |

Table 7.D.10 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 302 | 1 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 303 | 1 | 5 | 0.05 |
| 304 | 1 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 305 | 1 | 9 | 0.09 |
| 306 | 1 | 28 | 0.27 |
| 308 | 1 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 309 | 1 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 310 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 311 | 1 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 312 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 313 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 314 | 1 | 17 | 0.16 |
| 315 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 316 | 1 | 12 | 0.11 |
| 317 | 1 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 318 | 1 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 319 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 320 | 1 | 10 | 0.10 |
| 321 | 1 | 18 | 0.17 |
| 323 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 324 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 325 | 1 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 326 | 1 | 18 | 0.17 |
| 328 | 1 | 11 | 0.11 |
| 329 | 1 | 12 | 0.11 |
| 330 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 331 | 1 | 14 | 0.13 |
| 332 | 1 | 19 | 0.18 |
| 333 | 1 | 8 | 0.08 |
| 334 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 335 | 1 | 10 | 0.10 |
| 336 | 1 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 337 | 1 | 5 | 0.05 |
| 338 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 339 | 1 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 340 | 1 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 341 | 1 | 8 | 0.08 |
| 342 | 1 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 343 | 1 | 9 | 0.09 |
| 344 | 1 | 9 | 0.09 |

Table 7.D.10 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 345 | 1 | 10 | 0.10 |
| 346 | 1 | 18 | 0.17 |
| 347 | 1 | 17 | 0.16 |
| 348 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 349 | 1 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 350 | 1 | 8 | 0.08 |
| 351 | 1 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 352 | 1 | 19 | 0.18 |
| 353 | 1 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 355 | 1 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 356 | 1 | 4 | 0.04 |
| 358 | 1 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 359 | 1 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 360 | 1 | 19 | 0.18 |
| 361 | 1 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 362 | 1 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 364 | 1 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 367 | 1 | 37 | 0.35 |
| 368 | 1 | 20 | 0.19 |
| 370 | 2 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 372 | 2 | 5 | 0.05 |
| 374 | 2 | 26 | 0.25 |
| 375 | 2 | 19 | 0.18 |
| 376 | 2 | 14 | 0.13 |
| 377 | 2 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 379 | 2 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 381 | 2 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 382 | 2 | 44 | 0.42 |
| 383 | 2 | 23 | 0.22 |
| 385 | 2 | 12 | 0.11 |
| 386 | 2 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 388 | 2 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 389 | 2 | 41 | 0.39 |
| 390 | 2 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 391 | 2 | 5 | 0.05 |
| 392 | 2 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 394 | 2 | 5 | 0.05 |
| 396 | 2 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 397 | 2 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 398 | 2 | 37 | 0.35 |

Table 7.D.10 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 400 | 2 | 10 | 0.10 |
| 403 | 2 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 404 | 2 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 405 | 2 | 33 | 0.32 |
| 406 | 2 | 17 | 0.16 |
| 407 | 2 | 19 | 0.18 |
| 408 | 2 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 411 | 2 | 13 | 0.12 |
| 413 | 2 | 35 | 0.33 |
| 415 | 2 | 31 | 0.30 |
| 416 | 2 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 418 | 2 | 18 | 0.17 |
| 422 | 2 | 35 | 0.33 |
| 423 | 2 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 424 | 2 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 425 | 2 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 426 | 2 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 430 | 2 | 3 | 0.03 |
| 431 | 2 | 53 | 0.51 |
| 432 | 2 | 4 | 0.04 |
| 433 | 2 | 14 | 0.13 |
| 434 | 2 | 24 | 0.23 |
| 438 | 2 | 20 | 0.19 |
| 439 | 2 | 4 | 0.04 |
| 440 | 2 | 22 | 0.21 |
| 441 | 2 | 22 | 0.21 |
| 442 | 2 | 29 | 0.28 |
| 445 | 2 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 446 | 2 | 20 | 0.19 |
| 447 | 2 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 450 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 451 | 3 | 52 | 0.50 |
| 452 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 453 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 454 | 3 | 22 | 0.21 |
| 455 | 3 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 458 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 462 | 3 | 40 | 0.38 |
| 463 | 3 | 14 | 0.13 |
| 464 | 3 | 32 | 0.31 |

Table 7.D.10 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 465 | 3 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 468 | 3 | 6 | 0.06 |
| 470 | 3 | 4 | 0.04 |
| 471 | 3 | 16 | 0.15 |
| 472 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 474 | 3 | 62 | 0.59 |
| 475 | 3 | 7 | 0.07 |
| 480 | 3 | 50 | 0.48 |
| 483 | 3 | 11 | 0.11 |
| 487 | 3 | 33 | 0.32 |
| 488 | 3 | 4 | 0.04 |
| 490 | 3 | 37 | 0.35 |
| 491 | 3 | 12 | 0.11 |
| 492 | 3 | 19 | 0.18 |
| 495 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 496 | 3 | 15 | 0.14 |
| 497 | 3 | 2 | 0.02 |
| 501 | 3 | 42 | 0.40 |
| 503 | 3 | 80 | 0.77 |
| 505 | 3 | 20 | 0.19 |
| 506 | 3 | 9 | 0.09 |
| 509 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 511 | 3 | 41 | 0.39 |
| 516 | 3 | 70 | 0.67 |
| 517 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 519 | 3 | 39 | 0.37 |
| 524 | 3 | 43 | 0.41 |
| 525 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 528 | 3 | 68 | 0.65 |
| 529 | 3 | 31 | 0.30 |
| 535 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 540 | 3 | 47 | 0.45 |
| 544 | 3 | 25 | 0.24 |
| 545 | 3 | 125 | 1.20 |
| 546 | 3 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 558 | 3 | 3 | 0.03 |

Table 7.D.10 *(continuation six)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 565 | 3 | 53 | 0.51 |
| 570 | 3 | 141 | 1.35 |
| 574 | 3 | 10 | 0.10 |
| 595 | 3 | 34 | 0.33 |
| 600 | 3 | 110 | 1.05 |

Table 7.D.11 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 909 | 14.53 |
| 153 | 1 | 60 | 0.96 |
| 157 | 1 | 207 | 3.31 |
| 159 | 1 | 58 | 0.93 |
| 165 | 1 | 69 | 1.10 |
| 172 | 1 | 44 | 0.70 |
| 176 | 1 | 58 | 0.93 |
| 182 | 1 | 196 | 3.13 |
| 184 | 1 | 68 | 1.09 |
| 185 | 1 | 36 | 0.58 |
| 191 | 1 | 28 | 0.45 |
| 193 | 1 | 25 | 0.40 |
| 197 | 1 | 211 | 3.37 |
| 199 | 1 | 77 | 1.23 |
| 200 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 201 | 1 | 15 | 0.24 |
| 207 | 1 | 61 | 0.97 |
| 208 | 1 | 167 | 2.67 |
| 211 | 1 | 72 | 1.15 |
| 212 | 1 | 92 | 1.47 |
| 215 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 216 | 1 | 49 | 0.78 |
| 217 | 1 | 65 | 1.04 |
| 220 | 1 | 42 | 0.67 |
| 221 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 222 | 1 | 63 | 1.01 |
| 223 | 1 | 77 | 1.23 |
| 225 | 1 | 60 | 0.96 |
| 227 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 228 | 1 | 21 | 0.34 |
| 231 | 1 | 43 | 0.69 |
| 232 | 1 | 44 | 0.70 |
| 233 | 1 | 35 | 0.56 |
| 234 | 1 | 71 | 1.13 |
| 235 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 239 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 240 | 1 | 77 | 1.23 |
| 243 | 1 | 91 | 1.45 |
| 245 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |

Table 7.D.11 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 246 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 248 | 1 | 25 | 0.40 |
| 251 | 1 | 58 | 0.93 |
| 252 | 1 | 34 | 0.54 |
| 253 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 255 | 1 | 22 | 0.35 |
| 257 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 258 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 259 | 1 | 40 | 0.64 |
| 260 | 1 | 45 | 0.72 |
| 261 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 263 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 264 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 265 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 266 | 1 | 27 | 0.43 |
| 267 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 268 | 1 | 50 | 0.80 |
| 270 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 273 | 1 | 22 | 0.35 |
| 274 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 275 | 1 | 29 | 0.46 |
| 276 | 1 | 31 | 0.50 |
| 278 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 279 | 1 | 12 | 0.19 |
| 280 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 281 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 282 | 1 | 19 | 0.30 |
| 283 | 1 | 27 | 0.43 |
| 284 | 1 | 17 | 0.27 |
| 285 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 288 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 289 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 290 | 1 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 291 | 1 | 29 | 0.46 |
| 292 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 294 | 1 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 295 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 296 | 1 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 297 | 1 | 19 | 0.30 |
| 298 | 1 | 13 | 0.21 |

Table 7.D.11 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 299 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 300 | 1 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 302 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 303 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 304 | 1 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 305 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 306 | 1 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 308 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 309 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 310 | 1 | 20 | 0.32 |
| 311 | 1 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 312 | 1 | 25 | 0.40 |
| 313 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 314 | 1 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 315 | 1 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 316 | 1 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 317 | 1 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 318 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 319 | 1 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 320 | 1 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 321 | 1 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 323 | 1 | 12 | 0.19 |
| 324 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 325 | 1 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 326 | 1 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 328 | 1 | 16 | 0.26 |
| 329 | 1 | 12 | 0.19 |
| 330 | 1 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 331 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 332 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 333 | 1 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 334 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 335 | 1 | 15 | 0.24 |
| 336 | 1 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 337 | 1 | 9 | 0.14 |
| 338 | 1 | 16 | 0.26 |
| 339 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 340 | 1 | 21 | 0.34 |
| 341 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 342 | 1 | 2 | 0.03 |

Table 7.D.11 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 343 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 344 | 1 | 12 | 0.19 |
| 345 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 346 | 1 | 12 | 0.19 |
| 347 | 1 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 348 | 1 | 12 | 0.19 |
| 349 | 1 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 350 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 351 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 352 | 1 | 16 | 0.26 |
| 353 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 355 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 356 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 358 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 359 | 1 | 15 | 0.24 |
| 360 | 1 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 361 | 1 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 362 | 1 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 364 | 1 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 367 | 1 | 37 | 0.59 |
| 368 | 1 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 369 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 370 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 372 | 2 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 374 | 2 | 24 | 0.38 |
| 375 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 376 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 379 | 2 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 380 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 381 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 382 | 2 | 37 | 0.59 |
| 383 | 2 | 15 | 0.24 |
| 385 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 386 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 389 | 2 | 17 | 0.27 |
| 390 | 2 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 391 | 2 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 392 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 394 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 396 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.11 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 397 | 2 | 33 | 0.53 |
| 398 | 2 | 22 | 0.35 |
| 400 | 2 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 403 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 404 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 405 | 2 | 32 | 0.51 |
| 406 | 2 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 407 | 2 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 408 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 411 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 413 | 2 | 42 | 0.67 |
| 415 | 2 | 23 | 0.37 |
| 416 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 417 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 418 | 2 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 422 | 2 | 32 | 0.51 |
| 423 | 2 | 25 | 0.40 |
| 425 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 426 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 430 | 2 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 431 | 2 | 47 | 0.75 |
| 433 | 2 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 434 | 2 | 16 | 0.26 |
| 437 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 438 | 2 | 7 | 0.11 |
| 439 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 440 | 2 | 25 | 0.40 |
| 441 | 2 | 17 | 0.27 |
| 442 | 2 | 19 | 0.30 |
| 445 | 2 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 446 | 2 | 11 | 0.18 |
| 447 | 2 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 451 | 3 | 37 | 0.59 |
| 454 | 3 | 16 | 0.26 |
| 455 | 3 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 458 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 462 | 3 | 38 | 0.61 |
| 463 | 3 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 464 | 3 | 22 | 0.35 |
| 465 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.11 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 468 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 470 | 3 | 4 | 0.06 |
| 471 | 3 | 15 | 0.24 |
| 472 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 474 | 3 | 36 | 0.58 |
| 475 | 3 | 6 | 0.10 |
| 480 | 3 | 35 | 0.56 |
| 483 | 3 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 487 | 3 | 23 | 0.37 |
| 488 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 490 | 3 | 30 | 0.48 |
| 491 | 3 | 10 | 0.16 |
| 492 | 3 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 495 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 496 | 3 | 13 | 0.21 |
| 497 | 3 | 3 | 0.05 |
| 501 | 3 | 25 | 0.40 |
| 503 | 3 | 62 | 0.99 |
| 505 | 3 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 506 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 511 | 3 | 43 | 0.69 |
| 516 | 3 | 39 | 0.62 |
| 519 | 3 | 29 | 0.46 |
| 524 | 3 | 34 | 0.54 |
| 525 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 528 | 3 | 52 | 0.83 |
| 529 | 3 | 24 | 0.38 |
| 535 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 540 | 3 | 46 | 0.74 |
| 544 | 3 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 545 | 3 | 115 | 1.84 |
| 546 | 3 | 2 | 0.03 |
| 558 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 565 | 3 | 37 | 0.59 |
| 570 | 3 | 108 | 1.73 |
| 574 | 3 | 14 | 0.22 |
| 595 | 3 | 18 | 0.29 |
| 600 | 3 | 69 | 1.10 |

Table 7.D.12 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 787 | 14.96 |
| 153 | 1 | 63 | 1.20 |
| 157 | 1 | 153 | 2.91 |
| 159 | 1 | 28 | 0.53 |
| 165 | 1 | 65 | 1.24 |
| 172 | 1 | 35 | 0.67 |
| 176 | 1 | 42 | 0.80 |
| 182 | 1 | 177 | 3.36 |
| 184 | 1 | 55 | 1.05 |
| 185 | 1 | 22 | 0.42 |
| 191 | 1 | 21 | 0.40 |
| 193 | 1 | 20 | 0.38 |
| 197 | 1 | 161 | 3.06 |
| 199 | 1 | 78 | 1.48 |
| 200 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 201 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 207 | 1 | 50 | 0.95 |
| 208 | 1 | 101 | 1.92 |
| 211 | 1 | 61 | 1.16 |
| 212 | 1 | 75 | 1.43 |
| 215 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 216 | 1 | 31 | 0.59 |
| 217 | 1 | 77 | 1.46 |
| 220 | 1 | 35 | 0.67 |
| 221 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 222 | 1 | 47 | 0.89 |
| 223 | 1 | 50 | 0.95 |
| 225 | 1 | 51 | 0.97 |
| 228 | 1 | 29 | 0.55 |
| 231 | 1 | 26 | 0.49 |
| 232 | 1 | 35 | 0.67 |
| 233 | 1 | 20 | 0.38 |
| 234 | 1 | 49 | 0.93 |
| 235 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 240 | 1 | 56 | 1.06 |
| 243 | 1 | 76 | 1.44 |
| 246 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 248 | 1 | 33 | 0.63 |
| 250 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |

Table 7.D.12 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 251 | 1 | 37 | 0.70 |
| 252 | 1 | 28 | 0.53 |
| 253 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 255 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 258 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 259 | 1 | 15 | 0.29 |
| 260 | 1 | 38 | 0.72 |
| 261 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 263 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 264 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 265 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 266 | 1 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 267 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 268 | 1 | 21 | 0.40 |
| 270 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 273 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 274 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 275 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 276 | 1 | 31 | 0.59 |
| 278 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 279 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 280 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 281 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 282 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 283 | 1 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 284 | 1 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 285 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 288 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 289 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 290 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 291 | 1 | 33 | 0.63 |
| 292 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 294 | 1 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 295 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 296 | 1 | 15 | 0.29 |
| 297 | 1 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 298 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 299 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 300 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 301 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.12 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 302 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 303 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 304 | 1 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 305 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 306 | 1 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 308 | 1 | 15 | 0.29 |
| 309 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 310 | 1 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 311 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 312 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 313 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 314 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 315 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 316 | 1 | 15 | 0.29 |
| 317 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 318 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 319 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 320 | 1 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 321 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 323 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 324 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 325 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 326 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 328 | 1 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 329 | 1 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 330 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 331 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 332 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 333 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 334 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 335 | 1 | 14 | 0.27 |
| 336 | 1 | 12 | 0.23 |
| 337 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 338 | 1 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 340 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 341 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 343 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 344 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 345 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 346 | 1 | 8 | 0.15 |

Table 7.D.12 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 347 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 348 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 349 | 1 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 350 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 351 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 352 | 1 | 20 | 0.38 |
| 353 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 355 | 1 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 356 | 1 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 358 | 1 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 359 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 360 | 1 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 361 | 1 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 362 | 1 | 18 | 0.34 |
| 364 | 1 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 367 | 1 | 28 | 0.53 |
| 368 | 1 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 369 | 1 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 370 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 372 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 374 | 2 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 375 | 2 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 376 | 2 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 379 | 2 | 7 | 0.13 |
| 380 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 381 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 382 | 2 | 32 | 0.61 |
| 383 | 2 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 385 | 2 | 9 | 0.17 |
| 386 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 388 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 389 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 390 | 2 | 22 | 0.42 |
| 391 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 392 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 394 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 396 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 397 | 2 | 27 | 0.51 |
| 398 | 2 | 21 | 0.40 |
| 400 | 2 | 9 | 0.17 |

Table 7.D.12 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 403 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 404 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 405 | 2 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 406 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 407 | 2 | 15 | 0.29 |
| 411 | 2 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 413 | 2 | 32 | 0.61 |
| 415 | 2 | 19 | 0.36 |
| 416 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 417 | 2 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 418 | 2 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 422 | 2 | 32 | 0.61 |
| 423 | 2 | 25 | 0.48 |
| 425 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 426 | 2 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 427 | 2 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 430 | 2 | 3 | 0.06 |
| 431 | 2 | 30 | 0.57 |
| 433 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 434 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 438 | 2 | 24 | 0.46 |
| 440 | 2 | 21 | 0.40 |
| 441 | 2 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 442 | 2 | 11 | 0.21 |
| 445 | 2 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 446 | 2 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 447 | 2 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 451 | 3 | 32 | 0.61 |
| 453 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 454 | 3 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 455 | 3 | 16 | 0.30 |
| 460 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 462 | 3 | 34 | 0.65 |
| 463 | 3 | 14 | 0.27 |
| 464 | 3 | 21 | 0.40 |
| 465 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 468 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 470 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 471 | 3 | 17 | 0.32 |
| 472 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |

Table 7.D.12 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 474 | 3 | 51 | 0.97 |
| 475 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 480 | 3 | 30 | 0.57 |
| 482 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 483 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 487 | 3 | 27 | 0.51 |
| 488 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 490 | 3 | 34 | 0.65 |
| 491 | 3 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 492 | 3 | 15 | 0.29 |
| 495 | 3 | 4 | 0.08 |
| 496 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 497 | 3 | 6 | 0.11 |
| 501 | 3 | 29 | 0.55 |
| 503 | 3 | 66 | 1.25 |
| 505 | 3 | 13 | 0.25 |
| 506 | 3 | 8 | 0.15 |
| 511 | 3 | 34 | 0.65 |
| 516 | 3 | 45 | 0.86 |
| 519 | 3 | 37 | 0.70 |
| 524 | 3 | 41 | 0.78 |
| 525 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 528 | 3 | 50 | 0.95 |
| 529 | 3 | 21 | 0.40 |
| 535 | 3 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 540 | 3 | 56 | 1.06 |
| 544 | 3 | 23 | 0.44 |
| 545 | 3 | 108 | 2.05 |
| 546 | 3 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 558 | 3 | 2 | 0.04 |
| 565 | 3 | 50 | 0.95 |
| 570 | 3 | 94 | 1.79 |
| 574 | 3 | 10 | 0.19 |
| 595 | 3 | 23 | 0.44 |
| 600 | 3 | 74 | 1.41 |

Table 7.D.13 Scale Score and Performance Level Distribution—Overall Scores, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 150 | 1 | 484 | 14.19 |
| 153 | 1 | 30 | 0.88 |
| 157 | 1 | 108 | 3.17 |
| 159 | 1 | 30 | 0.88 |
| 165 | 1 | 34 | 1.00 |
| 172 | 1 | 15 | 0.44 |
| 176 | 1 | 23 | 0.67 |
| 182 | 1 | 80 | 2.35 |
| 184 | 1 | 38 | 1.11 |
| 185 | 1 | 15 | 0.44 |
| 191 | 1 | 8 | 0.23 |
| 193 | 1 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 197 | 1 | 114 | 3.34 |
| 199 | 1 | 34 | 1.00 |
| 200 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 201 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 207 | 1 | 27 | 0.79 |
| 208 | 1 | 52 | 1.52 |
| 211 | 1 | 34 | 1.00 |
| 212 | 1 | 46 | 1.35 |
| 215 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 216 | 1 | 21 | 0.62 |
| 217 | 1 | 39 | 1.14 |
| 220 | 1 | 12 | 0.35 |
| 221 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 222 | 1 | 36 | 1.06 |
| 223 | 1 | 35 | 1.03 |
| 225 | 1 | 27 | 0.79 |
| 228 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 231 | 1 | 15 | 0.44 |
| 232 | 1 | 19 | 0.56 |
| 233 | 1 | 18 | 0.53 |
| 234 | 1 | 27 | 0.79 |
| 235 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 239 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 240 | 1 | 36 | 1.06 |
| 243 | 1 | 40 | 1.17 |
| 246 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 248 | 1 | 13 | 0.38 |

Table 7.D.13 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 250 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 251 | 1 | 22 | 0.64 |
| 252 | 1 | 16 | 0.47 |
| 253 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 255 | 1 | 14 | 0.41 |
| 257 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 258 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 259 | 1 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 260 | 1 | 20 | 0.59 |
| 261 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 263 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 265 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 266 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 267 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 268 | 1 | 20 | 0.59 |
| 270 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 273 | 1 | 12 | 0.35 |
| 274 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 275 | 1 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 276 | 1 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 279 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 280 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 281 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 282 | 1 | 12 | 0.35 |
| 283 | 1 | 13 | 0.38 |
| 284 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 285 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 288 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 289 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 290 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 291 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 292 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 294 | 1 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 296 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 297 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 298 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 299 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 300 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 301 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 302 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |

Table 7.D.13 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 303 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 304 | 1 | 9 | 0.26 |
| 305 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 306 | 1 | 12 | 0.35 |
| 308 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 309 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 310 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 311 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 312 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 313 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 314 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 315 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 316 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 317 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 318 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 319 | 1 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 320 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 321 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 323 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 324 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 325 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 326 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 328 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 329 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 330 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 331 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 332 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 333 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 334 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 335 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 336 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 337 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 338 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 340 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 341 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 343 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 344 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 345 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 346 | 1 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 347 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |

Table 7.D.13 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 348 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 349 | 1 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 350 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 352 | 1 | 8 | 0.23 |
| 353 | 1 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 355 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 356 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 358 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 359 | 1 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 360 | 1 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 361 | 1 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 362 | 1 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 364 | 1 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 367 | 1 | 17 | 0.50 |
| 368 | 1 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 369 | 1 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 370 | 2 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 372 | 2 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 374 | 2 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 375 | 2 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 376 | 2 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 379 | 2 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 380 | 2 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 381 | 2 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 382 | 2 | 22 | 0.64 |
| 383 | 2 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 385 | 2 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 388 | 2 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 389 | 2 | 15 | 0.44 |
| 390 | 2 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 391 | 2 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 392 | 2 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 394 | 2 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 397 | 2 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 398 | 2 | 8 | 0.23 |
| 400 | 2 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 403 | 2 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 404 | 2 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 405 | 2 | 20 | 0.59 |
| 406 | 2 | 9 | 0.26 |

Table 7.D.13 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 407 | 2 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 411 | 2 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 413 | 2 | 20 | 0.59 |
| 415 | 2 | 17 | 0.50 |
| 417 | 2 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 418 | 2 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 422 | 2 | 15 | 0.44 |
| 423 | 2 | 19 | 0.56 |
| 425 | 2 | 9 | 0.26 |
| 426 | 2 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 427 | 2 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 430 | 2 | 2 | 0.06 |
| 431 | 2 | 24 | 0.70 |
| 433 | 2 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 434 | 2 | 8 | 0.23 |
| 438 | 2 | 9 | 0.26 |
| 440 | 2 | 12 | 0.35 |
| 441 | 2 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 442 | 2 | 14 | 0.41 |
| 445 | 2 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 446 | 2 | 9 | 0.26 |
| 447 | 2 | 6 | 0.18 |
| 451 | 3 | 38 | 1.11 |
| 454 | 3 | 10 | 0.29 |
| 455 | 3 | 24 | 0.70 |
| 462 | 3 | 28 | 0.82 |
| 463 | 3 | 14 | 0.41 |
| 464 | 3 | 16 | 0.47 |
| 470 | 3 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 471 | 3 | 8 | 0.23 |
| 472 | 3 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 473 | 3 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 474 | 3 | 35 | 1.03 |
| 475 | 3 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 480 | 3 | 23 | 0.67 |
| 483 | 3 | 5 | 0.15 |
| 487 | 3 | 31 | 0.91 |
| 488 | 3 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 490 | 3 | 14 | 0.41 |
| 491 | 3 | 6 | 0.18 |

Table 7.D.13 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale Score** | **Level** | **N** | **Percentage** |
| 492 | 3 | 11 | 0.32 |
| 496 | 3 | 8 | 0.23 |
| 497 | 3 | 3 | 0.09 |
| 501 | 3 | 15 | 0.44 |
| 503 | 3 | 43 | 1.26 |
| 505 | 3 | 17 | 0.50 |
| 506 | 3 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 511 | 3 | 26 | 0.76 |
| 516 | 3 | 31 | 0.91 |
| 519 | 3 | 29 | 0.85 |
| 524 | 3 | 39 | 1.14 |
| 528 | 3 | 39 | 1.14 |
| 529 | 3 | 30 | 0.88 |
| 540 | 3 | 50 | 1.47 |
| 544 | 3 | 14 | 0.41 |
| 545 | 3 | 88 | 2.58 |
| 558 | 3 | 4 | 0.12 |
| 565 | 3 | 35 | 1.03 |
| 570 | 3 | 95 | 2.79 |
| 574 | 3 | 7 | 0.21 |
| 595 | 3 | 19 | 0.56 |
| 600 | 3 | 66 | 1.93 |

### Appendix 7.E: Means and Standard Deviations of Scale Scores by Demographic Student Group

**Notes:**

* To protect privacy when the number of students in a student group is 10 or fewer, the summary statistics at the test level and reporting level are not reported and are presented as “N/A” in the tables in [appendix 7.E](#_Appendix_7.E:_Means).
* Percentages in these tables may not sum up to 100 because of rounding.

Table 7.E.1 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 133,652 | 317 | 131 | 65 | 20 | 15 |
| Male | 67,937 | 301 | 127 | 70 | 18 | 12 |
| Female | 65,693 | 334 | 133 | 60 | 22 | 18 |
| Nonbinary | 22 | 278 | 150 | 68 | 18 | 14 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 287 | 320 | 131 | 67 | 17 | 16 |
| Asian | 21,911 | 366 | 135 | 50 | 23 | 26 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 313 | 340 | 123 | 59 | 25 | 16 |
| Filipino | 1,047 | 381 | 124 | 46 | 27 | 27 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 97,610 | 302 | 125 | 70 | 19 | 11 |
| Black or African American | 795 | 356 | 135 | 52 | 25 | 23 |
| White | 7,661 | 346 | 143 | 55 | 22 | 24 |
| Two or more races | 4,028 | 340 | 149 | 57 | 19 | 24 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 83,366 | 299 | 122 | 71 | 18 | 11 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 50,286 | 348 | 139 | 55 | 22 | 23 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 114,480 | 281 | 103 | 76 | 23 | 1 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 19,172 | 532 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 98 |
| Migrant education | 2,047 | 245 | 109 | 85 | 10 | 5 |
| Not migrant education | 131,605 | 318 | 131 | 65 | 20 | 15 |
| Disability | 13,059 | 246 | 109 | 86 | 10 | 5 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 536 | 150 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| No disability | 120,593 | 325 | 131 | 63 | 21 | 16 |
| Assigned accommodations | 94 | 234 | 103 | 89 | 6 | 4 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 133,022 | 318 | 131 | 65 | 20 | 15 |

Table 7.E.1 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| Military | 933 | 349 | 128 | 57 | 23 | 20 |
| Not military | 132,719 | 317 | 131 | 65 | 20 | 15 |
| Homeless | 4,662 | 272 | 121 | 77 | 14 | 8 |
| Not homeless | 128,990 | 319 | 131 | 65 | 20 | 15 |
| Foster youth | 388 | 315 | 115 | 65 | 26 | 9 |
| Not foster youth | 133,264 | 317 | 131 | 65 | 20 | 15 |

Table 7.E.2 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 12,612 | 309 | 138 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Male | 6,637 | 301 | 134 | 67 | 17 | 16 |
| Female | 5,974 | 318 | 141 | 62 | 18 | 20 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 23 | 287 | 152 | 74 | 9 | 17 |
| Asian | 2,562 | 367 | 146 | 49 | 18 | 34 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 44 | 324 | 112 | 61 | 23 | 16 |
| Filipino | 144 | 399 | 115 | 37 | 31 | 33 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,636 | 284 | 125 | 72 | 17 | 11 |
| Black or African American | 93 | 346 | 151 | 56 | 17 | 27 |
| White | 1,370 | 328 | 145 | 59 | 19 | 23 |
| Two or more races | 740 | 304 | 151 | 67 | 12 | 22 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,757 | 286 | 122 | 72 | 18 | 10 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,855 | 335 | 150 | 56 | 17 | 27 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 10,639 | 269 | 108 | 77 | 19 | 4 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,973 | 527 | 53 | 0 | 7 | 93 |
| Migrant education | 203 | 219 | 99 | 90 | 7 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 12,409 | 310 | 138 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Disability | 663 | 263 | 123 | 79 | 13 | 8 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 60 | 150 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| No disability | 11,949 | 312 | 138 | 64 | 17 | 18 |
| Assigned accommodations | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 12,546 | 310 | 138 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Military | 105 | 382 | 123 | 43 | 26 | 31 |
| Not military | 12,507 | 308 | 138 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Homeless | 810 | 245 | 111 | 82 | 11 | 6 |
| Not homeless | 11,802 | 313 | 138 | 64 | 18 | 19 |
| Foster youth | 35 | 355 | 115 | 46 | 40 | 14 |
| Not foster youth | 12,577 | 309 | 138 | 65 | 17 | 18 |

Table 7.E.3 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 6,488 | 307 | 143 | 65 | 15 | 20 |
| Male | 3,346 | 302 | 140 | 67 | 15 | 18 |
| Female | 3,141 | 313 | 146 | 63 | 15 | 22 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 17 | 305 | 152 | 65 | 12 | 24 |
| Asian | 1,505 | 382 | 146 | 44 | 19 | 38 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 31 | 351 | 141 | 48 | 23 | 29 |
| Filipino | 75 | 432 | 82 | 17 | 48 | 35 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,495 | 271 | 127 | 76 | 13 | 11 |
| Black or African American | 59 | 359 | 147 | 46 | 24 | 31 |
| White | 746 | 316 | 142 | 64 | 14 | 22 |
| Two or more races | 560 | 297 | 140 | 69 | 13 | 18 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,022 | 276 | 128 | 74 | 15 | 11 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,466 | 335 | 149 | 58 | 15 | 27 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,348 | 262 | 110 | 79 | 16 | 5 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,140 | 523 | 54 | 0 | 8 | 92 |
| Migrant education | 129 | 225 | 101 | 91 | 4 | 5 |
| Not migrant education | 6,359 | 309 | 143 | 65 | 15 | 20 |
| Disability | 151 | 342 | 136 | 48 | 32 | 20 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 6,337 | 307 | 143 | 66 | 14 | 20 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,482 | 308 | 143 | 65 | 15 | 20 |
| Military | 60 | 428 | 127 | 28 | 22 | 50 |
| Not military | 6,428 | 306 | 142 | 66 | 15 | 20 |
| Homeless | 512 | 260 | 122 | 81 | 9 | 10 |
| Not homeless | 5,976 | 312 | 144 | 64 | 15 | 21 |
| Foster youth | 13 | 344 | 128 | 46 | 31 | 23 |
| Not foster youth | 6,475 | 307 | 143 | 65 | 15 | 20 |

Table 7.E.4 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,709 | 275 | 149 | 71 | 11 | 18 |
| Male | 2,906 | 268 | 146 | 73 | 11 | 17 |
| Female | 2,800 | 281 | 152 | 70 | 10 | 20 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 11 | 273 | 140 | 64 | 27 | 9 |
| Asian | 1,344 | 360 | 162 | 50 | 15 | 35 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 33 | 370 | 123 | 52 | 24 | 24 |
| Filipino | 74 | 423 | 97 | 22 | 42 | 36 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,051 | 229 | 122 | 83 | 7 | 10 |
| Black or African American | 55 | 353 | 164 | 45 | 16 | 38 |
| White | 687 | 291 | 149 | 68 | 12 | 20 |
| Two or more races | 454 | 263 | 144 | 75 | 9 | 16 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,693 | 242 | 129 | 79 | 10 | 11 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,016 | 304 | 159 | 64 | 11 | 25 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,027 | 237 | 116 | 81 | 12 | 8 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 682 | 549 | 47 | 0 | 3 | 97 |
| Migrant education | 93 | 196 | 97 | 91 | 4 | 4 |
| Not migrant education | 5,616 | 276 | 150 | 71 | 11 | 19 |
| Disability | 104 | 294 | 128 | 65 | 22 | 13 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,605 | 274 | 150 | 71 | 10 | 18 |
| Assigned accommodations | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,697 | 275 | 149 | 71 | 11 | 18 |
| Military | 45 | 395 | 147 | 38 | 27 | 36 |
| Not military | 5,664 | 274 | 149 | 71 | 10 | 18 |
| Homeless | 466 | 207 | 102 | 90 | 5 | 6 |
| Not homeless | 5,243 | 281 | 151 | 69 | 11 | 19 |
| Foster youth | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,701 | 275 | 149 | 71 | 11 | 18 |

Table 7.E.5 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Four

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,333 | 290 | 160 | 68 | 8 | 24 |
| Male | 2,834 | 288 | 159 | 69 | 8 | 23 |
| Female | 2,499 | 292 | 161 | 67 | 9 | 24 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,283 | 383 | 165 | 44 | 13 | 43 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 29 | 389 | 151 | 31 | 28 | 41 |
| Filipino | 64 | 447 | 95 | 20 | 33 | 47 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,827 | 240 | 136 | 80 | 6 | 14 |
| Black or African American | 50 | 342 | 163 | 52 | 12 | 36 |
| White | 617 | 306 | 159 | 68 | 7 | 25 |
| Two or more races | 457 | 278 | 155 | 71 | 7 | 21 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,420 | 246 | 135 | 79 | 7 | 14 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,913 | 326 | 169 | 59 | 10 | 31 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,393 | 233 | 112 | 83 | 10 | 8 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 940 | 552 | 47 | 0 | 2 | 98 |
| Migrant education | 114 | 191 | 92 | 94 | 1 | 5 |
| Not migrant education | 5,219 | 292 | 160 | 67 | 9 | 24 |
| Disability | 97 | 315 | 151 | 58 | 19 | 24 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,236 | 289 | 160 | 68 | 8 | 24 |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,326 | 290 | 160 | 68 | 8 | 24 |
| Military | 45 | 446 | 146 | 22 | 20 | 58 |
| Not military | 5,288 | 288 | 159 | 68 | 8 | 23 |
| Homeless | 474 | 208 | 101 | 91 | 4 | 5 |
| Not homeless | 4,859 | 298 | 162 | 66 | 9 | 25 |
| Foster youth | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,326 | 289 | 160 | 68 | 8 | 23 |

Table 7.E.6 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,928 | 300 | 163 | 67 | 8 | 25 |
| Male | 2,550 | 296 | 161 | 69 | 8 | 24 |
| Female | 2,378 | 304 | 166 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,153 | 390 | 170 | 45 | 10 | 45 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 20 | 429 | 103 | 25 | 30 | 45 |
| Filipino | 84 | 478 | 94 | 20 | 11 | 69 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,642 | 251 | 141 | 79 | 6 | 15 |
| Black or African American | 48 | 358 | 184 | 50 | 13 | 38 |
| White | 572 | 329 | 158 | 63 | 10 | 27 |
| Two or more races | 403 | 273 | 148 | 75 | 8 | 17 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,325 | 259 | 143 | 78 | 6 | 16 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,603 | 337 | 171 | 58 | 9 | 33 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,951 | 236 | 109 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 977 | 560 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 99 |
| Migrant education | 97 | 218 | 124 | 90 | 0 | 10 |
| Not migrant education | 4,831 | 302 | 164 | 67 | 8 | 25 |
| Disability | 74 | 365 | 158 | 41 | 24 | 35 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,854 | 299 | 163 | 68 | 7 | 25 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,924 | 300 | 163 | 67 | 8 | 25 |
| Military | 28 | 450 | 160 | 25 | 14 | 61 |
| Not military | 4,900 | 299 | 163 | 68 | 8 | 25 |
| Homeless | 425 | 232 | 123 | 85 | 4 | 10 |
| Not homeless | 4,503 | 306 | 165 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,924 | 300 | 163 | 67 | 8 | 25 |

Table 7.E.7 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,719 | 309 | 170 | 63 | 9 | 29 |
| Male | 2,436 | 310 | 169 | 63 | 9 | 28 |
| Female | 2,281 | 308 | 170 | 63 | 8 | 29 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 981 | 414 | 167 | 37 | 12 | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 24 | 419 | 146 | 29 | 17 | 54 |
| Filipino | 87 | 485 | 99 | 14 | 11 | 75 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,597 | 255 | 147 | 76 | 6 | 18 |
| Black or African American | 43 | 369 | 179 | 44 | 9 | 47 |
| White | 596 | 350 | 167 | 53 | 13 | 34 |
| Two or more races | 387 | 291 | 164 | 67 | 9 | 24 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,252 | 262 | 148 | 74 | 7 | 18 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,467 | 353 | 177 | 52 | 10 | 38 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,769 | 244 | 119 | 78 | 11 | 11 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 950 | 571 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 88 | 220 | 126 | 86 | 1 | 13 |
| Not migrant education | 4,631 | 311 | 170 | 62 | 9 | 29 |
| Disability | 68 | 373 | 172 | 41 | 16 | 43 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,651 | 308 | 170 | 63 | 8 | 29 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,717 | 309 | 170 | 63 | 9 | 29 |
| Military | 32 | 402 | 182 | 38 | 6 | 56 |
| Not military | 4,687 | 309 | 169 | 63 | 9 | 29 |
| Homeless | 389 | 230 | 126 | 85 | 6 | 10 |
| Not homeless | 4,330 | 317 | 171 | 61 | 9 | 31 |
| Foster youth | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,711 | 309 | 170 | 63 | 9 | 29 |

Table 7.E.8 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,995 | 302 | 167 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Male | 2,610 | 299 | 167 | 66 | 8 | 25 |
| Female | 2,383 | 305 | 167 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 961 | 414 | 166 | 38 | 11 | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 27 | 379 | 147 | 37 | 22 | 41 |
| Filipino | 94 | 481 | 105 | 10 | 21 | 69 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,945 | 251 | 142 | 79 | 6 | 15 |
| Black or African American | 32 | 383 | 179 | 44 | 3 | 53 |
| White | 522 | 360 | 168 | 52 | 11 | 37 |
| Two or more races | 407 | 280 | 161 | 72 | 8 | 20 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,480 | 265 | 150 | 75 | 7 | 18 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,515 | 339 | 175 | 57 | 9 | 34 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,019 | 237 | 111 | 82 | 10 | 8 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 976 | 572 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 96 | 216 | 111 | 90 | 2 | 8 |
| Not migrant education | 4,899 | 304 | 167 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Disability | 58 | 303 | 167 | 59 | 12 | 29 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,937 | 302 | 167 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,986 | 302 | 167 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Military | 32 | 456 | 152 | 25 | 3 | 72 |
| Not military | 4,963 | 301 | 167 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Homeless | 409 | 240 | 131 | 81 | 6 | 12 |
| Not homeless | 4,586 | 308 | 169 | 64 | 8 | 27 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,991 | 302 | 167 | 66 | 8 | 26 |

Table 7.E.9 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,771 | 307 | 168 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Male | 2,457 | 301 | 167 | 67 | 7 | 26 |
| Female | 2,312 | 312 | 169 | 64 | 8 | 29 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 828 | 419 | 164 | 39 | 10 | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 20 | 352 | 165 | 40 | 25 | 35 |
| Filipino | 102 | 501 | 94 | 12 | 11 | 77 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,907 | 255 | 146 | 78 | 6 | 16 |
| Black or African American | 31 | 418 | 164 | 32 | 16 | 52 |
| White | 520 | 376 | 165 | 47 | 13 | 40 |
| Two or more races | 357 | 293 | 160 | 71 | 7 | 22 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,396 | 268 | 151 | 75 | 7 | 18 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,375 | 346 | 175 | 55 | 9 | 36 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,787 | 238 | 111 | 82 | 10 | 8 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 984 | 571 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Migrant education | 89 | 216 | 116 | 88 | 4 | 8 |
| Not migrant education | 4,682 | 308 | 168 | 65 | 8 | 28 |
| Disability | 59 | 384 | 179 | 41 | 10 | 49 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,712 | 306 | 168 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,768 | 307 | 168 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Military | 38 | 470 | 146 | 24 | 5 | 71 |
| Not military | 4,733 | 305 | 168 | 66 | 8 | 27 |
| Homeless | 403 | 246 | 136 | 81 | 4 | 15 |
| Not homeless | 4,368 | 312 | 170 | 64 | 8 | 28 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,767 | 306 | 168 | 65 | 8 | 27 |

Table 7.E.10 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 10,448 | 265 | 150 | 77 | 5 | 18 |
| Male | 6,034 | 255 | 144 | 79 | 5 | 16 |
| Female | 4,409 | 279 | 156 | 73 | 6 | 21 |
| Nonbinary | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,162 | 416 | 164 | 38 | 11 | 51 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 31 | 366 | 134 | 35 | 35 | 29 |
| Filipino | 176 | 486 | 101 | 12 | 19 | 69 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,088 | 230 | 125 | 86 | 4 | 11 |
| Black or African American | 81 | 333 | 171 | 58 | 5 | 37 |
| White | 681 | 368 | 160 | 51 | 13 | 37 |
| Two or more races | 1,219 | 232 | 119 | 87 | 4 | 9 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 5,325 | 243 | 132 | 83 | 5 | 13 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,123 | 289 | 163 | 70 | 6 | 23 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 8,981 | 217 | 93 | 89 | 6 | 5 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,467 | 565 | 44 | 0 | 1 | 99 |
| Migrant education | 143 | 205 | 100 | 92 | 2 | 6 |
| Not migrant education | 10,305 | 266 | 150 | 76 | 5 | 18 |
| Disability | 63 | 341 | 167 | 51 | 11 | 38 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 10,385 | 265 | 149 | 77 | 5 | 18 |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 10,440 | 266 | 150 | 77 | 5 | 18 |
| Military | 54 | 391 | 167 | 43 | 13 | 44 |
| Not military | 10,394 | 265 | 149 | 77 | 5 | 18 |
| Homeless | 794 | 229 | 114 | 87 | 5 | 8 |
| Not homeless | 9,654 | 268 | 152 | 76 | 6 | 19 |
| Foster youth | 15 | 316 | 149 | 60 | 13 | 27 |
| Not foster youth | 10,433 | 265 | 150 | 77 | 5 | 18 |

Table 7.E.11 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 6,258 | 293 | 157 | 70 | 8 | 22 |
| Male | 3,396 | 278 | 149 | 74 | 8 | 18 |
| Female | 2,859 | 311 | 165 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 771 | 401 | 157 | 42 | 15 | 44 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 22 | 437 | 139 | 27 | 14 | 59 |
| Filipino | 115 | 483 | 102 | 12 | 22 | 66 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,382 | 250 | 133 | 82 | 6 | 13 |
| Black or African American | 41 | 422 | 159 | 39 | 10 | 51 |
| White | 592 | 418 | 162 | 36 | 13 | 51 |
| Two or more races | 325 | 302 | 156 | 67 | 10 | 23 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,254 | 258 | 138 | 79 | 7 | 14 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,004 | 332 | 167 | 60 | 9 | 31 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,153 | 235 | 102 | 85 | 9 | 6 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,105 | 565 | 44 | 0 | 1 | 99 |
| Migrant education | 136 | 196 | 90 | 95 | 2 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 6,122 | 295 | 158 | 69 | 8 | 23 |
| Disability | 48 | 358 | 181 | 44 | 15 | 42 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 6,210 | 293 | 157 | 70 | 8 | 22 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,249 | 293 | 157 | 70 | 8 | 22 |
| Military | 42 | 367 | 157 | 50 | 17 | 33 |
| Not military | 6,216 | 293 | 157 | 70 | 8 | 22 |
| Homeless | 446 | 236 | 124 | 84 | 6 | 10 |
| Not homeless | 5,812 | 298 | 159 | 69 | 8 | 23 |
| Foster youth | 12 | 210 | 118 | 92 | 0 | 8 |
| Not foster youth | 6,246 | 293 | 157 | 70 | 8 | 22 |

Table 7.E.12 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,261 | 305 | 165 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Male | 2,972 | 288 | 159 | 70 | 7 | 23 |
| Female | 2,285 | 327 | 170 | 61 | 8 | 31 |
| Nonbinary | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 632 | 400 | 154 | 42 | 14 | 44 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 19 | 459 | 121 | 16 | 26 | 58 |
| Filipino | 132 | 489 | 88 | 8 | 23 | 69 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,568 | 254 | 140 | 80 | 5 | 15 |
| Black or African American | 39 | 426 | 174 | 38 | 8 | 54 |
| White | 579 | 436 | 161 | 33 | 11 | 56 |
| Two or more races | 284 | 360 | 183 | 52 | 9 | 38 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,721 | 263 | 144 | 77 | 6 | 17 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,540 | 350 | 174 | 54 | 9 | 36 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,110 | 233 | 103 | 85 | 9 | 6 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,151 | 563 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 99 |
| Migrant education | 116 | 214 | 113 | 91 | 1 | 8 |
| Not migrant education | 5,145 | 307 | 165 | 66 | 8 | 27 |
| Disability | 30 | 368 | 164 | 43 | 13 | 43 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,231 | 305 | 165 | 66 | 7 | 26 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,259 | 305 | 165 | 66 | 8 | 26 |
| Military | 37 | 432 | 160 | 32 | 11 | 57 |
| Not military | 5,224 | 304 | 165 | 67 | 8 | 26 |
| Homeless | 422 | 241 | 130 | 84 | 5 | 11 |
| Not homeless | 4,839 | 311 | 167 | 65 | 8 | 27 |
| Foster youth | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,251 | 305 | 165 | 66 | 8 | 26 |

Table 7.E.13 Demographic Summary—Oral Language Composite, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 3,411 | 328 | 173 | 60 | 8 | 32 |
| Male | 1,837 | 297 | 164 | 68 | 7 | 25 |
| Female | 1,573 | 363 | 177 | 51 | 9 | 41 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 370 | 404 | 155 | 41 | 13 | 47 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 23 | 457 | 140 | 26 | 13 | 61 |
| Filipino | 81 | 492 | 112 | 12 | 10 | 78 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,145 | 259 | 144 | 78 | 6 | 16 |
| Black or African American | 35 | 427 | 162 | 31 | 14 | 54 |
| White | 556 | 495 | 131 | 16 | 11 | 73 |
| Two or more races | 195 | 355 | 180 | 52 | 9 | 39 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 1,674 | 273 | 151 | 75 | 6 | 19 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 1,737 | 381 | 177 | 46 | 9 | 45 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 2,472 | 238 | 106 | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 939 | 565 | 44 | 0 | 1 | 99 |
| Migrant education | 51 | 225 | 111 | 88 | 6 | 6 |
| Not migrant education | 3,360 | 329 | 174 | 60 | 8 | 33 |
| Disability | 36 | 259 | 154 | 72 | 11 | 17 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 3,375 | 329 | 173 | 60 | 8 | 32 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 3,402 | 328 | 173 | 60 | 8 | 32 |
| Military | 15 | 368 | 186 | 47 | 13 | 40 |
| Not military | 3,396 | 328 | 173 | 60 | 8 | 32 |
| Homeless | 227 | 235 | 129 | 83 | 4 | 13 |
| Not homeless | 3,184 | 334 | 174 | 59 | 8 | 34 |
| Foster youth | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 3,408 | 328 | 173 | 60 | 8 | 32 |

Table 7.E.14 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 133,652 | 260 | 100 | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| Male | 67,937 | 256 | 101 | 88 | 7 | 5 |
| Female | 65,693 | 265 | 99 | 87 | 8 | 6 |
| Nonbinary | 22 | 254 | 118 | 91 | 5 | 5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 287 | 275 | 119 | 83 | 7 | 10 |
| Asian | 21,911 | 347 | 124 | 61 | 18 | 21 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 313 | 277 | 93 | 87 | 8 | 5 |
| Filipino | 1,047 | 333 | 109 | 69 | 17 | 14 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 97,610 | 236 | 78 | 95 | 4 | 1 |
| Black or African American | 795 | 309 | 112 | 73 | 16 | 11 |
| White | 7,661 | 290 | 108 | 79 | 12 | 9 |
| Two or more races | 4,028 | 293 | 123 | 76 | 11 | 12 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 83,366 | 239 | 80 | 94 | 4 | 2 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 50,286 | 297 | 118 | 76 | 12 | 12 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 114,480 | 239 | 81 | 93 | 5 | 2 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 19,172 | 388 | 110 | 52 | 21 | 27 |
| Migrant education | 2,047 | 207 | 63 | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Not migrant education | 131,605 | 261 | 101 | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| Disability | 13,059 | 224 | 82 | 94 | 4 | 2 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 536 | 150 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| No disability | 120,593 | 264 | 101 | 87 | 8 | 6 |
| Assigned accommodations | 94 | 238 | 92 | 89 | 7 | 3 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 133,022 | 261 | 100 | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| Military | 933 | 280 | 100 | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Not military | 132,719 | 260 | 100 | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| Homeless | 4,662 | 222 | 75 | 96 | 3 | 1 |
| Not homeless | 128,990 | 262 | 101 | 87 | 7 | 6 |
| Foster youth | 388 | 239 | 72 | 96 | 3 | 1 |
| Not foster youth | 133,264 | 260 | 100 | 87 | 7 | 6 |

Table 7.E.15 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 12,612 | 295 | 125 | 76 | 13 | 11 |
| Male | 6,637 | 290 | 122 | 77 | 13 | 10 |
| Female | 5,974 | 300 | 128 | 74 | 14 | 12 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 23 | 283 | 142 | 83 | 0 | 17 |
| Asian | 2,562 | 377 | 141 | 48 | 23 | 29 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 44 | 304 | 111 | 75 | 18 | 7 |
| Filipino | 144 | 385 | 112 | 48 | 28 | 24 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,636 | 259 | 99 | 88 | 9 | 3 |
| Black or African American | 93 | 316 | 127 | 65 | 25 | 11 |
| White | 1,370 | 323 | 129 | 64 | 20 | 16 |
| Two or more races | 740 | 306 | 141 | 71 | 12 | 16 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,757 | 262 | 100 | 88 | 9 | 3 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,855 | 333 | 140 | 62 | 18 | 20 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 10,639 | 257 | 92 | 88 | 10 | 1 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,973 | 495 | 81 | 6 | 30 | 63 |
| Migrant education | 203 | 214 | 83 | 95 | 5 | 0 |
| Not migrant education | 12,409 | 296 | 125 | 75 | 13 | 11 |
| Disability | 663 | 244 | 106 | 87 | 9 | 4 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 60 | 150 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| No disability | 11,949 | 297 | 125 | 75 | 14 | 11 |
| Assigned accommodations | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 12,546 | 295 | 125 | 75 | 13 | 11 |
| Military | 105 | 360 | 119 | 54 | 25 | 21 |
| Not military | 12,507 | 294 | 125 | 76 | 13 | 11 |
| Homeless | 810 | 238 | 92 | 93 | 6 | 2 |
| Not homeless | 11,802 | 298 | 126 | 74 | 14 | 12 |
| Foster youth | 35 | 275 | 89 | 91 | 9 | 0 |
| Not foster youth | 12,577 | 295 | 125 | 76 | 13 | 11 |

Table 7.E.16 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 6,488 | 306 | 129 | 72 | 14 | 14 |
| Male | 3,346 | 301 | 127 | 73 | 14 | 13 |
| Female | 3,141 | 312 | 130 | 70 | 15 | 15 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 17 | 307 | 115 | 76 | 18 | 6 |
| Asian | 1,505 | 387 | 136 | 45 | 22 | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 31 | 334 | 98 | 61 | 29 | 10 |
| Filipino | 75 | 412 | 123 | 41 | 23 | 36 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,495 | 265 | 108 | 84 | 10 | 5 |
| Black or African American | 59 | 350 | 134 | 54 | 24 | 22 |
| White | 746 | 322 | 121 | 68 | 17 | 15 |
| Two or more races | 560 | 305 | 122 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,022 | 270 | 111 | 83 | 11 | 6 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,466 | 339 | 134 | 62 | 18 | 20 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,348 | 263 | 93 | 87 | 12 | 1 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,140 | 508 | 68 | 1 | 24 | 75 |
| Migrant education | 129 | 217 | 84 | 94 | 5 | 2 |
| Not migrant education | 6,359 | 308 | 129 | 71 | 15 | 14 |
| Disability | 151 | 296 | 121 | 70 | 22 | 8 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 6,337 | 307 | 129 | 72 | 14 | 14 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,482 | 307 | 129 | 72 | 14 | 14 |
| Military | 60 | 390 | 121 | 43 | 28 | 28 |
| Not military | 6,428 | 306 | 129 | 72 | 14 | 14 |
| Homeless | 512 | 260 | 110 | 86 | 8 | 6 |
| Not homeless | 5,976 | 310 | 129 | 71 | 15 | 14 |
| Foster youth | 13 | 283 | 97 | 77 | 23 | 0 |
| Not foster youth | 6,475 | 306 | 129 | 72 | 14 | 14 |

Table 7.E.17 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,709 | 225 | 115 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Male | 2,906 | 219 | 111 | 86 | 8 | 6 |
| Female | 2,800 | 231 | 119 | 83 | 10 | 8 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 11 | 176 | 71 | 91 | 9 | 0 |
| Asian | 1,344 | 293 | 141 | 66 | 18 | 16 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 33 | 250 | 123 | 82 | 12 | 6 |
| Filipino | 74 | 326 | 115 | 57 | 30 | 14 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,051 | 192 | 82 | 93 | 5 | 2 |
| Black or African American | 55 | 274 | 118 | 75 | 18 | 7 |
| White | 687 | 230 | 120 | 82 | 9 | 8 |
| Two or more races | 454 | 216 | 110 | 85 | 8 | 6 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,693 | 197 | 86 | 92 | 5 | 2 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,016 | 250 | 131 | 77 | 12 | 11 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,027 | 191 | 71 | 95 | 5 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 682 | 472 | 64 | 2 | 41 | 57 |
| Migrant education | 93 | 180 | 75 | 95 | 4 | 1 |
| Not migrant education | 5,616 | 226 | 115 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Disability | 104 | 201 | 78 | 93 | 6 | 1 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,605 | 225 | 115 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Assigned accommodations | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,697 | 225 | 115 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Military | 45 | 300 | 126 | 62 | 22 | 16 |
| Not military | 5,664 | 224 | 115 | 84 | 9 | 7 |
| Homeless | 466 | 176 | 61 | 97 | 2 | 1 |
| Not homeless | 5,243 | 229 | 118 | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Foster youth | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,701 | 225 | 115 | 84 | 9 | 7 |

Table 7.E.18 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Four

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,333 | 247 | 132 | 78 | 10 | 11 |
| Male | 2,834 | 244 | 130 | 79 | 10 | 11 |
| Female | 2,499 | 249 | 134 | 78 | 10 | 12 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,283 | 323 | 151 | 58 | 18 | 24 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 29 | 306 | 131 | 69 | 17 | 14 |
| Filipino | 64 | 371 | 104 | 44 | 33 | 23 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,827 | 208 | 102 | 89 | 6 | 5 |
| Black or African American | 50 | 274 | 140 | 66 | 16 | 18 |
| White | 617 | 254 | 138 | 77 | 10 | 13 |
| Two or more races | 457 | 239 | 132 | 80 | 9 | 11 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,420 | 208 | 100 | 88 | 7 | 5 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,913 | 278 | 146 | 70 | 13 | 17 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,393 | 195 | 73 | 95 | 5 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 940 | 486 | 68 | 2 | 33 | 65 |
| Migrant education | 114 | 176 | 65 | 95 | 4 | 1 |
| Not migrant education | 5,219 | 248 | 133 | 78 | 10 | 12 |
| Disability | 97 | 229 | 100 | 88 | 10 | 2 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,236 | 247 | 133 | 78 | 10 | 12 |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,326 | 247 | 132 | 78 | 10 | 12 |
| Military | 45 | 360 | 133 | 49 | 29 | 22 |
| Not military | 5,288 | 246 | 132 | 79 | 10 | 11 |
| Homeless | 474 | 182 | 68 | 96 | 3 | 2 |
| Not homeless | 4,859 | 253 | 135 | 77 | 11 | 12 |
| Foster youth | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,326 | 246 | 132 | 78 | 10 | 11 |

Table 7.E.19 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,928 | 258 | 140 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Male | 2,550 | 254 | 137 | 77 | 10 | 13 |
| Female | 2,378 | 262 | 143 | 75 | 11 | 15 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,153 | 335 | 162 | 56 | 14 | 30 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 20 | 348 | 107 | 55 | 35 | 10 |
| Filipino | 84 | 398 | 112 | 33 | 37 | 30 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,642 | 219 | 110 | 86 | 8 | 6 |
| Black or African American | 48 | 316 | 169 | 65 | 4 | 31 |
| White | 572 | 272 | 141 | 74 | 11 | 15 |
| Two or more races | 403 | 236 | 129 | 82 | 7 | 11 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,325 | 223 | 114 | 85 | 8 | 7 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,603 | 290 | 152 | 68 | 12 | 20 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,951 | 199 | 74 | 94 | 5 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 977 | 498 | 69 | 1 | 30 | 69 |
| Migrant education | 97 | 197 | 91 | 94 | 1 | 5 |
| Not migrant education | 4,831 | 259 | 140 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Disability | 74 | 285 | 123 | 68 | 22 | 11 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,854 | 258 | 140 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,924 | 258 | 140 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Military | 28 | 387 | 146 | 39 | 29 | 32 |
| Not military | 4,900 | 257 | 139 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Homeless | 425 | 202 | 94 | 91 | 5 | 4 |
| Not homeless | 4,503 | 263 | 142 | 75 | 11 | 15 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,924 | 258 | 140 | 76 | 10 | 14 |

Table 7.E.20 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,719 | 286 | 112 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| Male | 2,436 | 285 | 110 | 76 | 16 | 8 |
| Female | 2,281 | 287 | 114 | 74 | 16 | 10 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 981 | 355 | 113 | 51 | 26 | 22 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 24 | 346 | 119 | 63 | 21 | 17 |
| Filipino | 87 | 385 | 72 | 40 | 40 | 20 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,597 | 250 | 96 | 86 | 10 | 3 |
| Black or African American | 43 | 331 | 114 | 56 | 30 | 14 |
| White | 596 | 312 | 111 | 69 | 19 | 12 |
| Two or more races | 387 | 273 | 105 | 81 | 12 | 8 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,252 | 253 | 97 | 85 | 11 | 4 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,467 | 315 | 116 | 66 | 20 | 15 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,769 | 245 | 82 | 93 | 7 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 950 | 446 | 60 | 5 | 49 | 46 |
| Migrant education | 88 | 215 | 85 | 91 | 8 | 1 |
| Not migrant education | 4,631 | 287 | 112 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| Disability | 68 | 290 | 102 | 75 | 22 | 3 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,651 | 286 | 112 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,717 | 286 | 112 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| Military | 32 | 334 | 104 | 56 | 31 | 13 |
| Not military | 4,687 | 285 | 112 | 75 | 16 | 9 |
| Homeless | 389 | 234 | 88 | 91 | 7 | 2 |
| Not homeless | 4,330 | 290 | 113 | 74 | 16 | 10 |
| Foster youth | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,711 | 286 | 112 | 75 | 16 | 9 |

Table 7.E.21 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,995 | 288 | 114 | 76 | 14 | 10 |
| Male | 2,610 | 283 | 111 | 77 | 14 | 9 |
| Female | 2,383 | 292 | 116 | 74 | 14 | 11 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 961 | 364 | 116 | 51 | 25 | 24 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 27 | 332 | 83 | 63 | 30 | 7 |
| Filipino | 94 | 403 | 82 | 33 | 40 | 27 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,945 | 254 | 98 | 86 | 9 | 4 |
| Black or African American | 32 | 321 | 131 | 59 | 31 | 9 |
| White | 522 | 323 | 109 | 67 | 20 | 13 |
| Two or more races | 407 | 273 | 108 | 81 | 11 | 8 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,480 | 262 | 102 | 84 | 11 | 5 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,515 | 313 | 119 | 68 | 18 | 15 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,019 | 247 | 80 | 93 | 7 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 976 | 456 | 65 | 3 | 46 | 50 |
| Migrant education | 96 | 223 | 80 | 93 | 7 | 0 |
| Not migrant education | 4,899 | 289 | 114 | 75 | 14 | 10 |
| Disability | 58 | 255 | 103 | 83 | 16 | 2 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,937 | 288 | 114 | 76 | 14 | 10 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,986 | 288 | 114 | 76 | 14 | 10 |
| Military | 32 | 363 | 112 | 44 | 34 | 22 |
| Not military | 4,963 | 287 | 113 | 76 | 14 | 10 |
| Homeless | 409 | 246 | 91 | 89 | 8 | 3 |
| Not homeless | 4,586 | 291 | 115 | 75 | 15 | 11 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,991 | 288 | 114 | 76 | 14 | 10 |

Table 7.E.22 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,771 | 296 | 115 | 74 | 15 | 12 |
| Male | 2,457 | 290 | 112 | 75 | 14 | 11 |
| Female | 2,312 | 303 | 118 | 71 | 16 | 13 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 828 | 374 | 113 | 48 | 24 | 28 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 20 | 308 | 103 | 65 | 30 | 5 |
| Filipino | 102 | 421 | 81 | 25 | 40 | 34 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,907 | 263 | 101 | 84 | 10 | 6 |
| Black or African American | 31 | 357 | 113 | 52 | 32 | 16 |
| White | 520 | 336 | 109 | 61 | 23 | 16 |
| Two or more races | 357 | 287 | 110 | 78 | 14 | 9 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,396 | 270 | 103 | 83 | 11 | 6 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,375 | 323 | 120 | 64 | 19 | 17 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,787 | 253 | 81 | 92 | 8 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 984 | 462 | 65 | 3 | 41 | 56 |
| Migrant education | 89 | 248 | 86 | 91 | 6 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 4,682 | 297 | 115 | 73 | 15 | 12 |
| Disability | 59 | 316 | 129 | 59 | 27 | 14 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,712 | 296 | 115 | 74 | 15 | 12 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,768 | 296 | 115 | 74 | 15 | 12 |
| Military | 38 | 401 | 101 | 32 | 37 | 32 |
| Not military | 4,733 | 296 | 115 | 74 | 15 | 11 |
| Homeless | 403 | 256 | 96 | 87 | 8 | 4 |
| Not homeless | 4,368 | 300 | 116 | 72 | 15 | 12 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,767 | 296 | 115 | 74 | 15 | 12 |

Table 7.E.23 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 10,448 | 271 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Male | 6,034 | 261 | 106 | 84 | 9 | 8 |
| Female | 4,409 | 283 | 115 | 77 | 11 | 12 |
| Nonbinary | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,162 | 378 | 126 | 46 | 22 | 32 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 31 | 326 | 85 | 71 | 19 | 10 |
| Filipino | 176 | 422 | 98 | 28 | 34 | 39 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,088 | 246 | 93 | 89 | 7 | 4 |
| Black or African American | 81 | 318 | 129 | 62 | 17 | 21 |
| White | 681 | 338 | 119 | 60 | 20 | 20 |
| Two or more races | 1,219 | 249 | 90 | 90 | 6 | 4 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 5,325 | 255 | 97 | 87 | 8 | 5 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,123 | 287 | 122 | 75 | 11 | 13 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 8,981 | 237 | 75 | 94 | 6 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,467 | 477 | 64 | 2 | 34 | 64 |
| Migrant education | 143 | 229 | 80 | 94 | 2 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 10,305 | 271 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Disability | 63 | 285 | 118 | 76 | 16 | 8 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 10,385 | 271 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 10,440 | 271 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Military | 54 | 356 | 122 | 46 | 26 | 28 |
| Not military | 10,394 | 270 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Homeless | 794 | 245 | 86 | 90 | 7 | 3 |
| Not homeless | 9,654 | 273 | 112 | 80 | 10 | 10 |
| Foster youth | 15 | 299 | 137 | 80 | 7 | 13 |
| Not foster youth | 10,433 | 271 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |

Table 7.E.24 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 6,258 | 290 | 116 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| Male | 3,396 | 277 | 110 | 79 | 12 | 9 |
| Female | 2,859 | 305 | 122 | 69 | 15 | 15 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 771 | 367 | 122 | 48 | 25 | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 22 | 377 | 100 | 45 | 32 | 23 |
| Filipino | 115 | 418 | 92 | 30 | 37 | 34 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,382 | 261 | 100 | 85 | 9 | 6 |
| Black or African American | 41 | 358 | 106 | 49 | 32 | 20 |
| White | 592 | 373 | 118 | 46 | 23 | 31 |
| Two or more races | 325 | 291 | 121 | 73 | 15 | 12 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,254 | 265 | 102 | 84 | 10 | 7 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,004 | 317 | 124 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,153 | 250 | 81 | 91 | 9 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,105 | 476 | 61 | 1 | 33 | 66 |
| Migrant education | 136 | 224 | 79 | 96 | 2 | 2 |
| Not migrant education | 6,122 | 291 | 117 | 74 | 13 | 12 |
| Disability | 48 | 302 | 132 | 65 | 19 | 17 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 6,210 | 290 | 116 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,249 | 290 | 116 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| Military | 42 | 343 | 115 | 57 | 24 | 19 |
| Not military | 6,216 | 289 | 116 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| Homeless | 446 | 246 | 91 | 88 | 9 | 2 |
| Not homeless | 5,812 | 293 | 117 | 74 | 14 | 13 |
| Foster youth | 12 | 223 | 79 | 92 | 8 | 0 |
| Not foster youth | 6,246 | 290 | 116 | 75 | 13 | 12 |

Table 7.E.25 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,261 | 301 | 123 | 70 | 14 | 15 |
| Male | 2,972 | 285 | 119 | 75 | 13 | 12 |
| Female | 2,285 | 322 | 126 | 65 | 16 | 19 |
| Nonbinary | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 632 | 373 | 123 | 49 | 20 | 30 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 19 | 410 | 75 | 26 | 42 | 32 |
| Filipino | 132 | 427 | 79 | 24 | 36 | 39 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,568 | 266 | 107 | 83 | 10 | 8 |
| Black or African American | 39 | 382 | 103 | 44 | 26 | 31 |
| White | 579 | 386 | 119 | 39 | 27 | 35 |
| Two or more races | 284 | 331 | 135 | 59 | 17 | 24 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,721 | 271 | 111 | 81 | 10 | 9 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,540 | 333 | 128 | 59 | 19 | 23 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,110 | 251 | 84 | 90 | 9 | 1 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,151 | 479 | 62 | 1 | 31 | 67 |
| Migrant education | 116 | 244 | 88 | 92 | 5 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 5,145 | 302 | 124 | 70 | 14 | 16 |
| Disability | 30 | 317 | 113 | 57 | 33 | 10 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,231 | 301 | 123 | 71 | 14 | 15 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,259 | 301 | 123 | 70 | 14 | 15 |
| Military | 37 | 376 | 112 | 46 | 22 | 32 |
| Not military | 5,224 | 300 | 123 | 71 | 14 | 15 |
| Homeless | 422 | 255 | 105 | 86 | 8 | 6 |
| Not homeless | 4,839 | 305 | 124 | 69 | 15 | 16 |
| Foster youth | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,251 | 301 | 123 | 70 | 14 | 15 |

Table 7.E.26 Demographic Summary—Written Language Composite, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 3,411 | 314 | 129 | 64 | 16 | 20 |
| Male | 1,837 | 291 | 122 | 73 | 13 | 14 |
| Female | 1,573 | 341 | 132 | 55 | 20 | 26 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 370 | 365 | 119 | 49 | 24 | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 23 | 415 | 119 | 22 | 30 | 48 |
| Filipino | 81 | 432 | 85 | 12 | 38 | 49 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,145 | 268 | 109 | 82 | 10 | 9 |
| Black or African American | 35 | 389 | 133 | 40 | 17 | 43 |
| White | 556 | 431 | 105 | 22 | 29 | 49 |
| Two or more races | 195 | 325 | 135 | 55 | 23 | 22 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 1,674 | 274 | 112 | 79 | 11 | 10 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 1,737 | 353 | 132 | 51 | 21 | 29 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 2,472 | 252 | 85 | 88 | 11 | 1 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 939 | 479 | 62 | 1 | 30 | 69 |
| Migrant education | 51 | 241 | 76 | 92 | 6 | 2 |
| Not migrant education | 3,360 | 315 | 129 | 64 | 16 | 20 |
| Disability | 36 | 235 | 129 | 81 | 8 | 11 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 3,375 | 315 | 129 | 64 | 16 | 20 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 3,402 | 315 | 129 | 64 | 16 | 20 |
| Military | 15 | 355 | 148 | 53 | 13 | 33 |
| Not military | 3,396 | 314 | 129 | 64 | 16 | 20 |
| Homeless | 227 | 243 | 98 | 87 | 8 | 5 |
| Not homeless | 3,184 | 319 | 130 | 63 | 17 | 21 |
| Foster youth | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 3,408 | 314 | 129 | 64 | 16 | 20 |

Table 7.E.27 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 133,652 | 311 | 125 | 66 | 19 | 14 |
| Male | 67,937 | 297 | 121 | 71 | 17 | 12 |
| Female | 65,693 | 327 | 127 | 61 | 22 | 17 |
| Nonbinary | 22 | 275 | 145 | 68 | 18 | 14 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 287 | 315 | 127 | 67 | 17 | 16 |
| Asian | 21,911 | 364 | 131 | 50 | 23 | 27 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 313 | 334 | 117 | 59 | 26 | 15 |
| Filipino | 1,047 | 377 | 119 | 46 | 27 | 27 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 97,610 | 295 | 117 | 72 | 18 | 10 |
| Black or African American | 795 | 351 | 130 | 52 | 25 | 23 |
| White | 7,661 | 340 | 136 | 55 | 21 | 23 |
| Two or more races | 4,028 | 335 | 143 | 58 | 19 | 24 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 83,366 | 293 | 115 | 73 | 18 | 9 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 50,286 | 342 | 133 | 56 | 22 | 22 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 114,480 | 277 | 97 | 77 | 23 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 19,172 | 518 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 2,047 | 241 | 103 | 87 | 9 | 4 |
| Not migrant education | 131,605 | 313 | 125 | 66 | 19 | 14 |
| Disability | 13,059 | 244 | 103 | 86 | 9 | 4 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 536 | 150 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| No disability | 120,593 | 319 | 125 | 64 | 20 | 15 |
| Assigned accommodations | 94 | 234 | 99 | 89 | 6 | 4 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 133,022 | 312 | 125 | 66 | 19 | 14 |
| Military | 933 | 342 | 122 | 58 | 23 | 19 |
| Not military | 132,719 | 311 | 125 | 66 | 19 | 14 |
| Homeless | 4,662 | 267 | 114 | 79 | 14 | 7 |
| Not homeless | 128,990 | 313 | 125 | 66 | 20 | 15 |
| Foster youth | 388 | 307 | 108 | 68 | 24 | 8 |
| Not foster youth | 133,264 | 311 | 125 | 66 | 19 | 14 |

Table 7.E.28 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 12,612 | 305 | 130 | 68 | 17 | 16 |
| Male | 6,637 | 298 | 126 | 70 | 16 | 14 |
| Female | 5,974 | 312 | 133 | 65 | 17 | 18 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 23 | 286 | 146 | 74 | 9 | 17 |
| Asian | 2,562 | 370 | 140 | 48 | 18 | 34 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 44 | 318 | 102 | 64 | 25 | 11 |
| Filipino | 144 | 395 | 107 | 38 | 31 | 31 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,636 | 277 | 113 | 76 | 16 | 7 |
| Black or African American | 93 | 337 | 140 | 57 | 18 | 25 |
| White | 1,370 | 326 | 136 | 59 | 19 | 21 |
| Two or more races | 740 | 305 | 144 | 68 | 9 | 22 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,757 | 279 | 111 | 77 | 17 | 7 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,855 | 334 | 143 | 57 | 17 | 26 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 10,639 | 265 | 98 | 80 | 20 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,973 | 517 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 203 | 218 | 90 | 90 | 8 | 1 |
| Not migrant education | 12,409 | 306 | 130 | 67 | 17 | 16 |
| Disability | 663 | 257 | 115 | 83 | 10 | 7 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 60 | 150 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| No disability | 11,949 | 307 | 130 | 67 | 17 | 16 |
| Assigned accommodations | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 12,546 | 305 | 130 | 67 | 17 | 16 |
| Military | 105 | 376 | 116 | 44 | 30 | 27 |
| Not military | 12,507 | 304 | 130 | 68 | 17 | 16 |
| Homeless | 810 | 243 | 101 | 85 | 10 | 5 |
| Not homeless | 11,802 | 309 | 130 | 66 | 17 | 16 |
| Foster youth | 35 | 331 | 102 | 60 | 29 | 11 |
| Not foster youth | 12,577 | 305 | 130 | 68 | 17 | 16 |

Table 7.E.29 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 6,488 | 307 | 129 | 69 | 14 | 18 |
| Male | 3,346 | 302 | 126 | 70 | 14 | 16 |
| Female | 3,141 | 313 | 132 | 67 | 14 | 19 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 17 | 306 | 125 | 71 | 6 | 24 |
| Asian | 1,505 | 385 | 136 | 44 | 18 | 38 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 31 | 343 | 110 | 52 | 32 | 16 |
| Filipino | 75 | 423 | 97 | 31 | 31 | 39 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,495 | 269 | 110 | 80 | 12 | 8 |
| Black or African American | 59 | 355 | 134 | 49 | 20 | 31 |
| White | 746 | 319 | 125 | 66 | 15 | 19 |
| Two or more races | 560 | 302 | 124 | 72 | 13 | 15 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,022 | 273 | 112 | 79 | 13 | 9 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,466 | 337 | 136 | 60 | 15 | 25 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,348 | 263 | 92 | 83 | 17 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,140 | 516 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 129 | 221 | 84 | 93 | 5 | 2 |
| Not migrant education | 6,359 | 309 | 129 | 68 | 14 | 18 |
| Disability | 151 | 319 | 121 | 61 | 25 | 14 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 6,337 | 307 | 129 | 69 | 14 | 18 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,482 | 307 | 129 | 69 | 14 | 18 |
| Military | 60 | 409 | 117 | 37 | 18 | 45 |
| Not military | 6,428 | 306 | 129 | 69 | 14 | 17 |
| Homeless | 512 | 260 | 108 | 84 | 8 | 8 |
| Not homeless | 5,976 | 311 | 130 | 67 | 14 | 18 |
| Foster youth | 13 | 314 | 106 | 69 | 23 | 8 |
| Not foster youth | 6,475 | 307 | 129 | 69 | 14 | 18 |

Table 7.E.30 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Three

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,709 | 250 | 127 | 79 | 9 | 12 |
| Male | 2,906 | 244 | 124 | 80 | 9 | 11 |
| Female | 2,800 | 256 | 131 | 77 | 10 | 13 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 11 | 225 | 96 | 91 | 0 | 9 |
| Asian | 1,344 | 327 | 147 | 58 | 14 | 28 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 33 | 310 | 113 | 73 | 12 | 15 |
| Filipino | 74 | 375 | 99 | 42 | 32 | 26 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,051 | 211 | 97 | 89 | 6 | 4 |
| Black or African American | 55 | 314 | 136 | 55 | 27 | 18 |
| White | 687 | 261 | 129 | 76 | 11 | 13 |
| Two or more races | 454 | 240 | 123 | 81 | 8 | 11 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,693 | 220 | 102 | 87 | 8 | 5 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,016 | 277 | 141 | 71 | 11 | 18 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,027 | 215 | 88 | 89 | 11 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 682 | 511 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 93 | 188 | 82 | 95 | 3 | 2 |
| Not migrant education | 5,616 | 251 | 128 | 78 | 10 | 12 |
| Disability | 104 | 248 | 94 | 88 | 10 | 3 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,605 | 250 | 128 | 78 | 9 | 12 |
| Assigned accommodations | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,697 | 250 | 127 | 79 | 9 | 12 |
| Military | 45 | 348 | 132 | 51 | 24 | 24 |
| Not military | 5,664 | 249 | 127 | 79 | 9 | 12 |
| Homeless | 466 | 192 | 76 | 94 | 5 | 2 |
| Not homeless | 5,243 | 255 | 130 | 77 | 10 | 13 |
| Foster youth | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,701 | 250 | 127 | 79 | 9 | 12 |

Table 7.E.31 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Four

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,333 | 268 | 142 | 73 | 9 | 18 |
| Male | 2,834 | 266 | 141 | 74 | 10 | 17 |
| Female | 2,499 | 270 | 144 | 73 | 9 | 19 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,283 | 353 | 154 | 51 | 14 | 35 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 29 | 347 | 135 | 52 | 28 | 21 |
| Filipino | 64 | 409 | 92 | 28 | 39 | 33 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,827 | 224 | 115 | 85 | 6 | 9 |
| Black or African American | 50 | 308 | 147 | 58 | 14 | 28 |
| White | 617 | 280 | 145 | 72 | 9 | 20 |
| Two or more races | 457 | 259 | 139 | 76 | 8 | 16 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,420 | 227 | 114 | 84 | 7 | 9 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,913 | 302 | 154 | 64 | 11 | 25 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,393 | 215 | 88 | 89 | 11 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 940 | 519 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 114 | 183 | 76 | 94 | 4 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 5,219 | 270 | 143 | 73 | 9 | 18 |
| Disability | 97 | 272 | 118 | 73 | 22 | 5 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,236 | 268 | 143 | 73 | 9 | 18 |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,326 | 268 | 142 | 73 | 9 | 18 |
| Military | 45 | 403 | 134 | 36 | 20 | 44 |
| Not military | 5,288 | 267 | 142 | 74 | 9 | 17 |
| Homeless | 474 | 195 | 81 | 93 | 3 | 3 |
| Not homeless | 4,859 | 275 | 145 | 71 | 10 | 19 |
| Foster youth | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,326 | 268 | 142 | 73 | 9 | 18 |

Table 7.E.32 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,928 | 279 | 148 | 72 | 9 | 20 |
| Male | 2,550 | 275 | 145 | 73 | 9 | 19 |
| Female | 2,378 | 284 | 151 | 70 | 8 | 21 |
| Nonbinary | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,153 | 363 | 163 | 50 | 11 | 39 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 20 | 389 | 98 | 30 | 50 | 20 |
| Filipino | 84 | 438 | 96 | 29 | 21 | 50 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,642 | 235 | 122 | 82 | 7 | 11 |
| Black or African American | 48 | 337 | 174 | 54 | 13 | 33 |
| White | 572 | 301 | 145 | 69 | 9 | 22 |
| Two or more races | 403 | 255 | 135 | 79 | 6 | 14 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,325 | 241 | 124 | 81 | 7 | 11 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,603 | 314 | 159 | 63 | 9 | 28 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,951 | 218 | 87 | 89 | 11 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 977 | 529 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 97 | 208 | 103 | 90 | 3 | 7 |
| Not migrant education | 4,831 | 281 | 148 | 71 | 9 | 20 |
| Disability | 74 | 325 | 134 | 54 | 26 | 20 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,854 | 279 | 148 | 72 | 8 | 20 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,924 | 279 | 148 | 72 | 9 | 20 |
| Military | 28 | 419 | 149 | 25 | 25 | 50 |
| Not military | 4,900 | 279 | 148 | 72 | 8 | 20 |
| Homeless | 425 | 217 | 105 | 89 | 3 | 8 |
| Not homeless | 4,503 | 285 | 150 | 70 | 9 | 21 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,924 | 279 | 148 | 72 | 8 | 20 |

Table 7.E.33 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Six

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,719 | 298 | 136 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| Male | 2,436 | 298 | 135 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| Female | 2,281 | 298 | 138 | 66 | 14 | 20 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 981 | 385 | 136 | 41 | 19 | 40 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 24 | 382 | 129 | 33 | 38 | 29 |
| Filipino | 87 | 435 | 79 | 16 | 43 | 41 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,597 | 253 | 117 | 79 | 10 | 11 |
| Black or African American | 43 | 350 | 142 | 44 | 19 | 37 |
| White | 596 | 331 | 134 | 60 | 14 | 26 |
| Two or more races | 387 | 282 | 130 | 71 | 12 | 17 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,252 | 258 | 117 | 78 | 12 | 11 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,467 | 334 | 142 | 56 | 15 | 29 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,769 | 245 | 94 | 83 | 17 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 950 | 508 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 88 | 218 | 100 | 88 | 5 | 8 |
| Not migrant education | 4,631 | 299 | 137 | 66 | 13 | 20 |
| Disability | 68 | 332 | 134 | 49 | 29 | 22 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,651 | 297 | 136 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,717 | 298 | 136 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| Military | 32 | 368 | 138 | 44 | 16 | 41 |
| Not military | 4,687 | 297 | 136 | 67 | 13 | 20 |
| Homeless | 389 | 232 | 100 | 87 | 6 | 7 |
| Not homeless | 4,330 | 304 | 138 | 65 | 14 | 21 |
| Foster youth | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,711 | 298 | 136 | 67 | 13 | 20 |

Table 7.E.34 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Seven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,995 | 295 | 136 | 69 | 12 | 20 |
| Male | 2,610 | 292 | 134 | 70 | 12 | 19 |
| Female | 2,383 | 299 | 137 | 68 | 11 | 20 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 961 | 389 | 136 | 41 | 17 | 42 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 27 | 356 | 112 | 48 | 26 | 26 |
| Filipino | 94 | 442 | 86 | 16 | 39 | 45 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,945 | 253 | 115 | 81 | 8 | 10 |
| Black or African American | 32 | 352 | 150 | 47 | 16 | 38 |
| White | 522 | 342 | 133 | 56 | 16 | 27 |
| Two or more races | 407 | 277 | 130 | 76 | 9 | 15 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,480 | 264 | 121 | 78 | 10 | 12 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,515 | 326 | 143 | 60 | 13 | 27 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,019 | 242 | 90 | 86 | 14 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 976 | 514 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 96 | 220 | 89 | 92 | 4 | 4 |
| Not migrant education | 4,899 | 297 | 136 | 68 | 12 | 20 |
| Disability | 58 | 279 | 130 | 66 | 17 | 17 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,937 | 295 | 136 | 69 | 11 | 20 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,986 | 295 | 136 | 69 | 12 | 20 |
| Military | 32 | 410 | 129 | 28 | 19 | 53 |
| Not military | 4,963 | 294 | 136 | 69 | 11 | 19 |
| Homeless | 409 | 244 | 106 | 84 | 10 | 7 |
| Not homeless | 4,586 | 300 | 137 | 68 | 12 | 21 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,991 | 295 | 136 | 69 | 12 | 20 |

Table 7.E.35 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 4,771 | 302 | 137 | 68 | 12 | 21 |
| Male | 2,457 | 296 | 135 | 69 | 11 | 19 |
| Female | 2,312 | 308 | 139 | 66 | 12 | 22 |
| Nonbinary | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 828 | 396 | 133 | 41 | 16 | 42 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 20 | 330 | 129 | 55 | 25 | 20 |
| Filipino | 102 | 461 | 81 | 14 | 25 | 62 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,907 | 259 | 118 | 80 | 8 | 12 |
| Black or African American | 31 | 388 | 131 | 29 | 35 | 35 |
| White | 520 | 356 | 132 | 52 | 19 | 29 |
| Two or more races | 357 | 290 | 130 | 73 | 8 | 18 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,396 | 269 | 122 | 78 | 9 | 13 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,375 | 334 | 143 | 58 | 14 | 28 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 3,787 | 246 | 89 | 85 | 15 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 984 | 517 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 89 | 232 | 95 | 89 | 4 | 7 |
| Not migrant education | 4,682 | 303 | 137 | 67 | 12 | 21 |
| Disability | 59 | 350 | 149 | 42 | 22 | 36 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 4,712 | 301 | 136 | 68 | 11 | 20 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 4,768 | 302 | 137 | 68 | 12 | 21 |
| Military | 38 | 436 | 118 | 24 | 16 | 61 |
| Not military | 4,733 | 301 | 136 | 68 | 12 | 20 |
| Homeless | 403 | 251 | 110 | 84 | 8 | 8 |
| Not homeless | 4,368 | 306 | 138 | 66 | 12 | 22 |
| Foster youth | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 4,767 | 302 | 137 | 68 | 12 | 21 |

Table 7.E.36 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Nine

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 10,448 | 268 | 126 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| Male | 6,034 | 258 | 121 | 81 | 7 | 12 |
| Female | 4,409 | 282 | 132 | 75 | 9 | 17 |
| Nonbinary | 5 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 1,162 | 397 | 141 | 41 | 14 | 45 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 31 | 346 | 105 | 52 | 35 | 13 |
| Filipino | 176 | 454 | 94 | 15 | 33 | 52 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,088 | 238 | 104 | 87 | 6 | 8 |
| Black or African American | 81 | 326 | 147 | 58 | 10 | 32 |
| White | 681 | 353 | 136 | 54 | 16 | 30 |
| Two or more races | 1,219 | 241 | 100 | 88 | 5 | 6 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 5,325 | 249 | 110 | 84 | 7 | 9 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,123 | 288 | 139 | 72 | 9 | 19 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 8,981 | 227 | 78 | 91 | 9 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,467 | 521 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 143 | 217 | 85 | 93 | 2 | 5 |
| Not migrant education | 10,305 | 269 | 127 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| Disability | 63 | 314 | 139 | 54 | 30 | 16 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 10,385 | 268 | 126 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| Assigned accommodations | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 10,440 | 268 | 126 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| Military | 54 | 374 | 140 | 44 | 20 | 35 |
| Not military | 10,394 | 268 | 126 | 78 | 8 | 14 |
| Homeless | 794 | 237 | 95 | 88 | 7 | 5 |
| Not homeless | 9,654 | 271 | 128 | 77 | 8 | 15 |
| Foster youth | 15 | 308 | 139 | 67 | 20 | 13 |
| Not foster youth | 10,433 | 268 | 126 | 78 | 8 | 14 |

Table 7.E.37 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Ten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 6,258 | 292 | 133 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| Male | 3,396 | 278 | 125 | 76 | 10 | 14 |
| Female | 2,859 | 308 | 139 | 67 | 11 | 22 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 771 | 384 | 135 | 44 | 19 | 37 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 22 | 407 | 114 | 36 | 23 | 41 |
| Filipino | 115 | 451 | 92 | 17 | 31 | 51 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,382 | 255 | 112 | 83 | 7 | 10 |
| Black or African American | 41 | 390 | 128 | 41 | 20 | 39 |
| White | 592 | 395 | 136 | 42 | 14 | 44 |
| Two or more races | 325 | 297 | 134 | 70 | 14 | 16 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3,254 | 261 | 116 | 81 | 8 | 11 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,004 | 325 | 142 | 62 | 13 | 25 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,153 | 243 | 86 | 87 | 13 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,105 | 521 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 136 | 211 | 78 | 95 | 2 | 3 |
| Not migrant education | 6,122 | 294 | 133 | 71 | 11 | 18 |
| Disability | 48 | 330 | 154 | 48 | 25 | 27 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 6,210 | 291 | 133 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,249 | 292 | 133 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| Military | 42 | 355 | 132 | 55 | 17 | 29 |
| Not military | 6,216 | 291 | 133 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| Homeless | 446 | 241 | 102 | 86 | 8 | 7 |
| Not homeless | 5,812 | 296 | 134 | 71 | 11 | 19 |
| Foster youth | 12 | 217 | 95 | 92 | 0 | 8 |
| Not foster youth | 6,246 | 292 | 133 | 72 | 10 | 18 |

Table 7.E.38 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Eleven

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 5,261 | 303 | 140 | 68 | 10 | 22 |
| Male | 2,972 | 287 | 135 | 72 | 10 | 18 |
| Female | 2,285 | 325 | 144 | 62 | 11 | 26 |
| Nonbinary | 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 632 | 387 | 134 | 44 | 19 | 38 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 19 | 435 | 94 | 21 | 26 | 53 |
| Filipino | 132 | 458 | 78 | 15 | 33 | 52 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,568 | 260 | 119 | 81 | 7 | 12 |
| Black or African American | 39 | 404 | 132 | 38 | 8 | 54 |
| White | 579 | 411 | 136 | 34 | 16 | 51 |
| Two or more races | 284 | 346 | 155 | 55 | 11 | 34 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,721 | 267 | 123 | 79 | 8 | 13 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 2,540 | 342 | 147 | 56 | 13 | 31 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,110 | 242 | 88 | 87 | 13 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,151 | 521 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 116 | 230 | 95 | 91 | 3 | 6 |
| Not migrant education | 5,145 | 305 | 141 | 67 | 11 | 22 |
| Disability | 30 | 343 | 135 | 50 | 20 | 30 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 5,231 | 303 | 140 | 68 | 10 | 22 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 5,259 | 303 | 140 | 68 | 10 | 22 |
| Military | 37 | 404 | 133 | 35 | 19 | 46 |
| Not military | 5,224 | 302 | 140 | 68 | 10 | 22 |
| Homeless | 422 | 248 | 113 | 85 | 6 | 9 |
| Not homeless | 4,839 | 308 | 141 | 66 | 11 | 23 |
| Foster youth | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 5,251 | 303 | 140 | 68 | 10 | 22 |

Table 7.E.39 Demographic Summary—Overall Score, Grade Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **Number Tested** | **Mean Scale Score** | **SD of Scale Scores** | **Percent in Level 1** | **Percent in Level 2** | **Percent in Level 3** |
| All Valid Scores | 3,411 | 321 | 148 | 62 | 11 | 28 |
| Male | 1,837 | 294 | 140 | 70 | 9 | 21 |
| Female | 1,573 | 352 | 151 | 52 | 13 | 35 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Asian | 370 | 385 | 133 | 42 | 21 | 37 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 23 | 436 | 122 | 22 | 26 | 52 |
| Filipino | 81 | 462 | 92 | 9 | 23 | 68 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,145 | 264 | 123 | 80 | 8 | 13 |
| Black or African American | 35 | 408 | 143 | 31 | 20 | 49 |
| White | 556 | 463 | 113 | 18 | 14 | 68 |
| Two or more races | 195 | 340 | 155 | 55 | 13 | 32 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 1,674 | 274 | 128 | 76 | 9 | 15 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 1,737 | 367 | 151 | 48 | 13 | 39 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 2,472 | 245 | 91 | 85 | 15 | 0 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 939 | 522 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Migrant education | 51 | 233 | 87 | 94 | 0 | 6 |
| Not migrant education | 3,360 | 323 | 148 | 61 | 11 | 28 |
| Disability | 36 | 247 | 139 | 78 | 14 | 8 |
| Tested with alternate assessment | 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No disability | 3,375 | 322 | 148 | 61 | 11 | 28 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 3,402 | 322 | 148 | 61 | 11 | 28 |
| Military | 15 | 362 | 162 | 47 | 13 | 40 |
| Not military | 3,396 | 321 | 148 | 62 | 11 | 27 |
| Homeless | 227 | 239 | 110 | 83 | 9 | 8 |
| Not homeless | 3,184 | 327 | 148 | 60 | 11 | 29 |
| Foster youth | 3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Not foster youth | 3,408 | 321 | 148 | 62 | 11 | 28 |

## Psychometric Analyses

This chapter summarizes the item- and test-level statistics from the psychometric analyses conducted for the 2021–22 operational administration of the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) for computer-based general forms. The purposes of the analyses were to check the keys and quality of the items, as well as validate the scores of the assessment. Results are included for classical item analyses, response time analyses, and information on test reliability.

### Overview

Psychometric analyses were performed using data for all students taking the computer-based forms of the Initial ELPAC. For the 2021–22 test administration, there was only one student who took the paper–pencil test (PPT) emergency form, so there was not enough data to run another set of analyses for the PPT data.

The assessment data set for the 2021–22 administration was similar to the assessment data used in the 2020–21 administration and differs from data that was used in previous years’ technical reports. For example, for the 2018–19 and 2019–‍20 test administrations, only Rotating Score Validation Process (RSVP) data was used for the psychometric analyses. Because of this difference, results presented in this report might not be directly comparable with results from the 2018–19 and 2019–20 test administrations.

Results of item and test analyses are presented in this chapter. Additionally, explanations for all statistical procedures implemented during the psychometric analyses, including reliability estimates and decision consistency and accuracy of the achievement-level classifications, are provided.

#### Summary of the Analyses

This chapter summarizes the item- and test-level statistics calculated for the Initial ELPAC administered during the 2021–22 test administration. Each of these sets of analyses for the Initial ELPAC is presented in the body of the text and in the listed appendices.

1. **Classical Item Analyses—**Classical item analyses for the Initial ELPAC are provided in section [*8.2 Classical Item Analyses*](#_Classical_Item_Analyses). [Appendix 8.B](#_Appendix_8.B:_Classical) presents results of the classical item analyses, including item difficulty indices, item-total correlation coefficients, and the omission rates for dichotomous and polytomous items. In addition, the distribution of score points for the polytomous items are provided.
2. **Differential Item Functioning (DIF) Analyses—**Because Initial ELPAC forms for 2021–22 were reused from the 2018–19 administration, DIF analyses were not conducted again for 2021–22. Instead, refer to section *8.3 Differential Item Functioning (DIF)* of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–‍2019 Technical Report* (California Department of Education [CDE], 2020b) for descriptions of those analyses. Table 8.8 of that report presents the results of the DIF analyses for all Initial ELPAC items.
3. **Response Time Analyses—**ELPAC assessments are untimed, but test examiners need guidance on anticipated test duration as they schedule administrations. Response time analysis is described in section [*8.3 Testing Time Analyses*](#_Testing_Time_Analyses). Summary information regarding total test response times is presented in table 8.C.1 in [appendix 8.C](#_Appendix_8.C:_Response), which provides summary statistics of response times for the Initial ELPAC at the first, tenth, twenty-fifth, fiftieth, seventy-fifth, ninetieth, and ninety-ninth percentiles.
4. **Reliability Analyses—**Reliability estimation is presented in section [*8.4 Reliability Analyses*](#_Reliability_Analyses_1). [Appendix 8.D](#_Appendix_8.D:_Reliability) provides results of the reliability analyses of total test scores for the sample as a whole and for selected student groups of interest (e.g., gender, ethnicity). [Appendix 8.E](#_Appendix_8.E:_Classification) presents statistics describing the decision accuracy and decision consistency of the performance classifications.

#### Rotating Score Validation Process for the Initial ELPAC

In 2021–22, approximately 10 percent of local educational agencies (LEAs) in California were identified by the CDE to take part in the RSVP for the Initial ELPAC. These identified LEAs were asked to submit their scannable kindergarten through grade two (K–2) Writing Answer Books to ETS. Only identified LEAs received the pre‑identification labels and precoded Group Identification Sheets needed to return scannable Answer Books to ETS. For grades three through twelve, students’ responses to Writing domain items were provided to ETS for back-scoring through the test delivery system.

For each Initial ELPAC test administration year, a new group of LEAs is identified by the CDE to take part in the RSVP. This RSVP list of LEAs is posted on the ELPAC website. Participating LEAs selected one year are normally excluded from the RSVP eligibility list for the next year; however, an LEA that does not comply with returning completed and locally scored scannable Answer Books to ETS may be selected in consecutive years.

The RSVP process allows ETS and the CDE to compare the results provided by LEAs with the results determined by ETS. Each LEA that is a part of the RSVP receives a comparison report that is available in the Test Operations Management System. LEAs participating in the RSVP for 2021–22, and the number of students from each LEA, are presented in [appendix 8.A](#_Appendix_8.A:_Rotating_1).

#### Samples Used for Analyses

Analyses were based on students tested in 2021–22 using the computer-based assessment forms. There are stopping markers for each domain, so that test examiners could stop the assessments for students who did not answer any of the first few items correctly. However, there were students whose assessments were stopped after the stopping marker even though they answered one or more items correctly before the stopping marker. Because these students may have had their assessments stopped in error, their data was excluded from analyses of item performance, response time, and test reliability.

Table 8.1 shows the number of students who contributed to the analysis data, by grade level, in the sample. The N-counts used may not match those in other reports, nor will they always match those shown in other tables and appendices of this report, because different reporting specifications require demographic student group information that may be missing from some students’ records, or some data screening procedures were implemented to make the calculation of item statistics more psychometrically sound.

Table 8.1 Initial ELPAC Counts for Psychometric Analyses by Grade Level

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade Level** | **Total N-counts of General Administration Data** |
| Kindergarten | 133,161 |
| 1 | 12,561 |
| 2 | 6,484 |
| 3 | 5,704 |
| 4 | 5,329 |
| 5 | 4,930 |
| 6 | 4,719 |
| 7 | 4,988 |
| 8 | 4,770 |
| 9 | 10,447 |
| 10 | 6,249 |
| 11 | 5,259 |
| 12 | 3,403 |

### Classical Item Analyses

The classical item analyses include the item difficulty indices and the item-total correlation indices. Items that are not performing as expected are identified based on flagging rules associated with the item statistics. The omit rate of each item, the proportion of test takers choosing each distractor, the correlation of each distractor with the total score, and the distribution of students at each score point for the polytomous items are also included in the results of the classical item analyses.

#### Classical Item Difficulty Indices (*p*-value and Average Item Score)

Items scored as one (correct) or zero (incorrect) are referred to as dichotomous items. Items scored from zero to some number of points greater than one are called polytomous items.

For dichotomous items, item difficulty is indicated by its *p*-value, which is the proportion of students who answer the item correctly. The range of *p*-values is from 0.00 to 1.00. Items with high *p*-values are easier items; those with low *p*-values are more difficult. Dichotomous items are flagged for review if their *p*-values are above 0.95 (i.e., too easy). Two-choice dichotomous single-select items, three-choice dichotomous single-select items, and all other dichotomous items are flagged as too difficult if their *p*-values are below 0.50, 0.30, and 0.20, respectively.

The formula for the *p*-value for a dichotomous item is presented in equation 8.1. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.1*](#_Appendix_8.A:_Rotating) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.1)

where,

*Xij* is the score (0 or 1) received for a given dichotomous item *i* for student *j*, and

*Ni* is the total number of students who were presented with item *i*.

For polytomous items, the difficulty is indicated by either the average item score (AIS) or *p*-‍value. The AIS can range from 0.00 to the maximum total possible points for an item. Desired AIS values for polytomous items generally fall within the range of 20 percent to 80 percent of the maximum obtainable item score; items with values outside this range are flagged for review. To facilitate the interpretation, the AIS values for polytomous items are often expressed as the proportion of the maximum possible score, which are equivalent to the *p-*values for dichotomous items.

For polytomous items, the *p-*value is defined as presented in equation 8.2. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.2*](#_Alternative_Text_for_1) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.2)

where,

*Xij* is the score assigned for a given polytomous item *i* and student *j*,

*Ni* is the total number of students who were presented with item *i*, and


*Max (Xi)* is the maximum possible score for item *i*.

#### Item-Total Correlation

An important indicator of item discrimination is the item-total correlation, defined as the correlation between student scores on an individual item and student “total” scores on the test.

The item-total correlation statistic describes the relationship between students’ performance on a specific item and students’ performance on the total assessment. It is calculated as the correlation coefficient between the item score and total score—specifically, the polyserial correlation is used as the index of item-total correlation for both polytomous and dichotomous items. Statistically, it is calculated as the correlation between an observed continuous variable and an unobserved continuous variable hypothesized to underlie the variable with ordered categories (Olsson, Drasgow, & Dorans, 1982). The total scale score or the raw score is used as the criterion score for this analysis.

Theoretically, the polyserial correlation ranges from -1.0 (for a perfect negative relationship) to 1.0 (for a perfect positive relationship) and is estimated as presented in equation 8.3. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.3*](#_Alternative_Text_for_36) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.3)

where,

*β* is the item parameter to be estimated from the data, with the estimate denoted as , using maximum likelihood estimation; it is a regression coefficient (slope) for predicting the continuous version of an item score onto the continuous version of the total score; and

 is the variance of the criterion (for example, the students’ total score).

For a polytomous item, there is a regression for each boundary between item scores, with all regressions for the same item sharing a common slope, *β*. For a polytomous item with *m* possible score values, there are *m-*1 regressions.

Acceptable values for this correlation coefficient are positive and greater than 0.20. A relatively high item-total correlation coefficient value is preferred, as it indicates that higher-ability students tend to perform better on the item than lower-ability students. An item with a negative item-total correlation typically signifies a problem with the item, as that indicates that

* the higher-ability students on the overall test tend to respond incorrectly to the item if dichotomous, or are assigned a low score for the item if polytomous; or
* the lower-ability students on the overall test are responding correctly to the item if dichotomous, or are assigned a high score for that item if polytomous.

#### Distribution of Item Scores

For polytomous items, examination of the distribution of scores assists in showing how well items performed. If no students were given the highest possible score, the item may not be functioning as expected because the item may be confusing, poorly worded, or just unexpectedly difficult; the scoring rubric may be flawed; or students may not have had an opportunity to learn the content. If the rubric for an item allowed for partial credit but nearly all students received either full credit or partial credit, the rubric should be reviewed for whether the rubric for the partial credit score category should be revised.

Items with a low percentage (i.e., less than 3 percent) of students obtaining any score point were flagged for review. Such items may pose problems during item response theory (IRT) calibration. They need to be carefully reviewed and may need to be excluded from the item calibration analyses.

#### Omit Rates

If a student views an item, leaves it unanswered, and then goes on to view and answer another item, the missing response is classified as an “omit.” If the student omits an item in the Speaking and Writing domains—that is, leaves the item unanswered—and does not view additional items, the responses for the successive items are classified as “not seen.”

##### Rates for Dichotomous and Polytomous Items

For both dichotomous and polytomous items, examining the omit rate is useful for identifying potential problems with test features such as testing time and item or test layout. Items with high omit rates are flagged for further investigation by content specialists to ensure that no issues are found with these items. Omit rates for polytomous items tend to be higher than for dichotomous items.

#### Classical Item Analysis Results

This subsection presents tables of the classical item analysis results for the 2021–22 test items.

Mean item *p-*values by grade level or grade span and domain are presented in table 8.2. These *p*-value means varied from 0.16 to 0.51. The lowest mean of 0.16 was from the kindergarten Writing domain. The highest mean of 0.51 was from the kindergarten Speaking domain.

Table 8.2 Classical Item Statistics for Each Domain by Grade Level or Grade Span

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Domain** | **No. of Unique Items** | **Mean *p-*value** | **Minimum *p-*value** | **Maximum *p-*value** | **Mean Item-Total Correlation** | **Minimum Item-Total Correlation** | **Maximum Item-Total Correlation** |
| Kindergarten | Listening | 12 | 0.47 | 0.32 | 0.68 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.90 |
| Kindergarten | Speaking | 8 | 0.51 | 0.38 | 0.62 | 0.87 | 0.81 | 0.92 |
| Kindergarten | Reading | 8 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.62 | 0.83 | 0.78 | 0.86 |
| Kindergarten | Writing | 8 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.86 | 0.84 | 0.89 |
| 1 | Listening | 12 | 0.39 | 0.29 | 0.60 | 0.79 | 0.73 | 0.87 |
| 1 | Speaking | 8 | 0.43 | 0.29 | 0.56 | 0.91 | 0.87 | 0.95 |
| 1 | Reading | 9 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.52 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.88 |
| 1 | Writing | 8 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.50 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.96 |
| 2 | Listening | 12 | 0.40 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.91 |
| 2 | Speaking | 8 | 0.33 | 0.27 | 0.39 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.96 |
| 2 | Reading | 10 | 0.44 | 0.34 | 0.65 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 0.93 |
| 2 | Writing | 6 | 0.32 | 0.26 | 0.44 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.97 |
| 3–5 | Listening | 13 | 0.40 | 0.24 | 0.55 | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.87 |
| 3–5 | Speaking | 9 | 0.36 | 0.24 | 0.43 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.95 |
| 3–5 | Reading | 10 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.41 | 0.80 | 0.65 | 0.89 |
| 3–5 | Writing | 5 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.93 |

Table 8.2 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Domain** | **No. of Unique Items** | **Mean *p-*value** | **Minimum *p-*value** | **Maximum *p-*value** | **Mean Item-Total Correlation** | **Minimum Item-Total Correlation** | **Maximum Item-Total Correlation** |
| 6–8 | Listening | 14 | 0.49 | 0.34 | 0.66 | 0.76 | 0.65 | 0.85 |
| 6–8 | Speaking | 9 | 0.40 | 0.29 | 0.48 | 0.93 | 0.91 | 0.95 |
| 6–8 | Reading | 10 | 0.34 | 0.23 | 0.52 | 0.78 | 0.72 | 0.88 |
| 6–8 | Writing | 2 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| 9–12 | Listening | 14 | 0.43 | 0.31 | 0.59 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 0.83 |
| 9–12 | Speaking | 9 | 0.36 | 0.27 | 0.43 | 0.93 | 0.89 | 0.96 |
| 9–12 | Reading | 10 | 0.40 | 0.22 | 0.65 | 0.76 | 0.65 | 0.88 |
| 9–12 | Writing | 2 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |

Mean item-total correlations by grade level or grade span and domain are also presented in table 8.2. All of the mean item-total correlations were at or above 0.74.

Detailed results of the item analyses for each item by grade level or grade span are presented in [appendix 8.B](#_Appendix_8.B:_Classical). The item statistics, including *p-*values, item-total correlations, and item type are listed in table 8.B.1 through table 8.B.19.

Initial ELPAC *p-*values were generally within the expected range of greater than 0.20 and less than 0.95; most were also in the desired difficulty range of 0.30 to 0.90. These ranges were defined to produce items that support performance evaluation effectively throughout the range of student proficiency.

Across all grade levels, grade spans, domains, and test modes, the item-total correlations varied from 0.54 to 0.98. These values indicate that items in the assessment had desired item-total correlations.

The percentages of students earning each item score were also calculated for polytomous items. Results are consistent, with the items effectively distinguishing among levels of performance for students taking the Initial ELPAC. The distribution of item scores on each polytomous item is presented in [appendix 8.B](#_Appendix_8.B:_Classical), in table 8.B.20 to table 8.B.21.

Table 8.3 reports the mean omit rates by grade level or grade span and domain.

Table 8.3 Mean Percent of Items Omitted

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** |
| Kindergarten | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.07 |
| 1 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| 2 | 3.17 | 0.08 | 5.95 | 0.06 |
| 3–5 | 2.90 | 0.10 | 2.88 | 13.96 |
| 6–8 | 2.15 | 0.11 | 1.96 | 14.47 |
| 9–12 | 1.84 | 0.12 | 1.64 | 15.67 |

The mean omit rates were highest for the Writing items. The highest average omit rate, 15.67 percent, was observed for grade span nine through twelve students for Writing items. The second highest mean omit rate, 14.47 percent, was observed for grade span six through eight students within the same domain. The mean omit rate was lowest, at 0.01 percent, for kindergarten students within the Listening domain and grade one students within the Reading domain. Omit rates for Writing items for grade spans three through five, six through eight, and nine through twelve were highest among all domains because there were more students omitting the items before or at the stopping markers of that domain. These omit rates were similar to what were reported in table 5.4 of the *Computer-based Initial ELPAC 2020–2021 Technical Report* (CDE, 2022)

### Testing Time Analyses

Response time analyses are conducted at the item level and the total test level. Response time information is not available for the PPT Writing domain for K–2 forms. At the item level, timing information was collected by the delivery platform for each “page” (screen) that was presented to test takers. Information about the time required to answer a single question is available for items that appear on a page alone. The time required to answer all questions on a page is available when multiple items appear on a page. At the total test level, response times are calculated by summing the page durations for all items in the Initial ELPAC.

Table 8.C.1 in [appendix 8.C](#_Appendix_8.C:_Response) provides summary statistics of response times for the Initial ELPAC at the first, tenth, twenty-fifth, fiftieth, seventy-fifth, ninetieth, and ninety-ninth percentiles. The statistics were calculated for four student groups defined by their overall scale score quartiles. For example, the first quartile for kindergarten contained students with overall scale scores of 150 to 208. The second quartile included students with 209 to 328 overall scale scores. Students with overall scale scores from 329 to 411 and 412 to 600 made up the third and fourth quartiles, respectively.

Total test response times calculated for the fiftieth (i.e., median) and ninetieth percentiles provide administrators with an indication of how much time students required on average, as well as how much time might be needed for students who require more time. The median testing time varied for students with different proficiency levels. Students in the lower end of the proficiency distribution (i.e., the first quartile) spent a noticeably shorter time than students in other quartiles. Specifically, the median testing time ranged from 5 to 14 minutes for students in the first overall scale score quartile, 13 to 34 minutes for the second quartile, 17 to 51 minutes for the third quartile, and 16 to 52 minutes for the fourth quartile. The ninetieth percentile testing time ranged from nine to 41 minutes for students in the first overall scale score quartile, 21 to 59 minutes for the second quartile, 24 to 84 minutes for the third quartile, and 23 to 84 minutes for the fourth quartile.

With a few exceptions, response times increased from the first to the third quartiles. However, response times tended to decrease from the third to the fourth quartiles.

### Reliability Analyses

The reliability for a particular group of students’ test scores estimates the extent to which the scores would remain consistent if those same students were retested with a parallel version of the same test. There are many definitions of reliability (Haertel, 2006) that have their genesis in classical test theory and a variety of methods that can be used to estimate reliability.

The general concept of reliability concerns the extent to which the test scores measure *a particular construct* consistently. The variance in the distribution of test scores—essentially, the observed differences among individuals—is partly due to differences that are consistent and partly due to differences that are not consistent. The measure of variation associated with the first kind of differences—consistent differences—is called “true variance”; this would include actual differences in students’ knowledge. The measure of variation associated with the remaining differences—those that operate essentially at random—is called “error variance.” Error variance includes a variety of underlying differences such as selections of test content, which may cause a student’s test score to be slightly higher in one evaluation and slightly lower in another. Reliability is the proportion of total variance that is due to true variance. The standard error of measurement (SEM) is a statistic that characterizes the error variance.

Reliability coefficients range from zero to one. The higher the reliability coefficient for a set of scores, the more likely individuals are to obtain very similar scores upon repeated testing occasions, if the students do not change in their level of the knowledge or skills measured by the test.

#### Sample for Reliability Analyses

The sample used for reliability analyses for the Initial ELPAC was the same as was used for classical item analyses reported in subsection [*8.1.3 Samples Used for Analyses*](#_Samples_Used_for).

#### Reliability Measures

The reliability coefficient cannot, in fact, be computed directly unless the student actually takes two parallel versions of the same test. However, with some reasonable assumptions, reliability can be estimated from the students’ responses to a single version of the test.

Like other statistics, the reliability coefficient can vary substantially from one group of students to another. It tends to be larger in groups that are more diverse in the ability measured by the test and smaller in groups that are more homogeneous in the ability measured.

The ELPAC test reliabilities were evaluated for each domain, the composite scores, or for item types as dichotomous items and polytomous items, using the coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) index of internal consistency, which is calculated as presented in equation 8.4.

*Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.4*](#_Alternative_Text_for_12) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.4)

where,

*k* is the number of items on test form,

is the estimated variance of item *i*, and

is the estimated total test variance.

The reliability of the overall score was estimated by substituting sample estimates into the following definitional formula for composite reliability (Feldt & Brennan, 1989), equation 8.5. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.5*](#_Alternative_Text_for_13) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.5)

where,

is the weight of the *j*th component in forming the composite score,

is the variance of scores on the *j*th component,

is the reliability of scores on the *j*th component, and

is the variance of the composite score.

#### Reliability Estimates

Table 8.4 presents reliability coefficients for each domain, composite scores, and overall scores of the test by grade level or grade span. The reliability coefficients range from 0.84 to 0.97 across four domains and from 0.86 to 0.96 for two composite scores. The coefficients for overall scores are slightly higher and vary from 0.94 to 0.98.

Table 8.4 Reliability Coefficient of Domains, Composite, and Overall Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Listening: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** | **Speaking: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** | **Reading: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** | **Writing: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** | **Oral Language: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** | **Written Language: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** | **Overall: Reliability Coefficient Alpha** |
| Kindergarten | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.86 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.94 |
| 1 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.96 |
| 2 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.98 |
| 3–5 | 0.91 | 0.96 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.97 |
| 6–8 | 0.89 | 0.96 | 0.86 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.87 | 0.96 |
| 9–12 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.84 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.96 |

The reliabilities of the domain and composite scores were also examined for various student groups within the population. Table 8.D.1 through table 8.D.12 in [appendix 8.D](#_Appendix_8.D:_Reliability) present the reliabilities for student groups based on gender, ethnicity, economic status, calculated English language acquisition status (ELAS), migrant status, special education services, accommodation usage, military status, and homeless status.

#### Standard Error of Measurement

The SEM is a measure of how much students’ scores would vary from the scores they would earn on a perfectly reliable test. If it were possible to compute the error of measurement for each student’s score in a large group of students, these errors of measurement would have a mean of zero. These SEMs would be an indication of how much the errors of measurement affect the students’ scores. The SEM is expressed in the same units as the test score, whether the units are in raw score or scale score metric. In a large group of students, approximately two-thirds of the students will earn scores within one SEM of the scores they would earn on a perfectly reliable test.

The SEM is the square root of the error variance in the scores, that is, the standard deviation (SD) of the distribution of the differences between students’ observed scores and their true scores. The SEM is calculated using equation 8.6. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.6*](#_Alternative_Text_for_19) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.6)

where,

*a* is the reliability estimated in equation 8.5 for two composite scores of oral language and written language, and

*SD* is the standard deviation of the oral language or written language composite scores.

For grades two through twelve, the SEM for the overall score is calculated using equation 8.7. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.7*](#_Alternative_Text_for_20) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.7)

For grade one, equation 8.8 is used to calculate the SEM. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.8*](#_Alternative_Text_for_21) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.8)

For kindergarten, equation 8.9 is used to calculate the SEM. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.9*](#_Alternative_Text_for_22) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.9)

The SEM can be calculated for either raw scores or scale scores. Table 8.5 reports the SEM for Initial ELPAC raw scores. The range of raw score standard errors for the Initial ELPAC was between 0.517 and 2.438 points across all grade levels, domains, composites, and overall score. In general, this translated into an error band of one to three raw score points across domains. For example, if a student received a raw score of 25 with a standard error of 2.00 points, upon retesting, the student would be expected to obtain a score between 23 and 27 about two-thirds of the time. Table 8.6 reports the SEM for the scale scores of the Initial ELPAC.

These SEM values are shown in table 8.5.

Table 8.5 SEM Based on Classical Test Theory for Raw Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **SEM—Listening Raw Score** | **SEM—Speaking Raw Score** | **SEM—Reading Raw Score** | **SEM—Writing Raw Score** | **SEM—Oral Language Raw Score** | **SEM—Written Language Raw Score** | **SEM—Overall Raw Score** |
| Kindergarten | 1.303 | 1.586 | 1.230 | 0.808 | 2.306 | 1.613 | 2.082 |
| 1 | 1.280 | 1.650 | 1.126 | 1.171 | 2.438 | 1.772 | 1.787 |
| 2 | 1.049 | 1.564 | 1.038 | 1.238 | 2.217 | 1.897 | 1.459 |
| 3–5 | 1.295 | 1.316 | 1.036 | 0.917 | 2.207 | 1.737 | 1.404 |
| 6–8 | 1.476 | 1.371 | 1.153 | 0.546 | 2.424 | 2.007 | 1.574 |
| 9–12 | 1.483 | 1.369 | 1.225 | 0.517 | 2.380 | 2.097 | 1.586 |

Assessments are not perfectly reliable and only offer an estimate of what the student is capable of in a specified domain. As shown in table 8.6, both the average SEM scale score values for oral language and written language skills were about 34 scale score points; the average SEM scale score for the overall test was about 26 scale score points. Note that the scale score range for all the six Initial ELPAC assessments was from 150 to 600.

Table 8.6 SEM Based on Classical Test Theory for Scale Scores

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **SEM—Oral Language** | **SEM—Written Language** | **SEM—Overall** |
| Kindergarten | 35.159 | 26.723 | 31.755 |
| 1 | 34.301 | 28.598 | 25.498 |
| 2 | 29.027 | 30.291 | 20.977 |
| 3–5 | 32.434 | 32.507 | 22.960 |
| 6–8 | 37.627 | 41.473 | 27.999 |
| 9–12 | 35.836 | 44.402 | 28.530 |
| **Average:** | **34.064** | **33.999** | **26.287** |

#### Student Group Reliabilities

The reliabilities are also computed for various demographic student groups. The student groups considered were based on gender, ethnicity, economic status, calculated ELAS, special education services status, homeless status, and migrant status. Reliability estimates for each domain and composite scores are reported for each student group in table 8.D.1 through table 8.D.12 in [appendix 8.D](#_Appendix_8.D:_Reliability).

For student groups other than calculated ELAS—EL and initial fluent English proficient (IFEP)—the reliability estimates varied from 0.64 to 0.98. The lowest estimate, of 0.64, was for the Listening domain of grade span six through eight, for the Filipino student group. The majority of the estimates were above 0.80. All reliability estimates for the overall score for these student groups were at least 0.88, which indicates that the overall score was highly reliable across the student groups.

Low reliability estimates were observed for the calculated ELAS IFEP student group. Of note was one negative Cronbach’s alpha calculation for the oral language composite in kindergarten for this student group. This negative estimate is reported as zero with an asterisk (\*) in table 8.D.2. Note that this negative value is caused by the homogeneity of the IFEP group and does not indicate that the test is unreliable for this student group.

By design, Initial ELPAC scores aim to have greatest precision at the thresholds between performance levels. Initial ELPAC scores are not expected to effectively distinguish a student earning a near-threshold score that meets the IFEP standard from a student earning a higher score. Because the ELAS IFEP student group consisted of only students with the highest English proficiency, the computation of the reliability estimate for this student group was impacted by the restriction of the proficiency range. The restriction of range makes the reliability estimate smaller than the true reliability—or even negative, in some cases (Fife, Mendoza, & Terry, 2012). For example, the standard deviations of the oral language raw score for all students in kindergarten was 8.59, which was larger than the standard deviation of 7.55 for calculated ELAS EL students. The standard deviation for the English proficient students (i.e., calculated ELAS IFEP students) was 1.34, which was much smaller than the statistics for the all-student and calculated-ELAS English learner (EL) student groups.

The difference in these standard deviations for the three student groups explains why there was negative Cronbach’s alpha for the calculated ELAS IFEP student group for kindergarten in table 8.D.1. These results were similar to what was reported for the previous test administration and can be found in chapter 5 of the *Computer-based Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–2021 technical report* (CDE, 2022).

#### Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement

Classical test theory assumes that the standard error of a test score is constant throughout the score range. While the assumption is probably reasonable in the mid-score ranges, it is less reasonable at the extremes of the score distribution. IRT expands the concept by providing estimates of the standard error at each score point on the distribution.

##### Methodology

Conditional standard errors or measurement (CSEMs) are estimated as part of the IRT-based scoring procedure. CSEMs for scale scores are based on IRT and are estimated as a function of measured ability. The CSEMs of theta scores (or of linearly transformed theta scores) are smaller at points of the scale in the test metric where more items are located. A student’s CSEM under the IRT framework is equal to the reciprocal of the square root of the test information function (TIF) based on the items taken by each student. The CSEM for a student with proficiency 𝜃𝑗 is calculated using equation 8.10. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.10*](#_Alternative_Text_for_23) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.10)

where,

*I(θj)* is the test information for student *j* and is calculated using equation 8.11. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.11*](#_Alternative_Text_for_24) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.11)

where,

*Ii(θj)* is the item information of item *i* for student *j*.

Item information is calculated as presented in equation 8.12. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.12*](#_Alternative_Text_for_25) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.12)

where,

*si(θj)* is the expected item score for item *i* on a theta score *θj* calculated as presented in equation 8.13 *(Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.13*](#_Alternative_Text_for_26) *for a description of this equation.*)

 (8.13)

and equation 8.14. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.14*](#_Alternative_Text_for_27) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.14)

where *pih(θj)* is the probability of an examinee with *θj* getting score *h* on item *i*, the computation of which is shown in equation 8.15. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.15*](#_Alternative_Text_for_28) *for a description of this equation.*

P sub I h of theta sub j equals the numerator exp open parenthesis the sum from v equals 1 to h of D times a sub i of the quantity open parenthesis theta sub j minus b sub I plus d sub iv close parenthesis close parenthesis and denominator 1 plus the sum from c equals 1 to n sub I exp open parenthesis the sum from v equals 1 to c D times a sub i of the quantity open parenthesis theta sub j minus b sub I plus d sub iv close parenthesis close parenthesis, if score h equals 1, 2, …., n sub i.

P sub I h of theta sub j equals 1 divided by denominator 1 plus the sum from c equals 1 to n sub I exp open parenthesis the sum from v equals 1 to c D times a sub i of the quantity open parenthesis theta sub j minus b sub I plus d sub iv close parenthesis close parenthesis, if score h equals 0. (8.15)

where,

*Pih(θj)* is the probability of student with proficiency *θj* obtaining score *h* on item *i,*

*ni* is the maximum number of score points for item *i*,

*ai* is the discrimination parameter for item *i*,

*bi* is the location parameter for item *i*,

*div* is the category parameter for item *i* on score *v*, and

*D* is a scaling constant of 1.7 that makes the logistic model approximate the normal ogive model.

When *ni* = 1, equation 8.15 becomes an expression of the two-parameter logistic model for dichotomous items.

CSEMs for scale scores are computed by transforming CSEMs of theta scores onto the reporting scale. Refer to subsection [*7.4.2 Scale Scores*](#_Scale_Scores)for scaling procedures. A student’s CSEM for scale scores under the IRT framework is equal to the reciprocal of the square root of the TIF multiplied by the scaling factor *a*, as presented in equation 8.16. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.16*](#_Alternative_Text_for_39) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.16)

where,

;

CSEM(*SS*) is the conditional SEM on scale score scale;

 is the TIF at ability level  as shown in equations 8.12, 8.13, and 8.14; and

*a* is the scaling factor (the slope) needed to transform theta to the scale score metric.

##### Results

IRT’s version of an SEM has a U-shaped distribution in which SEM values decrease as scores move toward the center of the range. CSEM values are reported as part of the raw-score-to-scale-score conversion tables presented in table 7.C.1 through table 7.C.26 of [appendix 7.C](#_Appendix_7.C:_Raw) for the oral language and written language skills.

CSEMs vary across the scale and are typically smaller toward the center of the scale where more items are located and typically larger at the extreme ends of the scale. For most grade levels and grade spans, the lowest values of CSEM are between the proficiency levels one and two; the threshold scores between proficiency levels one and two are toward the middle of the scale score ranges. The CSEMs for threshold scores between proficiency levels two and three are somewhat larger.

#### Decision Classification Analyses

When an assessment uses performance levels as the primary method to report test results, accuracy and consistency of decisions become key indicators of the quality of the assessment.

##### Methodology

The reliabilities of performance-level classifications, which are criterion referenced, are related to the reliabilities of the test scores on which they are based; however, they are not exactly the same. Glaser (1963) was among the first to draw attention to this distinction, and Feldt and Brennan (1989) reviewed the topic extensively. While test reliability evaluates the consistency of test scores, decision classification reliability evaluates the consistency of classification.

Decision accuracy is the extent to which students are classified in the same way as they would be if each student’s score were the average over all possible forms of the test (the student’s true score). Decision accuracy answers the following question: How closely does the actual classification of test takers, based on their single-form scores, agree with the classification that would be made on the basis of their true scores, if their true scores could somehow be known?

Decision consistency is the extent to which students are classified in the same way as they would be on the basis of a single form of an assessment other than the one for which data is available. Decision consistency answers the following question: What is the agreement between the classifications based on two nonoverlapping, equally difficult forms of the test?

The methodology used for estimating the reliability of classification decisions is described in Livingston and Lewis (1995). The necessary input information includes only the maximum and minimum possible scores on the assessment and the observed score distribution and the reliability coefficient for the group of students referenced by the estimates. The method was implemented by the ETS proprietary computer program RELCLASS-COMP (Version 4.14).

Reliability of classification at a threshold is estimated by combining the performance levels above a particular threshold and combining the performance levels below that threshold. The result is a two-by-two table indicating whether the students are above or below the threshold. The sum of the entries in the main diagonal is the number of students accurately (or consistently) classified as above or below that threshold.

Table 8.7 and table 8.8 illustrate these two-by-two contingency tables. The proportion of students being accurately classified is determined by summing across the diagonals of the upper tables. The proportion of consistently classified students is determined by summing the diagonals of the lower tables.

Table 8.7 Decision Accuracy for Reaching a Performance Level

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Level Status** | **Does Not Reach a Performance Level Based on True Score** | **Reaches a Performance Level Based on True Score** |
| Does not reach a performance level | Correct classification | Incorrect classification |
| Reaches a performance level | Incorrect classification | Correct classification |

Table 8.8 Decision Consistency for Reaching a Performance Level

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Level Status** | **Does Not Reach a Performance Level Based on an Alternate Form** | **Reaches a Performance Level Based on an Alternate Form** |
| Does not reach a performance level | Consistent classification | Inconsistent classification |
| Reaches a performance level | Inconsistent classification | Consistent classification |

##### Results

Overall decision accuracy and consistency—that is, classification across all cut scores—are reported in table 8.9. The classification accuracy varied from 0.860 for written language of grade span nine through twelve to 0.947 for the same composite of Kindergarten. The range for classification consistency was from 0.817 for written language of grade span six through eight to 0.924 for written language of Kindergarten. The classification accuracy and consistency statistics are very similar to the values reported for the 2020–21 administration, in table 5.7 of the *Computer-based Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–2021 Technical Report* (CDE, 2022).

Table 8.9 Classification Consistency and Accuracy for Composite Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Oral Language Accuracy** | **Oral Language Consistency** | **Written Language Accuracy** | **Written Language Consistency** | **Overall Language Accuracy** | **Overall Language Consistency** |
| Kindergarten | 0.863 | 0.820 | 0.947 | 0.924 | 0.875 | 0.833 |
| 1 | 0.878 | 0.841 | 0.914 | 0.880 | 0.906 | 0.871 |
| 2 | 0.914 | 0.880 | 0.909 | 0.874 | 0.933 | 0.906 |
| 3–5 | 0.905 | 0.875 | 0.919 | 0.893 | 0.936 | 0.914 |
| 6–8 | 0.891 | 0.859 | 0.863 | 0.817 | 0.912 | 0.881 |
| 9–12 | 0.913 | 0.886 | 0.860 | 0.818 | 0.918 | 0.890 |

Results of classification consistency and accuracy, by grade level or grade span and composite language skills, are reported in [appendix 8.E](#_Appendix_8.E:_Classification).

#### Interrater Agreement (Constructed-Response Scoring Reliability)

ETS raters in the Online Network for Evaluation (ONE) system scored all Writing responses for RSVP samples. Those scores were compared with Writing item scores that were entered by test examiners in the Data Entry Interface for K–2 and the Teacher Hand Scoring System for grades three through twelve. During the administration of the Speaking domain, a test examiner pressed a button in the test delivery system (TDS) to record the responses of a student. The test examiner scored the student’s response in-the-moment. The audio-captured response in TDS were scored by ETS raters.

To check Speaking scores, ETS randomly sampled 1,200 Speaking responses representing all grade levels and grade spans and scored them. To check the consistency of ratings between ETS and test examiners, interrater reliability analyses were conducted with the two sets of scores for both the Speaking and Writing domains.

This interrater consistency is described in two ways:

1. Percentage agreement between two human raters
2. Quadratic-weighted kappa (QWK) coefficient

##### Percentage Agreement

Percentage agreement between two raters is frequently defined as the percentage of exact score agreement and adjacent score agreement. Exact score agreement means two raters give exact same scores. Adjacent score agreement means agreement between scores that differ by just one point. The percentage of exact score agreement is a stringent criterion, which tends to decrease with an increasing number of item score points. The fewer the item score points, the fewer degrees of freedom on which two raters can vary, and the higher the percentage of agreement.

##### Kappa

Interrater reliability or consistency is an indicator of homogeneity and is most frequently measured using Cohen’s Kappa statistic (1960), which takes chance agreement into account. For a human-scored item with *m+1* categories, one can construct an (*m+1)* × *(m+1)* rating table with scores provided by two raters, *X* and *Y*, as shown in table 8.10. Let n sub s t denote the number of responses for which rater *X’s* score = *s* and rater *Y’s* score = *t,* n sub s plus is the number of responses for which rater *X’s* score = *s*, n sub plus t is the number of responses for which rater *Y’s* score = *t*, and n sub plus plus is the number of all responses.

Table 8.10 Frequencies of Ratings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Y = 0** | **Y = 1** | **Y = 2** | **…\*\*** | **Y = m\*** |
| X = 0 | n00 | n01 | n02 | … | n0m |
| X = 1 | N10 | n11 | n12 | … | n1m |
| X = 2 | n20 | n21 | n22 | … | n2m |
| … | … | … | … | … | … |
| X = m | nm0 | nm1 | nm2 | … | nmm |

\* m is the number of score categories of an item.

\*\* An ellipsis (…) signifies that there might be more rows (or columns) in the table.

*Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.17*](#_Alternative_Text_for_29) *for a description of this equation.* The kappa statistic is defined as

 (8.17)

*Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.18*](#_Alternative_Text_for_37) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.18)

*Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.19*](#_Alternative_Text_for_38) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.19)

where,

p sub obs is the observed agreement, and

p sub exp is the expected agreement between *X* and *Y*.

When p sub obs and p sub exp agree only at the chance level, the value of kappa is 0. When the two measurements agree perfectly, the value of kappa is 1.0.

##### Quadratic-Weighted Kappa

QWK is used because kappa does not take into account the degree of disagreement between raters. It is a generalization of the simple kappa coefficient using weights to quantify the relative difference between categories. The range of the QWK is from 0.0 to 1.0, with perfect agreement being equal to 1.0.

For a human-scored item with *m+1* categories, one can construct an *(m+1)* × *(m+1)* rating table with scores provided by two raters, *X* and *Y,* as described in table 8.10. The weighted kappa coefficient is defined as presented in equation 8.20. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.20*](#_Alternative_Text_for_32) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.20)

For QWK, the weights are calculated using equation 8.21. *Refer to the* [*Alternative Text for Equation 8.21*](#_Alternative_Text_for_33) *for a description of this equation.*

 (8.21)

##### Interrater Reliability Results

ETS ONE offers a comprehensive set of tools that the scoring leaders and scoring management staff used to monitor the progress and accuracy of individual raters and raters in aggregate. Reports were produced to show rater productivity and performance indicated how many responses a rater scored during a shift.

Table 8.11 presents the interrater reliability of Writing items for each grade level or grade span. The expected rate of exact agreement is 90 percent for 1-point items, 80 percent for 2-point items, 70 percent for 3-‍point items, and 60 percent for 4-point items. In this table, “Adjacent” indicates that the difference between scores is exactly one. “Discrepant” indicates that the difference between scores is greater than one. Because 1-point items cannot have discrepant ratings, these are listed as “N/A.” “Adjacent” indicates that the difference between scores is one point.

Table 8.11 Interrater Reliabilities for Writing Items

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item Number** | **Maximum Possible Score Point** | **N** | **Percent Exact** | **Percent Adjacent** | **Percent Discrepant** | **QWK** |
| Kindergarten | VR171914 | 1 | 16,184 | 97.19 | 2.81 | N/A | 0.93 |
| Kindergarten | VR171917 | 1 | 16,184 | 95.04 | 4.96 | N/A | 0.88 |
| Kindergarten | VR171920 | 2 | 16,184 | 92.29 | 7.31 | 0.40 | 0.88 |
| Kindergarten | VR171943 | 2 | 16,184 | 91.53 | 8.14 | 0.33 | 0.87 |
| Kindergarten | VR171945 | 1 | 16,184 | 98.02 | 1.98 | N/A | 0.93 |
| Kindergarten | VR171947 | 1 | 16,184 | 98.07 | 1.93 | N/A | 0.93 |
| Kindergarten | VR171953 | 2 | 16,184 | 95.80 | 3.93 | 0.27 | 0.93 |
| Kindergarten | VR171956 | 2 | 16,184 | 96.32 | 3.45 | 0.23 | 0.94 |
| 1 | VR170490 | 1 | 1,119 | 98.03 | 1.97 | N/A | 0.96 |
| 1 | VR170514 | 1 | 1,119 | 96.78 | 3.22 | N/A | 0.94 |
| 1 | VR170515 | 2 | 1,119 | 90.71 | 9.03 | 0.27 | 0.89 |
| 1 | VR170516 | 2 | 1,119 | 87.85 | 11.44 | 0.71 | 0.86 |
| 1 | VR170524 | 1 | 1,119 | 96.34 | 3.66 | N/A | 0.93 |
| 1 | VR170531 | 1 | 1,119 | 96.16 | 3.84 | N/A | 0.92 |
| 1 | VR170534 | 2 | 1,119 | 96.51 | 3.22 | 0.27 | 0.97 |
| 1 | VR170538 | 3 | 1,119 | 86.15 | 11.44 | 2.41 | 0.88 |
| 2 | VR170546 | 1 | 426 | 95.31 | 4.69 | N/A | 0.91 |
| 2 | VR170552 | 1 | 426 | 93.19 | 6.81 | N/A | 0.86 |
| 2 | VR170553 | 2 | 426 | 86.85 | 13.15 | 0.00 | 0.85 |
| 2 | VR170626 | 3 | 426 | 82.39 | 13.62 | 3.99 | 0.87 |
| 2 | VR170643 | 3 | 426 | 83.57 | 15.49 | 0.94 | 0.93 |
| 2 | VR170647 | 3 | 426 | 82.39 | 16.43 | 1.17 | 0.92 |

Table 8.11 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item Number** | **Maximum Possible Score Point** | **N** | **Percent Exact** | **Percent Adjacent** | **Percent Discrepant** | **QWK** |
| 3–5 | VR026380 | 2 | 1,186 | 86.85 | 12.14 | 1.01 | 0.89 |
| 3–5 | VR026378 | 2 | 1,186 | 81.45 | 17.37 | 1.18 | 0.84 |
| 3–5 | VR026375 | 2 | 1,186 | 86.85 | 11.89 | 1.26 | 0.87 |
| 3–5 | VR026373 | 2 | 1,186 | 86.85 | 11.64 | 1.52 | 0.87 |
| 3–5 | VR029781 | 4 | 1,186 | 78.84 | 18.55 | 2.61 | 0.91 |
| 6–8 | VR029177 | 4 | 1,062 | 68.27 | 27.02 | 4.71 | 0.89 |
| 6–8 | VR029556 | 4 | 1,062 | 74.48 | 23.92 | 1.60 | 0.92 |
| 9–12 | VR029232 | 4 | 2,080 | 70.00 | 26.83 | 3.17 | 0.91 |
| 9–12 | VR029699 | 4 | 2,080 | 74.18 | 24.62 | 1.20 | 0.94 |

The results indicate that for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC, scores by local test examiners and the ETS raters were fairly consistent. QWK values range from 0.86 to 0.96 for 1-point items, 0.84 to 0.97 for 2-point items, 0.87 to 0.93 for 3-point items, and 0.89 to 0.94 for 4-point items. Values of QWK that are close to or greater than 0.70 indicate excellent agreement (Williamson, Xi, & Breyer, 2012). The percentage of students for whom the human raters were in exact agreement ranged from 93.19 percent to 98.07 percent for 1-point items, 81.45 percent to 96.51 percent for 2-point items, 82.39 percent to 86.15 percent for 3-point items, and 68.27 percent to 78.84 percent for 4-point items across all grade levels and grade spans. These exact agreement values indicate a strong agreement between the two ratings.

Table 8.12 presents interrater reliability of Speaking items.

Table 8.12 Interrater Reliability of Speaking Items

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Number of Score Points** | **Total Number of Responses** | **Average of Percent Exact** | **Average of Percent Adjacent** | **Average of Percent Discrepant** |
| Kindergarten | All Speaking Items | 8,924 | 71.53 | 25.97 | 2.50 |
| Kindergarten | 1-pt Score Items | 3,542 | 82.83 | 17.17 | N/A |
| Kindergarten | 2-pt Score Items | 4,317 | 67.66 | 29.44 | 2.90 |
| Kindergarten | 4-pt Score Items | 1,065 | 49.58 | 41.22 | 9.20 |
| 1 | All Speaking Items | 9,037 | 73.27 | 23.95 | 2.79 |
| 1 | 1-pt Score Items | 3,396 | 85.19 | 14.81 | N/A |
| 1 | 2-pt Score Items | 3,255 | 76.47 | 21.23 | 2.30 |
| 1 | 4-pt Score Items | 2,386 | 51.93 | 40.65 | 7.42 |

Table 8.12 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Number of Score Points** | **Total Number of Responses** | **Average of Percent Exact** | **Average of Percent Adjacent** | **Average of Percent Discrepant** |
| 2 | All Speaking Items | 8,866 | 75.92 | 21.85 | 2.23 |
| 2 | 1-pt Score Items | 3,327 | 91.73 | 8.27 | N/A |
| 2 | 2-pt Score Items | 3,171 | 80.10 | 18.01 | 1.89 |
| 2 | 4-pt Score Items | 2,368 | 48.10 | 46.07 | 5.83 |
| 3–5 | All Speaking Items | 9,844 | 83.86 | 14.62 | 1.52 |
| 3–5 | 1-pt Score Items | 3,243 | 94.20 | 5.80 | N/A |
| 3–5 | 2-pt Score Items | 5,478 | 83.75 | 14.80 | 1.44 |
| 3–5 | 4-pt Score Items | 1,123 | 54.50 | 39.18 | 6.32 |
| 6–8 | All Speaking Items | 10,160 | 82.11 | 16.60 | 1.29 |
| 6–8 | 1-pt Score Items | 3,352 | 92.42 | 7.58 | N/A |
| 6–8 | 2-pt Score Items | 5,640 | 81.77 | 16.74 | 1.49 |
| 6–8 | 4-pt Score Items | 1,168 | 54.11 | 41.87 | 4.02 |
| 9–12 | All Speaking Items | 10,213 | 80.73 | 17.82 | 1.45 |
| 9–12 | 1-pt Score Items | 3,493 | 92.10 | 7.90 | N/A |
| 9–12 | 2-pt Score Items | 5,605 | 79.38 | 18.97 | 1.66 |
| 9–12 | 4-pt Score Items | 1,115 | 51.93 | 43.14 | 4.93 |

For the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration, the average percentage of exact agreement for all Speaking items ranged from 71.53 percent for kindergarten to 83.86 percent for grade span three through five. Three 1-point Speaking items for kindergarten and two 1-point Speaking items for grade one had the percentage of exact agreement below 90 percent. These were sent to the ETS assessment development team for investigation and plans for improvement. They would also be considered for replacement when the form is refreshed in 2024–25.

All of the values of percent exact for 4-point items are also below expectations; this is theorized to be because second scorings based on audio recordings differ in fundamental ways from first scorings performed by test examiners in the moment. Test examiners scored Speaking responses in the moment immediately after students finished their speaking. Meanwhile, second scorers listened to audio recordings of the Speaking responses to score them. Test examiners tended to assign higher scores than did second scorers. Similar results were found for the Summative ELPAC (CDE, 2023).

A study was conducted to enhance understanding about how different rating conditions impact the rating agreement and how interrater reliabilities can be improved for future administrations for the Summative ELPAC. The preliminary results of the study suggested higher exact agreement for either two local ratings or two audio file ratings, as compared to one audio file and one local rating. The 4-point items with percent exact below 60 percent would also be taken into consideration for replacement when the form is refreshed in 2024–‍25.

### Validity Evidence

#### Design of the Initial ELPAC

The Initial ELPAC was developed in accordance with the criteria for test development, administration, and use described in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (2014) adopted by the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME).

Test validation is an ongoing process, beginning at conceptualization and continuing throughout the lifetime of the assessment. Every aspect of an assessment provides evidence in support of its validity (or evidence to the contrary), including design, content requirements, item development, and psychometric quality. According to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014, p. 9)*,*

Validity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations made from test scores. Validity is, therefore, the most fundamental consideration in developing and evaluating tests. The process of validation involves accumulating evidence to provide a sound, scientific basis for the proposed score interpretations.

##### Purpose of the Initial ELPAC

The Initial ELPAC was designed and developed to provide scores representing English language proficiency (ELP) performance levels for required educational decision making as defined by the test purposes in the California *Education Code (EC)* Section 313. The primary inferences from the test results, in general, include (1) the proficiency level of individual students and (2) a source of information for the identification of EL students and IFEP students.

Based on the results of the home language survey (HLS), those students whose primary language is not English or American Sign Language take the Initial ELPAC one time only. Those students who are identified as ELs, as a result of the Initial ELPAC, take the Summative ELPAC each year to track their progress until they are reclassified as fluent English proficient.

##### Constructs to Be Measured

The Initial ELPAC is designed to show how well students perform relative to the *California English Language Development Standards, Kindergarten Through Grade 12* (2012 ELD Standards) (CDE, 2014). The standards describe the ELP knowledge, skills, and abilities that students are expected to acquire at each grade level. The Initial ELPAC test blueprints describe the assessment task types that the students perform, the number of items per task type, and the alignment of the items to the 2012 ELD Standards (CDE, 2019).

*EC* Section 60810 specifies that the state ELP assessment shall measure the language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The test blueprints describe the assessment task types and the number of items that are used to assess students’ ELP in each language domain.

The Initial ELPAC provides an overall scale score and placement within one of three levels as described in the *Initial ELPAC General Performance Level Descriptors* (CDE, 2020a). The oral language reporting levels are drawn from the Listening and Speaking results. The written language reporting levels are drawn from the Reading and Writing results. The overall scale score and reporting level are derived from Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing.

For grades two through twelve, the overall scale score is derived from the equal weighting of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. For kindergarten, where students are developing foundational literacy skills, the overall scale score is derived from differential weighting in which 90 percent of the overall scale score comes from Listening and Speaking and 10 percent comes from Reading and Writing. For grade one, the overall scale score is derived from the differential weighting in which 70 percent is derived from the Listening and Speaking domains and 30 percent comes from Reading and Writing.

##### Interpretations and Uses of the Scores

Initial ELPAC scores were used as one criterion for considering whether a student will be classified as an EL or an IFEP student. Pursuant to California *EC* Section 60811.8, students who were classified as ELs were enrolled in a full load of courses that were part of the standard instructional program; the designation of EL was not used to deny student participation in the standard instructional program.

##### Intended Test Population

The ELPAC is the required state test for ELP that must be given to students whose primary language is a language other than English. The Initial ELPAC is used to identify students as being either an EL or IFEP. The Initial ELPAC is administered only once during a student’s time in California public schools. The decision to administer the Initial ELPAC is based on the results of the HLS. The Initial ELPAC is administered to kindergarten through grade twelve students who enrolled in a California public school for the first time. This includes students who enroll in transitional kindergarten, which is the first year of a two-year kindergarten program.

Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who cannot take one or more domains of the ELPAC with allowed universal tools, designated supports, or accommodations can take a locally determined alternate assessment(s), as noted in their individualized education program (IEP). In cases where an eligible student had a disability for which there were no appropriate accommodations in one or more domains, the student was exempt from testing in that domain or domains as indicated.

#### Content

##### Description of the State Standards

The 2012 ELD Standards were developed and approved by the California State Board of Education in 2012 and then published in 2014. The 2012 ELD Standards describe the key knowledge, skills, and abilities that students who are learning English need to access, engage with, and achieve in grade‐level academic content. The 2012 ELD Standards provide a framework to guide the development of ELD assessment systems that help California educators ensure that all EL students make progress in the English language knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to become college- and career-ready (CDE, 2014). Items that appear on the Initial ELPAC were all developed to align with the 2012 ELD Standards.

##### Test Blueprints

Test blueprints describe the content of the Initial ELPAC and include four tables with information about the task types in each of the four language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Task types are individual items or sets of items that require a student to perform an activity to elicit information about the student’s ELP.

The test blueprints provide information about the number of items and points that were administered per task type within each grade level and domain. The test blueprints also provide the alignment of task types with the 2012 ELD Standards (CDE, 2019).

##### Form Assembly Process

The assembly process for the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC form began with the creation of test development specifications, which described the content characteristics, the psychometric characteristics, and the number of items to be used in the Initial ELPAC. ETS created the test development specifications that the CDE then reviewed and approved. This review process is described in [*Chapter 3: Item Development and Review*](#_Item_Development_and), in section [*3.5 ETS Item Review Process*](#_ETS_Item_Review)*.*

#### Internal Structure

Internal structure evidence evaluates the strength or salience of the major dimensions underlying an assessment using indices of measurement precision such as fairness and DIF analyses, test reliability, and reliability of performance classifications.

##### Fairness and Differential Item Functioning

###### Bias and Sensitivity Reviews

To develop test materials that are fair and unbiased to all students, ELPAC test items underwent reviews by Bias and Sensitivity Review panels from August 3 through August 5, 2016. Eighteen California educators reviewed the text and artwork of more than 2,000 newly developed items. Items were approved as is, approved with revisions, or rejected. As described in subsection [*3.7 California Educator Review*](#_California_Educator_Review_1), the educators added value to the item pool by revising items to make them fair and unbiased measures of ELP.

###### Differential Item Functioning

DIF analyses were conducted to identify differences in item performance by student gender. There were no items identified as having significant levels of DIF for any domain. Refer to chapter 8 of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2020b) for a description of the DIF analyses and the results of the DIF analyses performed on Initial ELPAC items.

##### Reliability

###### Overall Reliability Estimates

The results of reliability analyses on the four domains, two composites, and overall scores are presented in table 8.4 and reported in subsection [*8.4.3 Reliability Estimates*](#_Reliability_Estimates_1). The results indicate that the reliability estimates of the test were high.

###### Student Group Reliability Estimates

The reliabilities are also computed for various demographic student groups. The student groups considered were based on gender, ethnicity, economic status, calculated ELAS, special education services status, homeless status, and migrant status. Reliability estimates for each domain and composite scores are reported for each student group in table 8.D.1 through table 8.D.12 in [appendix 8.D](#_Appendix_8.D:_Reliability).

These results were similar to what was reported for the previous test administration and can be found in chapter 6 of the *Computer-based* *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–2021 Technical Report* (CDE, 2021).

###### Reliability of Performance Classifications

The methodology used for estimating the reliability of classification decisions is evaluated with the decision classification analyses in subsection[*8.4.7 Decision Classification Analyses*](#_Toc120609667). The results of these analyses are presented in [appendix 8.E](#_Appendix_8.E:_Classification). Classification accuracy coefficients ranged from 0.917 for the written language composite for grade spans six through eight and nine through twelve to 0.977 for the written language composite for kindergarten. Classification consistency coefficients ranged from 0.885 for the written language composite for grade spans six through eight and nine through twelve to 0.969 for the written language composite for kindergarten.

###### Interrater Reliability

To monitor the scoring of constructed responses, ETS scored Writing responses of the RSVP sample and approximately 1,200 Speaking responses that were randomly selected for back-scoring by ETS raters. For Writing scores, QWK statistics were used to provide evidence of the degree to which a student’s score is consistent from one rater to another. Research has shown values of QWK greater than 0.70 indicate excellent agreement (Williamson, Xi, & Breyer, 2012).

The results in table 8.11 range from 0.84 to 0.97 across items. All the QWK results for grade levels were greater than 0.70, which indicates high levels of agreement between two raters. These statistics were similar to results reported in chapter 5 of the *Paper–Pencil Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2019–2020 Technical Report* (CDE, 2021).

Refer to subsection [*8.4.8.3 Quadratic-Weighted Kappa*](#_Quadratic-Weighted_Kappa_1) for additional information about QWK statistics.

Table 8.12 presents the interrater reliability results for Speaking responses. As discussed earlier, the percentage of exact agreement for 1-point items for kindergarten and grade one and 4-point items for all grades was lower than expected. A study is underway to provide additional understanding into these observations.

#### Other Validity Evidence

Convergent and discriminant validity evidence can also be established through a pattern of high correlations among scales that purport to measure domains that are known to be closely related and lower correlations among scales that are intended to measure dissimilar domains. The pattern of correlations within the Initial ELPAC provides preliminary evidence of validity by showing that the correlations among oral language and written language skills are positive and reasonably high, except for kindergarten. These correlations for each domain and composite score by grade level or grade span are presented in [appendix 8.F](#_Appendix_8.F:_Correlations). These results were similar to the correlation between domains of the Initial ELPAC calculated using 2020–21 testing data, which can be found in appendix 6.A of the *Computer-based Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–‍2021 Technical Report* (CDE, 2022).

Table 8.13 provides the correlations between composite scale scores and overall scale scores.

Table 8.13 Correlation Among Composites and the Overall Score

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Language Composite** | **Written Language** | **Overall** |
| Kindergarten | Oral | 0.667 | 0.998 |
| Kindergarten | Written | 1.000 | 0.710 |
| 1 | Oral | 0.839 | 0.987 |
| 1 | Written | 1.000 | 0.914 |
| 2 | Oral | 0.806 | 0.955 |
| 2 | Written | 1.000 | 0.945 |
| 3–5 | Oral | 0.885 | 0.976 |
| 3–5 | Written | 1.000 | 0.965 |
| 6–8 | Oral | 0.865 | 0.978 |
| 6–8 | Written | 1.000 | 0.951 |
| 9–12 | Oral | 0.888 | 0.979 |
| 9–12 | Written | 1.000 | 0.962 |

The correlation patterns among composite and overall scores were similar to the results found in chapter 6 of the *Computer-based Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–2021 Technical Report* (CDE, 2022).

### References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

California Department of Education. (2014). *California English language development standards: Kindergarten through grade 12*. Adopted by the State Board of Education November 2012. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2019). *Test blueprints for the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020a). *Initial ELPAC general performance level descriptors*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2020b). *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 technical report* [Unpublished report]*.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2022). *Computer-based Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–2021 technical report* [Unpublished report]*.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2023). *Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2020–2021 technical report* [Unpublished report]*.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20 (1): 37–46.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.

Feldt, L. S. & Brennan, R. L. (1989). Reliability. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd edition) (pp. 105–46). New York: Macmillan.

Fife, D. A., Mendoza, J. L., & Terry, R. (2012). The assessment of reliability under range restriction: A comparison of α, ω, and test–retest reliability for dichotomous data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *72*(5), 862–88.

Glaser, R. (1963). Instructional technology and the measurement of learning outcomes. *American Psychologist,* 18. 519–32.

Haertel, E. H. (2006). Reliability. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th ed., pp. 65–110). Washington, DC: American Council on Education and National Council on Measurement in Education.

Kolen, M. J., & Brennan, R. L. (2004). *Test equating, linking, and scaling: Methods and practices* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Livingston, S. A. & Lewis, C. (1995). Estimating the consistency and accuracy of classification based on test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 32*, 179–97.

Olsson, U., Drasgow, F., & Dorans, N. J. (1982). The polyserial correlation coefficient. *Psychometrika, 47*, 337–47.

Williamson, D.M., Xi, X., & Breyer, F.J. (2012), A framework for evaluation and use of automated scoring. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 31: 2–13.

### Accessibility Information

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.1

P value sub dich equals the fraction with the numerator the sum of X sub ij and the denominator N sub I end fraction.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.2

P value sub poly equals the fraction with the numerator X sub ij and the denominator N sub i times Max of X sub I end fraction.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.3

r sub polyreg equals the fraction beta sub hat times S tot divided by the square root of Beta sub hat squared times s sub tot squared plus 1.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.4

Alpha hat equals the numerator k divided by the denominator k minus 1 multiplied by open bracket 1 minus the numerator summation from i equals 1 to k multiplied by sigma-hat squared sub i divided by the denominator sigma-hat squared sub x close bracket.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.5

Alpha hat sub c equals 1 minus fraction with numerator sum of j of w squared sub j times Sigma hat squared sub j times open parenthesis 1 minus alpha hat sub j close parenthesis and denominator Sigma hat squared sub c.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.6

SEM equals total score standard deviation multiplied by the square root of 1 minus alpha where alpha is the reliability corresponding to the two composite scores.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.7

Overall SEM is equal to square root of the sum of the weighted composite of the squared SEMs. The weighted composite is 0.5 squared times the square of the oral language SEM plus 0.5 squared times the square of the written language SEM.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.8

Overall SEM is equal to square root of the sum of the weighted composite of the squared SEMs. The weighted composite is 0.7 squared times the square of the oral language SEM plus 0.3 squared times the square of the written language SEM.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.9

Overall SEM is equal to square root of the sum of the weighted composite of the squared SEMs. The weighted composite is 0.9 squared times the square of the oral language SEM plus 0.1 squared times the square of the written language SEM.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.10

SE of theta sub j equals 1 divided by the square root of I of theta sub j.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.11

I of theta sub j equals the sum from i equals 1 to n of I sub i of Theta sub j.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.12

I sub i of theta sub j equals open bracket s sub i2 of theta sub j minus s sub i squared of theta sub j.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.13

S sub i of theta sub j equals the sum from h equals 0 to n sub i of h times p sub ih of theta sub j.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.14

S sub i2 of theta sub j equals the sum from h equals 0 to n sub i of h squared times p sub ih of theta sub j.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.15

P sub ih of theta sub j equals the numerator exp open parenthesis the sum from v equals 1 to h of Da sub i open parenthesis theta sub j minus b sub I plus d sub iv close parenthesis close parenthesis divided by the denominator open parenthesis 1 plus the sum from c equals 1 to n sub I exp open parenthesis the sum from v equals 1 to c of Da sub I open parenthesis theta sub j minus b sub I plus d sub iv close parenthesis close parenthesis close parenthesis, if score h equals 1, 2, …, n sub i.

P sub ih of theta sub j equals 1 divided by the denominator open parenthesis 1 plus the sum from c equals 1 to n sub I exp open parenthesis the sum from v equals 1 to c of Da sub I open parenthesis theta sub j minus b sub I plus d sub iv close parenthesis close parenthesis close parenthesis, if score h equals 0.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.16

CSEM of SS equals 1 times a divided by the square root of I of theta hat.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.17

kappa equals the fraction with the numerator p sub obs minus p sub exp the denominator 1 minus p sub exp.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.18

P sub obs equals 1 divided by n times the sum from s equals 0 to m n sub ss.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.19

P sub exp equals 1 divided by n square times the sum from s equals 0 to m n sub s plus times n sub plus s.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.20

K sub ij equals open parenthesis the sum from i equals zero to m the sum from j equals zero to m of w sub ij times n sub ij divided by n sub plus plus close parenthesis minus open parenthesis the sum from i equals zero to m the sum from j equals zero to m of w sub ij times n sub I plus times n sub plus j divided by n squared sub plus plus close parenthesis divided open parenthesis 1 minus open parenthesis the sum from i equals zero to m the sum from j equals zero to m of w sub ij times n sub i plus times n sub plus j divided by n squared sub plus plus close parenthesis close parenthesis, K sub ij equals open parenthesis the sum from i equals zero to m the sum from j equals zero to m of w sub ij times n sub ij divided by n sub plus plus close parenthesis minus open parenthesis the sum from i equals zero to m the sum from j equals zero to m of w sub ij times n sub i plus times n sub plus j divided by n squared sub plus plus close parenthesis divided open parenthesis 1 minus open parenthesis the sum from i equals zero to m the sum from j equals zero to m of w sub ij times n sub i plus times n sub plus j divided by n squared sub plus plus close parenthesis close parenthesis.

#### Alternative Text for Equation 8.21

W sub ij equals 1 minus open parenthesis I minus j close parenthesis squared divided by m squared.

### Appendix 8.A: Rotating Score Validation Process Participant Data

Table 8.A.1 Number of Students by LEA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA** | **N** |
| ASCEND | 27 |
| Adelante Charter | 1 |
| Alliance Dr. Olga Mohan High | 2 |
| Alliance Jack H. Skirball Middle | 2 |
| Alpha Cindy Avitia High | 14 |
| Alta Loma Elementary | 92 |
| Anderson Valley Unified | 24 |
| Antioch Unified | 210 |
| Aromas - San Juan Unified | 2 |
| Aspire APEX Academy | 7 |
| Aspire Alexander Twilight College Preparatory Academy | 32 |
| Aspire Antonio Maria Lugo Academy | 27 |
| Aspire Firestone Academy Charter | 29 |
| Aspire Titan Academy | 22 |
| Ballico-Cressey Elementary | 12 |
| Banning Unified | 13 |
| Barack Obama Charter | 15 |
| Barstow Unified | 72 |
| Bert Corona Charter High | 5 |
| Biggs Unified | 1 |
| Blue Oak Charter | 2 |
| Bonita Unified | 105 |
| Brea-Olinda Unified | 19 |
| Brentwood Union Elementary | 108 |
| Brittan Elementary | 6 |
| Browns Elementary | 3 |
| Burlingame Elementary | 26 |
| Calaveras Unified | 31 |
| Caliber: ChangeMakers Academy | 35 |
| California Montessori Project - Capitol Campus | 2 |
| Camino Union Elementary | 2 |
| Capay Joint Union Elementary | 6 |
| Capitol Collegiate Academy | 20 |
| Carlsbad Unified | 125 |
| Carpinteria Unified | 71 |

Table 8.A.1 *(continuation one)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA** | **N** |
| Cascade Union Elementary | 10 |
| Castro Valley Unified | 265 |
| Central City Value | 8 |
| Central Elementary | 111 |
| Central Union High | 62 |
| Charter Oak Unified | 66 |
| Chula Vista Elementary | 1,297 |
| Clovis Unified | 64 |
| Coalinga-Huron Unified | 18 |
| Connecting Waters Charter | 4 |
| Connecting Waters Charter - East Bay | 1 |
| Coronado Unified | 109 |
| Covina-Valley Unified | 206 |
| Cox Academy | 47 |
| Cutten Elementary | 7 |
| Darnall Charter | 33 |
| Denair Unified | 27 |
| Discovery Charter II | 2 |
| Duarte Unified | 81 |
| Dunham Elementary | 1 |
| East Palo Alto Academy | 3 |
| El Monte City | 453 |
| El Nido Elementary | 14 |
| El Segundo Unified | 7 |
| El Sol Santa Ana Science and Arts Academy | 4 |
| El Tejon Unified | 9 |
| Emery Unified | 15 |
| Environmental Charter Middle | 1 |
| Escalon Unified | 5 |
| Everest Value | 3 |
| Fenton STEM Academy: Elementary Center for Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics | 12 |
| Ferndale Unified | 1 |
| Five Keys Independence HS (SF Sheriff's) | 5 |
| Fontana Unified | 1,038 |
| Galt Joint Union High | 22 |
| Gateway Unified | 1 |
| Geyserville Unified | 2 |
| Glendale Unified | 920 |
| Global Education Academy 2 | 11 |

Table 8.A.1 *(continuation two)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA** | **N** |
| Great Valley Academy - Salida | 6 |
| Grossmont Union High | 115 |
| Gustine Unified | 10 |
| Hart-Ransom Union Elementary | 7 |
| Heritage Peak Charter | 3 |
| Horicon Elementary | 5 |
| Huntington Beach City Elementary | 42 |
| ICEF Vista Middle Academy | 1 |
| Iftin Charter | 24 |
| Imperial County Office of Education | 1 |
| Integrity Charter | 4 |
| KIPP Empower Academy | 42 |
| Kentfield Elementary | 29 |
| Kit Carson Union Elementary | 9 |
| La Canada Unified | 49 |
| La Mesa-Spring Valley | 193 |
| Lakeside Joint | 5 |
| Lakeside Union Elementary | 81 |
| Lamont Elementary | 219 |
| Lashon Academy | 49 |
| Lassen Union High | 4 |
| Laytonville Unified | 5 |
| Lazear Charter Academy | 37 |
| Learning Without Limits | 3 |
| Lemoore Union High | 8 |
| Lennox | 314 |
| Leonardo da Vinci Health Sciences Charter | 3 |
| Lifeline Education Charter | 3 |
| Little Lake City Elementary | 3 |
| Lodestar: A Lighthouse Community Charter Public | 25 |
| Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary | 1 |
| Lompoc Unified | 199 |
| Los Alamitos Unified | 54 |
| Los Angeles Unified | 2,753 |
| Los Nietos | 52 |
| Magnolia Science Academy 2 | 6 |
| Manzanita Elementary | 2 |
| Manzanita Public Charter | 8 |
| Maricopa Unified | 8 |
| Meadows Union Elementary | 10 |

Table 8.A.1 *(continuation three)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA** | **N** |
| Modesto City High | 75 |
| Mono County Office of Education | 3 |
| Monrovia Unified | 20 |
| Mount Pleasant Elementary | 88 |
| Mountain View Whisman | 361 |
| Mountain View-Los Altos Union High | 36 |
| National Elementary | 293 |
| Natomas Unified | 292 |
| New Hope Elementary | 9 |
| Newman-Crows Landing Unified | 109 |
| Norwalk-La Mirada Unified | 341 |
| Ocean View | 128 |
| Orchard Elementary | 15 |
| Orinda Union Elementary | 33 |
| Oro Grande | 4 |
| Oroville Union High | 9 |
| Pacific View Charter 2.0 | 1 |
| Palo Verde Unified | 11 |
| Perris Elementary | 396 |
| Piner-Olivet Union Elementary | 5 |
| Placer Union High | 9 |
| Pleasanton Unified | 507 |
| Port of Los Angeles High | 2 |
| Rancho Santa Fe Elementary | 7 |
| Red Bluff Union Elementary | 36 |
| Redding Elementary | 20 |
| Redondo Beach Unified | 127 |
| Renaissance Arts Academy | 5 |
| Richmond Charter Elementary-Benito Juarez | 52 |
| Rise Kohyang Middle | 10 |
| Rising Sun Montessori | 10 |
| Rocketship Los Suenos Academy | 40 |
| Rocklin Academy Gateway | 22 |
| Roseland Charter | 1 |
| Rosemead Elementary | 167 |
| Ross Valley Charter | 2 |
| Rowland Unified | 495 |
| Sacramento City Unified | 942 |
| Saint Helena Unified | 22 |
| Salinas City Elementary | 713 |

Table 8.A.1 *(continuation four)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA** | **N** |
| San Benito High | 14 |
| San Diego County Office of Education | 11 |
| San Francisco Unified | 2,398 |
| San Joaquin County Office of Education | 29 |
| San Marino Unified | 103 |
| San Miguel Joint Union | 1 |
| Sanger Unified | 204 |
| Santa Clara Unified | 679 |
| Santa Cruz City High | 30 |
| Santa Paula Unified | 216 |
| School for Entrepreneurship and Technology | 4 |
| Scotts Valley Unified | 21 |
| Sierra Foothill Charter | 1 |
| Sonoma Valley Unified | 114 |
| Southern Kern Unified | 72 |
| St. HOPE Public School 7 | 1 |
| Steele Canyon High | 18 |
| Strathmore Union Elementary | 25 |
| Summit Public School K2 | 6 |
| Synergy Charter Academy | 25 |
| Tamalpais Union High | 6 |
| Temecula Valley Unified | 218 |
| Templeton Unified | 5 |
| Thermalito Union Elementary | 16 |
| Travis Unified | 55 |
| Tulare City | 277 |
| Twin Hills Union Elementary | 2 |
| Twin Rivers Charter | 9 |
| Two Rock Union | 7 |
| Union Hill Elementary | 6 |
| Upland Unified | 59 |
| Urban Discovery Academy Charter | 11 |
| Vacaville Unified | 171 |
| Val Verde Unified | 538 |
| Valley Charter Elementary | 14 |
| Victor Valley Union High | 49 |
| Village Charter Academy | 24 |
| Wasco Union High | 8 |
| Waugh Elementary | 1 |
| Waukena Joint Union Elementary | 13 |

Table 8.A.1 *(continuation five)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LEA** | **N** |
| Weed Union Elementary | 4 |
| Westmorland Union Elementary | 20 |
| Westside Union Elementary | 91 |
| Wheatland Union High | 15 |
| Wilder's Preparatory Academy Charter | 2 |
| Windsor Unified | 93 |
| Wright Elementary | 82 |
| Yuba City Unified | 364 |

### Appendix 8.B: Classical Item Analyses Results

**Note:** In table 8.B.1 through table 8.B.18, “D” indicates dichotomous items and “P” indicates polytomous items.

Table 8.B.1 Item Analysis—Listening, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR012742 | D | 126,916 | 0.37 | 0.77 | 0.01 |
| VR014850 | D | 126,916 | 0.47 | 0.80 | 0.01 |
| VR013658 | D | 126,916 | 0.46 | 0.80 | 0.01 |
| VR025267 | D | 126,916 | 0.40 | 0.69 | 0.00 |
| VR025269 | D | 126,916 | 0.32 | 0.77 | 0.00 |
| VR025268 | D | 126,916 | 0.43 | 0.76 | 0.00 |
| VR025304 | D | 126,916 | 0.67 | 0.90 | 0.00 |
| VR025306 | D | 126,916 | 0.53 | 0.83 | 0.00 |
| VR025305 | D | 126,916 | 0.68 | 0.87 | 0.00 |
| VR027108 | D | 126,916 | 0.49 | 0.85 | 0.01 |
| VR027109 | D | 126,916 | 0.49 | 0.79 | 0.01 |
| VR027110 | D | 126,916 | 0.33 | 0.78 | 0.02 |

Table 8.B.2 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR023881 | D | 11,674 | 0.49 | 0.74 | 0.02 |
| VR023950 | D | 11,674 | 0.60 | 0.85 | 0.02 |
| VR023885 | D | 11,674 | 0.30 | 0.74 | 0.02 |
| VR023671 | D | 11,674 | 0.40 | 0.81 | 0.00 |
| VR023673 | D | 11,674 | 0.34 | 0.81 | 0.00 |
| VR023672 | D | 11,674 | 0.36 | 0.79 | 0.00 |
| VR023761 | D | 11,674 | 0.33 | 0.76 | 0.00 |
| VR023762 | D | 11,674 | 0.52 | 0.87 | 0.03 |
| VR023763 | D | 11,674 | 0.33 | 0.73 | 0.03 |
| VR027156 | D | 11,674 | 0.29 | 0.77 | 0.04 |
| VR027158 | D | 11,674 | 0.43 | 0.83 | 0.04 |
| VR027157 | D | 11,674 | 0.32 | 0.74 | 0.04 |

Table 8.B.3 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR007626 | D | 6,149 | 0.26 | 0.77 | 12.13 |
| VR007643 | D | 6,149 | 0.44 | 0.87 | 10.98 |
| VR007638 | D | 6,149 | 0.36 | 0.77 | 11.51 |
| VR025956 | D | 6,149 | 0.41 | 0.86 | 0.15 |
| VR025958 | D | 6,149 | 0.46 | 0.91 | 0.11 |
| VR025957 | D | 6,149 | 0.39 | 0.86 | 0.13 |
| VR026158 | D | 6,149 | 0.40 | 0.87 | 0.42 |
| VR026160 | D | 6,149 | 0.42 | 0.87 | 0.49 |
| VR026159 | D | 6,149 | 0.44 | 0.86 | 0.44 |
| VR027926 | D | 6,149 | 0.37 | 0.86 | 0.62 |
| VR027928 | D | 6,149 | 0.40 | 0.89 | 0.60 |
| VR027927 | D | 6,149 | 0.47 | 0.88 | 0.49 |

Table 8.B.4 Item Analysis for—Listening, Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR008854 | D | 14,819 | 0.24 | 0.77 | 9.95 |
| VR009052 | D | 14,819 | 0.33 | 0.78 | 9.50 |
| VR008904 | D | 14,819 | 0.55 | 0.79 | 9.26 |
| VR021572 | D | 14,819 | 0.44 | 0.81 | 0.19 |
| VR021574 | D | 14,819 | 0.36 | 0.76 | 0.67 |
| VR021573 | D | 14,819 | 0.41 | 0.80 | 0.51 |
| VR027071 | D | 14,819 | 0.44 | 0.85 | 0.80 |
| VR027073 | D | 14,819 | 0.37 | 0.86 | 0.88 |
| VR027072 | D | 14,819 | 0.42 | 0.87 | 0.86 |
| VR028155 | D | 14,819 | 0.36 | 0.69 | 1.21 |
| VR028159 | D | 14,819 | 0.50 | 0.87 | 1.24 |
| VR028158 | D | 14,819 | 0.38 | 0.79 | 1.32 |
| VR028157 | D | 14,819 | 0.37 | 0.77 | 1.30 |

Table 8.B.5 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR008564 | D | 13,541 | 0.58 | 0.82 | 7.55 |
| VR009070 | D | 13,541 | 0.51 | 0.78 | 7.00 |
| VR009087 | D | 13,541 | 0.66 | 0.85 | 6.69 |
| VR009873 | D | 13,541 | 0.60 | 0.84 | 0.04 |
| VR009875 | D | 13,541 | 0.47 | 0.80 | 0.37 |
| VR009874 | D | 13,541 | 0.48 | 0.71 | 0.38 |
| VR027311 | D | 13,541 | 0.54 | 0.79 | 0.83 |
| VR027314 | D | 13,541 | 0.39 | 0.72 | 0.97 |
| VR027313 | D | 13,541 | 0.34 | 0.72 | 0.93 |
| VR027312 | D | 13,541 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 0.94 |
| VR022966 | D | 13,541 | 0.54 | 0.84 | 1.02 |
| VR022970 | D | 13,541 | 0.43 | 0.70 | 1.11 |
| VR022969 | D | 13,541 | 0.39 | 0.73 | 1.09 |
| VR022968 | D | 13,541 | 0.38 | 0.65 | 1.13 |

Table 8.B.6 Item Analysis—Listening, Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR008495 | D | 23,746 | 0.59 | 0.81 | 6.01 |
| VR008023 | D | 23,746 | 0.31 | 0.54 | 5.79 |
| VR008630 | D | 23,746 | 0.42 | 0.77 | 5.88 |
| VR009837 | D | 23,746 | 0.33 | 0.82 | 0.17 |
| VR009839 | D | 23,746 | 0.48 | 0.69 | 0.42 |
| VR009838 | D | 23,746 | 0.44 | 0.69 | 0.43 |
| VR027220 | D | 23,746 | 0.49 | 0.69 | 0.72 |
| VR027221 | D | 23,746 | 0.47 | 0.77 | 0.83 |
| VR027224 | D | 23,746 | 0.38 | 0.78 | 0.86 |
| VR027222 | D | 23,746 | 0.45 | 0.70 | 0.81 |
| VR022167 | D | 23,746 | 0.42 | 0.77 | 0.89 |
| VR022171 | D | 23,746 | 0.38 | 0.83 | 0.96 |
| VR022170 | D | 23,746 | 0.42 | 0.80 | 0.99 |
| VR022169 | D | 23,746 | 0.41 | 0.72 | 1.04 |

Table 8.B.7 Item Analysis—Speaking, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR068452 | D | 129,776 | 0.41 | 0.81 | 0.04 |
| VR068453 | D | 129,776 | 0.62 | 0.84 | 0.06 |
| VR068457 | D | 129,776 | 0.60 | 0.86 | 0.05 |
| VR068455 | P | 129,776 | 0.52 | 0.89 | 0.05 |
| VR068456 | P | 129,776 | 0.48 | 0.89 | 0.06 |
| VR068454 | P | 129,776 | 0.46 | 0.89 | 0.08 |
| VR068466 | P | 129,776 | 0.58 | 0.89 | 0.02 |
| VR068459 | P | 129,776 | 0.38 | 0.92 | 0.05 |

Table 8.B.8 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR068391 | D | 12,241 | 0.42 | 0.87 | 0.03 |
| VR068392 | D | 12,241 | 0.47 | 0.88 | 0.05 |
| VR068396 | D | 12,241 | 0.56 | 0.93 | 0.07 |
| VR068394 | P | 12,241 | 0.39 | 0.90 | 0.02 |
| VR068395 | P | 12,241 | 0.50 | 0.91 | 0.03 |
| VR068393 | P | 12,241 | 0.42 | 0.92 | 0.06 |
| VR068397 | P | 12,241 | 0.38 | 0.95 | 0.00 |
| VR068403 | P | 12,241 | 0.29 | 0.95 | 0.13 |

Table 8.B.9 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR068419 | D | 6,327 | 0.38 | 0.93 | 0.05 |
| VR068420 | D | 6,327 | 0.39 | 0.91 | 0.08 |
| VR068424 | D | 6,327 | 0.36 | 0.91 | 0.05 |
| VR068422 | P | 6,327 | 0.30 | 0.91 | 0.06 |
| VR068423 | P | 6,327 | 0.33 | 0.92 | 0.17 |
| VR068421 | P | 6,327 | 0.32 | 0.91 | 0.16 |
| VR068429 | P | 6,327 | 0.31 | 0.96 | 0.02 |
| VR068432 | P | 6,327 | 0.27 | 0.96 | 0.08 |

Table 8.B.10 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR068508 | D | 15,521 | 0.40 | 0.92 | 0.04 |
| VR068509 | D | 15,521 | 0.43 | 0.95 | 0.05 |
| VR068513 | D | 15,521 | 0.39 | 0.91 | 0.10 |
| VR068511 | P | 15,521 | 0.38 | 0.94 | 0.09 |
| VR068512 | P | 15,521 | 0.40 | 0.93 | 0.09 |
| VR068510 | P | 15,521 | 0.40 | 0.94 | 0.12 |
| VR068521 | P | 15,521 | 0.31 | 0.93 | 0.02 |
| VR068520 | P | 15,521 | 0.31 | 0.94 | 0.11 |
| VR068518 | P | 15,521 | 0.24 | 0.95 | 0.30 |

Table 8.B.11 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR068544 | D | 13,976 | 0.48 | 0.94 | 0.04 |
| VR068545 | D | 13,976 | 0.43 | 0.91 | 0.04 |
| VR068549 | D | 13,976 | 0.43 | 0.92 | 0.07 |
| VR068547 | P | 13,976 | 0.39 | 0.94 | 0.06 |
| VR068548 | P | 13,976 | 0.38 | 0.94 | 0.12 |
| VR068546 | P | 13,976 | 0.46 | 0.93 | 0.13 |
| VR068555 | P | 13,976 | 0.38 | 0.93 | 0.01 |
| VR068551 | P | 13,976 | 0.39 | 0.93 | 0.14 |
| VR068566 | P | 13,976 | 0.29 | 0.95 | 0.34 |

Table 8.B.12 Item Analysis—Speaking, Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR068575 | D | 24,501 | 0.43 | 0.91 | 0.06 |
| VR068576 | D | 24,501 | 0.42 | 0.94 | 0.08 |
| VR068580 | D | 24,501 | 0.42 | 0.92 | 0.09 |
| VR068578 | P | 24,501 | 0.39 | 0.94 | 0.12 |
| VR068579 | P | 24,501 | 0.34 | 0.93 | 0.14 |
| VR068577 | P | 24,501 | 0.38 | 0.89 | 0.17 |
| VR068588 | P | 24,501 | 0.33 | 0.94 | 0.02 |
| VR068587 | P | 24,501 | 0.29 | 0.94 | 0.07 |
| VR068600 | P | 24,501 | 0.27 | 0.96 | 0.32 |

Table 8.B.13 Item Analysis—Reading, Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR001790 | P | 122,788 | 0.27 | 0.86 | 0.00 |
| VR001782 | D | 122,788 | 0.62 | 0.82 | 0.01 |
| VR002163 | P | 122,788 | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.01 |
| VR002155 | D | 122,788 | 0.51 | 0.78 | 0.01 |
| VR003705 | P | 122,788 | 0.33 | 0.86 | 0.00 |
| VR003375 | D | 122,788 | 0.49 | 0.83 | 0.05 |
| VR003374 | D | 122,788 | 0.56 | 0.84 | 0.05 |
| VR003373 | D | 122,788 | 0.45 | 0.79 | 0.06 |

Table 8.B.14 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR003528 | P | 11,818 | 0.42 | 0.88 | 0.00 |
| VR002369 | D | 11,818 | 0.49 | 0.85 | 0.00 |
| VR002372 | D | 11,818 | 0.50 | 0.84 | 0.00 |
| VR002371 | D | 11,818 | 0.35 | 0.84 | 0.00 |
| VR000311 | D | 11,818 | 0.52 | 0.88 | 0.00 |
| VR000313 | D | 11,818 | 0.48 | 0.86 | 0.02 |
| VR000312 | D | 11,818 | 0.42 | 0.85 | 0.03 |
| VR000163 | D | 11,818 | 0.38 | 0.85 | 0.03 |
| VR001008 | D | 11,818 | 0.38 | 0.84 | 0.04 |

Table 8.B.15 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR000153 | D | 6,303 | 0.65 | 0.93 | 10.84 |
| VR000991 | D | 6,303 | 0.58 | 0.88 | 10.69 |
| VR000176 | D | 6,303 | 0.48 | 0.87 | 0.40 |
| VR000874 | D | 6,303 | 0.40 | 0.85 | 0.46 |
| VR000080 | D | 6,303 | 0.39 | 0.85 | 5.65 |
| VR000082 | D | 6,303 | 0.42 | 0.89 | 5.84 |
| VR000081 | D | 6,303 | 0.37 | 0.86 | 5.93 |
| VR002533 | D | 6,303 | 0.41 | 0.85 | 6.52 |
| VR002536 | D | 6,303 | 0.35 | 0.83 | 6.60 |
| VR002535 | D | 6,303 | 0.34 | 0.84 | 6.57 |

Table 8.B.16 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VH992080 | D | 15,141 | 0.41 | 0.82 | 10.84 |
| VH992086 | D | 15,141 | 0.41 | 0.88 | 10.48 |
| VH990840 | D | 15,141 | 0.24 | 0.80 | 0.13 |
| VH990843 | D | 15,141 | 0.31 | 0.89 | 0.30 |
| VH990842 | D | 15,141 | 0.31 | 0.87 | 0.35 |
| VH991264 | D | 15,141 | 0.27 | 0.72 | 1.20 |
| VH991265 | D | 15,141 | 0.22 | 0.81 | 1.32 |
| VH991266 | D | 15,141 | 0.27 | 0.79 | 1.35 |
| VH991270 | D | 15,141 | 0.27 | 0.80 | 1.40 |
| VH991269 | D | 15,141 | 0.18 | 0.65 | 1.38 |

Table 8.B.17 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VH992053 | D | 13,846 | 0.52 | 0.88 | 6.67 |
| VH992068 | D | 13,846 | 0.51 | 0.74 | 6.63 |
| VH990781 | D | 13,846 | 0.34 | 0.80 | 0.15 |
| VH990784 | D | 13,846 | 0.23 | 0.78 | 0.40 |
| VH990783 | D | 13,846 | 0.24 | 0.76 | 0.45 |
| VH991133 | D | 13,846 | 0.44 | 0.86 | 0.92 |
| VH991134 | D | 13,846 | 0.27 | 0.78 | 1.08 |
| VH991135 | D | 13,846 | 0.40 | 0.72 | 1.06 |
| VH991139 | D | 13,846 | 0.23 | 0.74 | 1.13 |
| VH991136 | D | 13,846 | 0.26 | 0.73 | 1.12 |

Table 8.B.18 Item Analysis—Reading, Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Item Type** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| VR000373 | D | 24,375 | 0.45 | 0.82 | 5.79 |
| VR000393 | D | 24,375 | 0.65 | 0.88 | 5.68 |
| VH990484 | D | 24,375 | 0.34 | 0.74 | 0.14 |
| VH990487 | D | 24,375 | 0.38 | 0.65 | 0.30 |
| VH990486 | D | 24,375 | 0.36 | 0.78 | 0.39 |
| VH991718 | D | 24,375 | 0.37 | 0.73 | 0.66 |
| VH991719 | D | 24,375 | 0.51 | 0.81 | 0.77 |
| VH991720 | D | 24,375 | 0.35 | 0.71 | 0.97 |
| VH991724 | D | 24,375 | 0.22 | 0.69 | 0.87 |
| VH991722 | D | 24,375 | 0.38 | 0.77 | 0.86 |

Table 8.B.19 Item Analysis—Writing, by Grade Level or Grade Span

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item ID** | **N** | ***p*-value** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Percent Omit** |
| Kindergarten | VR171914 | 130,648 | 0.25 | 0.86 | 0.04 |
| Kindergarten | VR171917 | 130,648 | 0.24 | 0.84 | 0.06 |
| Kindergarten | VR171920 | 130,648 | 0.13 | 0.87 | 0.07 |
| Kindergarten | VR171943 | 130,648 | 0.13 | 0.86 | 0.06 |
| Kindergarten | VR171945 | 130,648 | 0.17 | 0.84 | 0.01 |
| Kindergarten | VR171947 | 130,648 | 0.16 | 0.85 | 0.07 |
| Kindergarten | VR171953 | 130,648 | 0.11 | 0.86 | 0.10 |
| Kindergarten | VR171956 | 130,648 | 0.12 | 0.89 | 0.12 |
| 1 | VR170490 | 12,255 | 0.50 | 0.96 | 0.02 |
| 1 | VR170514 | 12,255 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 0.07 |
| 1 | VR170515 | 12,255 | 0.24 | 0.91 | 0.07 |
| 1 | VR170516 | 12,255 | 0.21 | 0.91 | 0.06 |
| 1 | VR170524 | 12,255 | 0.39 | 0.94 | 0.00 |
| 1 | VR170531 | 12,255 | 0.42 | 0.94 | 0.06 |
| 1 | VR170534 | 12,255 | 0.29 | 0.93 | 0.05 |
| 1 | VR170538 | 12,255 | 0.18 | 0.94 | 0.06 |
| 2 | VR170546 | 6,289 | 0.43 | 0.92 | 0.02 |
| 2 | VR170552 | 6,289 | 0.44 | 0.93 | 0.08 |
| 2 | VR170553 | 6,289 | 0.27 | 0.90 | 0.10 |
| 2 | VR170626 | 6,289 | 0.27 | 0.95 | 0.10 |
| 2 | VR170643 | 6,289 | 0.28 | 0.97 | 0.02 |
| 2 | VR170647 | 6,289 | 0.26 | 0.97 | 0.06 |
| 3–5 | VR026380 | 15,467 | 0.22 | 0.90 | 32.11 |
| 3–5 | VR026378 | 15,467 | 0.23 | 0.91 | 34.24 |
| 3–5 | VR026375 | 15,467 | 0.22 | 0.90 | 0.56 |
| 3–5 | VR026373 | 15,467 | 0.25 | 0.91 | 1.18 |
| 3–5 | VR029781 | 15,467 | 0.19 | 0.93 | 1.71 |
| 6–8 | VR029177 | 13,826 | 0.29 | 0.98 | 28.95 |
| 6–8 | VR029556 | 13,826 | 0.25 | 0.98 | 0.00 |
| 9–12 | VR029232 | 24,594 | 0.27 | 0.98 | 31.34 |
| 9–12 | VR029699 | 24,594 | 0.25 | 0.98 | 0.00 |

**Note:** For table 8.B.20,

* the mean proportion of maximum is the mean score divided by the maximum possible score for an item, and
* N/A = not applicable.

Table 8.B.20 Distribution of Item Scores for Speaking Items with Multiple Score Points

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item ID** | **Percent Score Point = 0** | **Percent Score Point = 1** | **Percent Score Point = 2** | **Percent Score Point = 3** | **Percent Score Point = 4** | **Percent Omit** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Mean** | **Mean Proportion of Maximum** | **Standard Deviation** |
| Kindergarten | VR068455 | 38.34 | 19.77 | 41.85 | N/A | N/A | 0.05 | 0.89 | 1.035 | 0.517 | 0.895 |
| Kindergarten | VR068456 | 38.28 | 26.51 | 35.15 | N/A | N/A | 0.06 | 0.89 | 0.968 | 0.484 | 0.857 |
| Kindergarten | VR068454 | 44.48 | 19.26 | 36.19 | N/A | N/A | 0.08 | 0.89 | 0.916 | 0.458 | 0.895 |
| Kindergarten | VR068466 | 30.03 | 23.27 | 46.68 | N/A | N/A | 0.02 | 0.89 | 1.166 | 0.583 | 0.860 |
| Kindergarten | VR068459 | 38.57 | 11.50 | 19.02 | 19.07 | 11.79 | 0.05 | 0.92 | 1.539 | 0.385 | 1.453 |
| 1 | VR068394 | 50.54 | 20.05 | 29.39 | N/A | N/A | 0.02 | 0.90 | 0.788 | 0.394 | 0.869 |
| 1 | VR068395 | 45.58 | 8.59 | 45.80 | N/A | N/A | 0.03 | 0.91 | 1.002 | 0.501 | 0.956 |
| 1 | VR068393 | 51.34 | 12.91 | 35.69 | N/A | N/A | 0.06 | 0.92 | 0.843 | 0.421 | 0.920 |
| 1 | VR068397 | 47.73 | 6.15 | 10.77 | 18.63 | 16.71 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 1.504 | 0.376 | 1.606 |
| 1 | VR068403 | 50.08 | 12.34 | 16.32 | 13.53 | 7.60 | 0.13 | 0.95 | 1.160 | 0.290 | 1.366 |
| 2 | VR068422 | 65.20 | 10.02 | 24.72 | N/A | N/A | 0.06 | 0.91 | 0.595 | 0.297 | 0.858 |
| 2 | VR068423 | 61.83 | 9.33 | 28.67 | N/A | N/A | 0.17 | 0.92 | 0.667 | 0.333 | 0.892 |
| 2 | VR068421 | 62.46 | 11.05 | 26.33 | N/A | N/A | 0.16 | 0.91 | 0.637 | 0.319 | 0.871 |
| 2 | VR068429 | 60.14 | 3.33 | 6.32 | 12.69 | 17.50 | 0.02 | 0.96 | 1.240 | 0.310 | 1.640 |
| 2 | VR068432 | 61.06 | 6.35 | 8.84 | 11.71 | 11.96 | 0.08 | 0.96 | 1.070 | 0.268 | 1.497 |

Table 8.B.20 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item ID** | **Percent Score Point = 0** | **Percent Score Point = 1** | **Percent Score Point = 2** | **Percent Score Point = 3** | **Percent Score Point = 4** | **Percent Omit** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Mean** | **Mean Proportion of Maximum** | **Standard Deviation** |
| 3–5 | VR068511 | 56.97 | 9.45 | 33.48 | N/A | N/A | 0.09 | 0.94 | 0.764 | 0.382 | 0.922 |
| 3–5 | VR068512 | 55.09 | 10.02 | 34.80 | N/A | N/A | 0.09 | 0.93 | 0.796 | 0.398 | 0.926 |
| 3–5 | VR068510 | 55.51 | 9.70 | 34.68 | N/A | N/A | 0.12 | 0.94 | 0.791 | 0.395 | 0.927 |
| 3–5 | VR068521 | 65.67 | 6.80 | 27.52 | N/A | N/A | 0.02 | 0.93 | 0.618 | 0.309 | 0.887 |
| 3–5 | VR068520 | 64.94 | 7.95 | 27.00 | N/A | N/A | 0.11 | 0.94 | 0.619 | 0.310 | 0.881 |
| 3–5 | VR068518 | 62.89 | 5.94 | 10.64 | 12.03 | 8.20 | 0.30 | 0.95 | 0.961 | 0.240 | 1.399 |
| 6–8 | VR068547 | 55.51 | 11.53 | 32.90 | N/A | N/A | 0.06 | 0.94 | 0.773 | 0.387 | 0.913 |
| 6–8 | VR068548 | 56.88 | 10.88 | 32.12 | N/A | N/A | 0.12 | 0.94 | 0.751 | 0.376 | 0.911 |
| 6–8 | VR068546 | 50.92 | 5.87 | 43.08 | N/A | N/A | 0.13 | 0.93 | 0.920 | 0.460 | 0.967 |
| 6–8 | VR068555 | 58.06 | 8.56 | 33.36 | N/A | N/A | 0.01 | 0.93 | 0.753 | 0.376 | 0.924 |
| 6–8 | VR068551 | 57.00 | 8.35 | 34.51 | N/A | N/A | 0.14 | 0.93 | 0.774 | 0.387 | 0.930 |
| 6–8 | VR068566 | 57.61 | 5.34 | 10.23 | 14.40 | 12.09 | 0.34 | 0.95 | 1.174 | 0.293 | 1.522 |
| 9–12 | VR068578 | 55.48 | 10.84 | 33.56 | N/A | N/A | 0.12 | 0.94 | 0.780 | 0.390 | 0.918 |
| 9–12 | VR068579 | 61.09 | 10.42 | 28.35 | N/A | N/A | 0.14 | 0.93 | 0.671 | 0.336 | 0.888 |
| 9–12 | VR068577 | 56.72 | 9.95 | 33.16 | N/A | N/A | 0.17 | 0.89 | 0.763 | 0.381 | 0.919 |
| 9–12 | VR068588 | 62.78 | 8.21 | 28.99 | N/A | N/A | 0.02 | 0.94 | 0.662 | 0.331 | 0.896 |
| 9–12 | VR068587 | 65.21 | 11.55 | 23.17 | N/A | N/A | 0.07 | 0.94 | 0.579 | 0.289 | 0.841 |
| 9–12 | VR068600 | 59.25 | 6.99 | 10.14 | 10.66 | 12.64 | 0.32 | 0.96 | 1.098 | 0.275 | 1.501 |

**Note:** For table 8.B.21,

* the mean proportion of maximum is the mean score divided by the maximum possible score for an item;
* N/A = not applicable; and
* the last four items with an asterisk (\*) are Reading items.

Table 8.B.21 Distribution of Item Scores for Written Items with Multiple Score Points

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item ID** | **Percent Score Point = 0** | **Percent Score Point = 1** | **Percent Score Point = 2** | **Percent Score Point = 3** | **Percent Score Point = 4** | **Percent Omit** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Mean** | **Mean Proportion of Maximum** | **Standard Deviation** |
| Kindergarten | VR171920 | 80.67 | 11.88 | 7.38 | N/A | N/A | 0.07 | 0.87 | 0.266 | 0.133 | 0.586 |
| Kindergarten | VR171943 | 82.33 | 9.64 | 7.98 | N/A | N/A | 0.06 | 0.86 | 0.256 | 0.128 | 0.592 |
| Kindergarten | VR171953 | 84.72 | 7.61 | 7.57 | N/A | N/A | 0.10 | 0.86 | 0.228 | 0.114 | 0.572 |
| Kindergarten | VR171956 | 84.04 | 8.21 | 7.63 | N/A | N/A | 0.12 | 0.89 | 0.235 | 0.117 | 0.576 |
| 1 | VR170515 | 65.02 | 21.49 | 13.42 | N/A | N/A | 0.07 | 0.91 | 0.483 | 0.242 | 0.720 |
| 1 | VR170516 | 70.90 | 15.94 | 13.10 | N/A | N/A | 0.06 | 0.91 | 0.421 | 0.211 | 0.711 |
| 1 | VR170534 | 67.02 | 8.35 | 24.59 | N/A | N/A | 0.05 | 0.93 | 0.575 | 0.288 | 0.858 |
| 1 | VR170538 | 75.09 | 6.19 | 7.23 | 11.43 | N/A | 0.06 | 0.94 | 0.549 | 0.183 | 1.038 |
| 2 | VR170553 | 58.72 | 28.73 | 12.45 | N/A | N/A | 0.10 | 0.90 | 0.536 | 0.268 | 0.706 |
| 2 | VR170626 | 65.80 | 6.20 | 10.19 | 17.71 | N/A | 0.10 | 0.95 | 0.797 | 0.266 | 1.195 |
| 2 | VR170643 | 63.56 | 7.52 | 11.51 | 17.40 | N/A | 0.02 | 0.97 | 0.827 | 0.276 | 1.190 |
| 2 | VR170647 | 64.35 | 8.00 | 12.13 | 15.46 | N/A | 0.06 | 0.97 | 0.786 | 0.262 | 1.157 |
| 3–5 | VR026380 | 41.64 | 7.88 | 18.37 | N/A | N/A | 32.11 | 0.90 | 0.446 | 0.223 | 0.784 |
| 3–5 | VR026378 | 36.24 | 12.48 | 17.04 | N/A | N/A | 34.24 | 0.91 | 0.466 | 0.233 | 0.768 |
| 3–5 | VR026375 | 71.49 | 12.52 | 15.43 | N/A | N/A | 0.56 | 0.90 | 0.434 | 0.217 | 0.745 |
| 3–5 | VR026373 | 68.37 | 11.59 | 18.85 | N/A | N/A | 1.18 | 0.91 | 0.493 | 0.246 | 0.792 |
| 3–5 | VR029781 | 67.50 | 5.29 | 10.23 | 9.55 | 5.73 | 1.71 | 0.93 | 0.773 | 0.193 | 1.281 |

Table 8.B.21 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Item ID** | **Percent Score Point = 0** | **Percent Score Point = 1** | **Percent Score Point = 2** | **Percent Score Point = 3** | **Percent Score Point = 4** | **Percent Omit** | **Item-Total Correlation** | **Mean** | **Mean Proportion of Maximum** | **Standard Deviation** |
| 6–8 | VR029177 | 27.88 | 7.57 | 11.52 | 12.44 | 11.65 | 28.95 | 0.98 | 1.145 | 0.286 | 1.486 |
| 6–8 | VR029556 | 58.93 | 9.24 | 11.96 | 10.83 | 9.03 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 1.018 | 0.255 | 1.398 |
| 9–12 | VR029232 | 28.91 | 6.57 | 9.10 | 11.75 | 12.32 | 31.34 | 0.98 | 1.093 | 0.273 | 1.505 |
| 9–12 | VR029699 | 60.98 | 7.70 | 10.21 | 10.56 | 10.54 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 1.020 | 0.255 | 1.443 |
| Kindergarten | \*VR001790 | 52.76 | 39.76 | 7.48 | N/A | N/A | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.547 | 0.274 | 0.630 |
| Kindergarten | \*VR002163 | 57.25 | 35.64 | 7.10 | N/A | N/A | 0.01 | 0.85 | 0.498 | 0.249 | 0.626 |
| Kindergarten | \*VR003705 | 58.25 | 18.31 | 23.45 | N/A | N/A | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.652 | 0.326 | 0.834 |
| 1 | \*VR003528 | 51.36 | 13.94 | 34.69 | N/A | N/A | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0.833 | 0.417 | 0.913 |

### Appendix 8.C: Response Time Results

**Notes:**

* Overall scale scores were used to group students into quartiles.
* For kindergarten through grade two, the Writing domain was not included in the raw score and response time calculations because this domain was paper-based.
* All students who completed the test and have an unrounded test time greater than zero (0) are included.
* Grade levels and grade spans reflect students’ enrolled grade levels or grade spans during the 2021–22 school year.
* SD = standard deviation.
* Response time percentiles are identified as follows:
* “% Pt. 1” is the time taken by test takers in the first percentile of response time.
* “% Pt. 10” is the time taken by test takers in the tenth percentile of response time.
* “% Pt. 25” is the time taken by test takers in the twenty-fifth percentile of response time.
* “% Pt. 50” is the time taken by test takers in the fiftieth percentile of response time.
* “% Pt. 75” is the time taken by test takers in the seventy-fifth percentile of response time.
* “% Pt. 90” is the time taken by test takers in the ninetieth percentile of response time.
* “% Pt. 99” is the time taken by test takers in the ninety-ninth percentile of response time.

Table 8.C.1 Total Testing Time (in Minutes) at Each Raw Score Interval

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Based on Scale Score Quartiles** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Min.** | **Max.** | **% Pt. 1** | **% Pt. 10** | **% Pt. 25** | **% Pt. 50** | **% Pt. 75** | **% Pt. 90** | **% Pt. 99** |
| Kindergarten | 150–208 | 28,812 | 10.60 | 5.37 | 0.51 | 103.65 | 1.31 | 4.85 | 7.06 | 9.86 | 13.37 | 17.04 | 26.94 |
| Kindergarten | 209–328 | 27,794 | 16.99 | 6.08 | 0.77 | 109.18 | 3.62 | 10.87 | 13.29 | 16.21 | 19.72 | 23.77 | 37.15 |
| Kindergarten | 329–411 | 28,282 | 17.97 | 5.61 | 1.02 | 97.12 | 5.58 | 12.52 | 14.58 | 17.23 | 20.38 | 24.19 | 36.66 |
| Kindergarten | 412–600 | 28,200 | 16.98 | 5.36 | 1.11 | 93.77 | 5.97 | 11.93 | 13.77 | 16.21 | 19.18 | 22.93 | 34.60 |
| 1 | 150–185 | 2,694 | 8.42 | 4.11 | 0.44 | 45.12 | 0.85 | 3.94 | 5.97 | 8.00 | 10.32 | 13.14 | 21.77 |
| 1 | 186–325 | 2,640 | 18.11 | 6.16 | 0.75 | 85.27 | 5.05 | 11.79 | 14.31 | 17.49 | 21.00 | 25.03 | 38.14 |
| 1 | 326–418 | 2,612 | 21.78 | 6.24 | 0.80 | 89.87 | 5.83 | 16.04 | 18.25 | 21.06 | 24.48 | 28.70 | 42.04 |
| 1 | 419–600 | 2,633 | 20.53 | 6.31 | 0.97 | 91.33 | 2.73 | 15.16 | 17.32 | 19.69 | 23.18 | 26.79 | 41.99 |

Table 8.C.1 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Based on Scale Score Quartiles** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Min.** | **Max.** | **% Pt. 1** | **% Pt. 10** | **% Pt. 25** | **% Pt. 50** | **% Pt. 75** | **% Pt. 90** | **% Pt. 99** |
| 2 | 150–201 | 1,414 | 5.98 | 3.25 | 0.34 | 48.87 | 0.61 | 3.11 | 4.27 | 5.43 | 7.08 | 9.22 | 17.68 |
| 2 | 202–304 | 1,398 | 13.60 | 5.83 | 0.99 | 49.93 | 3.94 | 7.14 | 9.36 | 12.97 | 16.66 | 20.68 | 34.11 |
| 2 | 305–425 | 1,373 | 23.36 | 7.50 | 1.22 | 67.41 | 9.56 | 15.40 | 18.54 | 22.40 | 27.18 | 32.66 | 47.04 |
| 2 | 426–600 | 1,386 | 22.85 | 6.75 | 0.98 | 69.63 | 1.74 | 16.78 | 18.97 | 22.10 | 25.43 | 30.23 | 46.77 |
| 3–5 | 150–150 | 3,394 | 8.56 | 5.70 | 0.39 | 70.54 | 0.77 | 3.45 | 5.15 | 7.27 | 10.36 | 15.31 | 28.46 |
| 3–5 | 151–210 | 3,297 | 23.16 | 10.65 | 0.93 | 163.72 | 6.75 | 13.27 | 16.40 | 21.04 | 27.50 | 35.31 | 60.76 |
| 3–5 | 211–409 | 3,240 | 38.50 | 16.70 | 1.20 | 147.30 | 9.83 | 21.15 | 27.38 | 35.71 | 46.51 | 58.32 | 96.76 |
| 3–5 | 410–600 | 3,296 | 40.12 | 14.21 | 2.97 | 144.60 | 6.45 | 26.26 | 31.40 | 37.75 | 46.21 | 56.79 | 90.25 |
| 6–8 | 150–183 | 2,989 | 13.63 | 10.41 | 0.34 | 97.21 | 0.66 | 3.20 | 5.57 | 10.38 | 20.09 | 26.76 | 46.40 |
| 6–8 | 184–272 | 2,951 | 31.31 | 14.40 | 1.62 | 143.67 | 8.22 | 17.22 | 22.42 | 29.05 | 36.82 | 47.49 | 82.01 |
| 6–8 | 273–445 | 2,936 | 48.46 | 18.55 | 1.78 | 256.12 | 16.03 | 29.39 | 35.97 | 45.04 | 57.76 | 71.76 | 108.06 |
| 6–8 | 446–600 | 2,959 | 47.83 | 17.43 | 5.68 | 145.59 | 12.19 | 29.87 | 35.66 | 45.06 | 56.38 | 69.59 | 100.23 |
| 9–12 | 150–185 | 5,299 | 18.51 | 16.80 | 0.24 | 162.16 | 0.38 | 1.78 | 5.17 | 14.30 | 27.95 | 40.64 | 72.35 |
| 9–12 | 186–243 | 5,271 | 37.34 | 16.77 | 1.68 | 176.41 | 9.58 | 19.93 | 26.42 | 34.26 | 44.86 | 58.64 | 92.91 |
| 9–12 | 244–423 | 5,288 | 55.69 | 22.92 | 1.59 | 232.64 | 17.84 | 32.31 | 40.05 | 51.45 | 66.80 | 84.33 | 133.70 |
| 9–12 | 424–600 | 5,254 | 56.55 | 22.54 | 5.88 | 279.18 | 22.36 | 33.65 | 41.58 | 52.33 | 66.58 | 83.71 | 134.07 |

### Appendix 8.D: Reliability Estimates

**Notes:**

* The reliabilities are reported only for samples that comprise 30 or more test takers.
* In some cases in [appendix 8.D](#_Appendix_8.D:_Reliability), reliabilities could not be estimated because of only having zero or one test takers and are presented in the tables as “N/A.”
* A hyphen (-) in the tables indicates that the reliabilities were estimated but are not reported because the estimates are not sufficiently accurate with the small sample size.
* A value of 0.00 with an asterisk (\*) was used to replace negative estimates. Refer to subsection [*8.4.5 Student Group Reliabilities*](#_Student_Group_Reliabilities) for the background information about these values.

Table 8.D.1 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Male | 64,223 | 0.89 | 65,700 | 0.91 | 62,254 | 0.87 | 66,302 | 0.94 |
| Female | 62,622 | 0.89 | 64,001 | 0.91 | 60,465 | 0.86 | 64,271 | 0.94 |
| Nonbinary | 20 | - | 21 | - | 20 | - | 22 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 275 | 0.89 | 277 | 0.92 | 259 | 0.88 | 278 | 0.95 |
| Asian | 21,218 | 0.89 | 21,492 | 0.90 | 21,096 | 0.86 | 21,439 | 0.94 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 297 | 0.84 | 300 | 0.89 | 292 | 0.83 | 303 | 0.92 |
| Filipino | 1,006 | 0.86 | 1,015 | 0.87 | 1,003 | 0.81 | 1,012 | 0.93 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 92,145 | 0.88 | 94,492 | 0.92 | 88,444 | 0.85 | 95,381 | 0.92 |
| Black or African American | 757 | 0.89 | 770 | 0.90 | 739 | 0.86 | 777 | 0.94 |
| White | 7,324 | 0.90 | 7,447 | 0.92 | 7,129 | 0.86 | 7,472 | 0.94 |
| Two or more races | 3,843 | 0.92 | 3,929 | 0.93 | 3,777 | 0.89 | 3,933 | 0.95 |

Table 8.D.1 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Economically disadvantaged | 78,773 | 0.88 | 80,686 | 0.91 | 75,806 | 0.85 | 81,472 | 0.92 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 48,092 | 0.90 | 49,036 | 0.91 | 46,933 | 0.87 | 49,123 | 0.95 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 107,693 | 0.85 | 110,550 | 0.90 | 103,993 | 0.84 | 111,786 | 0.93 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 19,172 | 0.21 | 19,172 | 0.15 | 18,746 | 0.69 | 18,809 | 0.93 |
| Migrant education | 1,901 | 0.89 | 1,980 | 0.92 | 1,834 | 0.84 | 2,006 | 0.89 |
| Not migrant education | 124,964 | 0.89 | 127,742 | 0.91 | 120,905 | 0.86 | 128,589 | 0.94 |
| Disability | 11,796 | 0.89 | 12,085 | 0.92 | 11,478 | 0.86 | 12,325 | 0.93 |
| No disability | 115,069 | 0.89 | 117,637 | 0.91 | 111,261 | 0.86 | 118,270 | 0.94 |
| Assigned accommodations | 90 | 0.90 | 92 | 0.92 | 92 | 0.89 | 92 | 0.94 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 126,775 | 0.89 | 129,630 | 0.91 | 122,647 | 0.86 | 130,503 | 0.94 |
| Military | 888 | 0.87 | 911 | 0.90 | 843 | 0.84 | 919 | 0.94 |
| Not military | 125,977 | 0.89 | 128,811 | 0.92 | 121,896 | 0.86 | 129,676 | 0.94 |
| Homeless | 4,395 | 0.89 | 4,515 | 0.93 | 4,205 | 0.86 | 4,584 | 0.92 |
| Not homeless | 122,470 | 0.89 | 125,207 | 0.91 | 118,534 | 0.86 | 126,011 | 0.94 |
| Foster youth | 369 | 0.88 | 377 | 0.89 | 358 | 0.82 | 376 | 0.91 |
| Not foster youth | 126,496 | 0.89 | 129,345 | 0.92 | 122,381 | 0.86 | 130,219 | 0.94 |

Table 8.D.2 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Male | 62,879 | 0.93 | 61,337 | 0.93 | 58,526 | 0.94 |
| Female | 61,515 | 0.93 | 59,514 | 0.93 | 57,224 | 0.93 |
| Nonbinary | 20 | - | 20 | - | 19 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 269 | 0.93 | 253 | 0.95 | 244 | 0.94 |
| Asian | 20,962 | 0.92 | 20,791 | 0.94 | 20,205 | 0.93 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 288 | 0.91 | 287 | 0.92 | 272 | 0.92 |
| Filipino | 993 | 0.91 | 988 | 0.92 | 966 | 0.92 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 90,199 | 0.92 | 87,109 | 0.90 | 83,100 | 0.93 |
| Black or African American | 741 | 0.93 | 729 | 0.93 | 698 | 0.94 |
| White | 7,187 | 0.94 | 7,005 | 0.93 | 6,732 | 0.94 |
| Two or more races | 3,775 | 0.94 | 3,709 | 0.95 | 3,552 | 0.95 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 77,090 | 0.92 | 74,677 | 0.90 | 71,249 | 0.93 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 47,324 | 0.93 | 46,194 | 0.94 | 44,520 | 0.94 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 105,242 | 0.91 | 102,443 | 0.91 | 97,341 | 0.91 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 19,172 | \*0.00 | 18,428 | 0.91 | 18,428 | 0.23 |
| Migrant education | 1,859 | 0.93 | 1,810 | 0.87 | 1,694 | 0.93 |
| Not migrant education | 122,555 | 0.93 | 119,061 | 0.93 | 114,075 | 0.93 |
| Disability | 11,474 | 0.93 | 11,324 | 0.92 | 10,681 | 0.94 |
| No disability | 112,940 | 0.93 | 109,547 | 0.93 | 105,088 | 0.93 |
| Assigned accommodations | 89 | 0.94 | 91 | 0.93 | 87 | 0.94 |
| Not assigned accommodations | 124,325 | 0.93 | 120,780 | 0.93 | 115,682 | 0.94 |

Table 8.D.2 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Military | 872 | 0.92 | 836 | 0.93 | 800 | 0.92 |
| Not military | 123,542 | 0.93 | 120,035 | 0.93 | 114,969 | 0.94 |
| Homeless | 4,302 | 0.93 | 4,161 | 0.90 | 3,965 | 0.94 |
| Not homeless | 120,112 | 0.93 | 116,710 | 0.93 | 111,804 | 0.93 |
| Foster youth | 364 | 0.91 | 351 | 0.87 | 338 | 0.92 |
| Not foster youth | 124,050 | 0.93 | 120,520 | 0.93 | 115,431 | 0.94 |

Table 8.D.3 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Male | 6,143 | 0.88 | 6,450 | 0.94 | 6,186 | 0.91 | 6,430 | 0.94 |
| Female | 5,521 | 0.90 | 5,781 | 0.94 | 5,622 | 0.92 | 5,815 | 0.93 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 21 | - | 21 | - | 19 | - | 21 | - |
| Asian | 2,449 | 0.90 | 2,495 | 0.92 | 2,471 | 0.93 | 2,512 | 0.91 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 39 | 0.82 | 41 | 0.89 | 39 | 0.89 | 42 | 0.91 |
| Filipino | 139 | 0.80 | 139 | 0.88 | 135 | 0.87 | 139 | 0.88 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 6,996 | 0.86 | 7,421 | 0.94 | 7,085 | 0.89 | 7,401 | 0.93 |
| Black or African American | 84 | 0.88 | 88 | 0.94 | 86 | 0.91 | 90 | 0.91 |
| White | 1,274 | 0.90 | 1,317 | 0.94 | 1,296 | 0.92 | 1,335 | 0.92 |
| Two or more races | 663 | 0.92 | 710 | 0.95 | 678 | 0.94 | 706 | 0.94 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,197 | 0.86 | 6,553 | 0.93 | 6,273 | 0.89 | 6,541 | 0.92 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,468 | 0.91 | 5,679 | 0.94 | 5,536 | 0.93 | 5,705 | 0.93 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 9,697 | 0.82 | 10,260 | 0.93 | 9,844 | 0.88 | 10,280 | 0.92 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,968 | 0.34 | 1,972 | 0.44 | 1,965 | 0.42 | 1,966 | 0.76 |
| Migrant education | 185 | 0.86 | 199 | 0.94 | 185 | 0.91 | 198 | 0.91 |
| Not migrant education | 11,480 | 0.89 | 12,033 | 0.94 | 11,624 | 0.91 | 12,048 | 0.93 |
| Disability | 562 | 0.89 | 594 | 0.93 | 567 | 0.90 | 592 | 0.94 |
| No disability | 11,103 | 0.89 | 11,638 | 0.94 | 11,242 | 0.91 | 11,654 | 0.93 |
| Assigned accommodations | 7 | - | 7 | - | 7 | - | 7 | - |
| Not assigned accommodations | 11,658 | 0.89 | 12,225 | 0.94 | 11,802 | 0.91 | 12,239 | 0.93 |

Table 8.D.3 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Military | 103 | 0.84 | 105 | 0.91 | 103 | 0.90 | 102 | 0.91 |
| Not military | 11,562 | 0.89 | 12,127 | 0.94 | 11,706 | 0.91 | 12,144 | 0.93 |
| Homeless | 744 | 0.86 | 789 | 0.95 | 750 | 0.89 | 787 | 0.92 |
| Not homeless | 10,921 | 0.89 | 11,443 | 0.94 | 11,059 | 0.91 | 11,459 | 0.93 |
| Foster youth | 35 | 0.81 | 35 | 0.91 | 33 | 0.89 | 35 | 0.92 |
| Not foster youth | 11,630 | 0.89 | 12,197 | 0.94 | 11,776 | 0.91 | 12,211 | 0.93 |

Table 8.D.4 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Male | 6,053 | 0.94 | 6,064 | 0.95 | 5,715 | 0.96 |
| Female | 5,405 | 0.94 | 5,514 | 0.95 | 5,128 | 0.96 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 20 | - | 18 | - | 17 | - |
| Asian | 2,409 | 0.94 | 2,435 | 0.95 | 2,331 | 0.96 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 38 | 0.91 | 37 | 0.94 | 35 | 0.94 |
| Filipino | 136 | 0.90 | 133 | 0.92 | 129 | 0.93 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 6,885 | 0.93 | 6,939 | 0.93 | 6,465 | 0.95 |
| Black or African American | 83 | 0.94 | 86 | 0.95 | 80 | 0.96 |
| White | 1,244 | 0.94 | 1,274 | 0.95 | 1,191 | 0.96 |
| Two or more races | 644 | 0.95 | 657 | 0.96 | 596 | 0.97 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,092 | 0.93 | 6,142 | 0.93 | 5,714 | 0.95 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 5,367 | 0.95 | 5,437 | 0.96 | 5,130 | 0.97 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 9,492 | 0.92 | 9,621 | 0.93 | 8,892 | 0.94 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,967 | 0.39 | 1,958 | 0.75 | 1,952 | 0.49 |
| Migrant education | 184 | 0.93 | 183 | 0.94 | 171 | 0.95 |
| Not migrant education | 11,275 | 0.94 | 11,396 | 0.95 | 10,673 | 0.96 |
| Disability | 556 | 0.94 | 561 | 0.95 | 528 | 0.96 |
| No disability | 10,903 | 0.94 | 11,018 | 0.95 | 10,316 | 0.96 |
| Assigned accommodations | 7 | - | 7 | - | 7 | - |
| Not assigned accommodations | 11,452 | 0.94 | 11,572 | 0.95 | 10,837 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.4 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Military | 103 | 0.92 | 100 | 0.94 | 98 | 0.95 |
| Not military | 11,356 | 0.94 | 11,479 | 0.95 | 10,746 | 0.96 |
| Homeless | 732 | 0.93 | 740 | 0.93 | 691 | 0.95 |
| Not homeless | 10,727 | 0.94 | 10,839 | 0.95 | 10,153 | 0.96 |
| Foster youth | 35 | 0.91 | 33 | 0.93 | 33 | 0.94 |
| Not foster youth | 11,424 | 0.94 | 11,546 | 0.95 | 10,811 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.5 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Male | 3,153 | 0.95 | 3,250 | 0.95 | 3,247 | 0.92 | 3,236 | 0.93 |
| Female | 2,993 | 0.95 | 3,074 | 0.95 | 3,053 | 0.92 | 3,050 | 0.93 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 14 | - | 16 | - | 17 | - | 17 | - |
| Asian | 1,466 | 0.95 | 1,462 | 0.94 | 1,476 | 0.93 | 1,466 | 0.93 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 30 | 0.95 | 29 | - | 30 | 0.87 | 29 | - |
| Filipino | 75 | 0.84 | 75 | 0.85 | 74 | 0.92 | 72 | 0.91 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,271 | 0.94 | 3,412 | 0.95 | 3,384 | 0.91 | 3,388 | 0.93 |
| Black or African American | 59 | 0.95 | 58 | 0.94 | 59 | 0.94 | 58 | 0.92 |
| White | 703 | 0.95 | 726 | 0.94 | 716 | 0.91 | 719 | 0.92 |
| Two or more races | 529 | 0.95 | 547 | 0.95 | 545 | 0.91 | 538 | 0.93 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,835 | 0.94 | 2,946 | 0.95 | 2,934 | 0.91 | 2,933 | 0.93 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,312 | 0.95 | 3,379 | 0.95 | 3,367 | 0.93 | 3,354 | 0.93 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 5,008 | 0.92 | 5,193 | 0.94 | 5,161 | 0.87 | 5,148 | 0.92 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,139 | 0.27 | 1,132 | 0.48 | 1,140 | 0.59 | 1,139 | 0.64 |
| Migrant education | 119 | 0.93 | 125 | 0.95 | 127 | 0.90 | 126 | 0.95 |
| Not migrant education | 6,028 | 0.95 | 6,200 | 0.95 | 6,174 | 0.92 | 6,161 | 0.93 |
| Disability | 142 | 0.94 | 143 | 0.92 | 143 | 0.92 | 141 | 0.92 |
| No disability | 6,005 | 0.95 | 6,182 | 0.95 | 6,158 | 0.92 | 6,146 | 0.93 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,147 | 0.95 | 6,325 | 0.95 | 6,301 | 0.92 | 6,287 | 0.93 |

Table 8.D.5 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Military | 60 | 0.92 | 60 | 0.93 | 59 | 0.90 | 60 | 0.92 |
| Not military | 6,087 | 0.95 | 6,265 | 0.95 | 6,242 | 0.92 | 6,227 | 0.93 |
| Homeless | 473 | 0.94 | 491 | 0.95 | 497 | 0.91 | 496 | 0.94 |
| Not homeless | 5,674 | 0.95 | 5,834 | 0.95 | 5,804 | 0.92 | 5,791 | 0.93 |
| Foster youth | 13 | - | 13 | - | 13 | - | 12 | - |
| Not foster youth | 6,134 | 0.95 | 6,312 | 0.95 | 6,288 | 0.92 | 6,275 | 0.93 |

Table 8.D.6 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Male | 3,071 | 0.96 | 3,152 | 0.95 | 2,930 | 0.98 |
| Female | 2,934 | 0.96 | 2,970 | 0.95 | 2,807 | 0.98 |
| Nonbinary | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A | 1 | N/A |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 13 | - | 17 | - | 13 | - |
| Asian | 1,431 | 0.96 | 1,442 | 0.94 | 1,387 | 0.97 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 29 | - | 29 | - | 28 | - |
| Filipino | 75 | 0.89 | 71 | 0.94 | 71 | 0.95 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3,201 | 0.96 | 3,291 | 0.94 | 3,049 | 0.97 |
| Black or African American | 58 | 0.96 | 58 | 0.95 | 57 | 0.98 |
| White | 683 | 0.96 | 691 | 0.94 | 648 | 0.97 |
| Two or more races | 516 | 0.96 | 524 | 0.94 | 485 | 0.98 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 2,775 | 0.96 | 2,855 | 0.94 | 2,660 | 0.97 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 3,231 | 0.96 | 3,268 | 0.95 | 3,078 | 0.98 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 4,875 | 0.95 | 4,984 | 0.92 | 4,608 | 0.97 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 1,131 | 0.50 | 1,139 | 0.68 | 1,130 | 0.57 |
| Migrant education | 116 | 0.95 | 124 | 0.93 | 112 | 0.97 |
| Not migrant education | 5,890 | 0.96 | 5,999 | 0.95 | 5,626 | 0.98 |
| Disability | 140 | 0.95 | 138 | 0.94 | 132 | 0.97 |
| No disability | 5,866 | 0.96 | 5,985 | 0.95 | 5,606 | 0.98 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 6,006 | 0.96 | 6,123 | 0.95 | 5,738 | 0.98 |

Table 8.D.6 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Military | 60 | 0.95 | 59 | 0.94 | 59 | 0.97 |
| Not military | 5,946 | 0.96 | 6,064 | 0.95 | 5,679 | 0.98 |
| Homeless | 455 | 0.96 | 482 | 0.94 | 434 | 0.97 |
| Not homeless | 5,551 | 0.96 | 5,641 | 0.95 | 5,304 | 0.98 |
| Foster youth | 13 | - | 12 | - | 12 | - |
| Not foster youth | 5,993 | 0.96 | 6,111 | 0.95 | 5,726 | 0.98 |

Table 8.D.7 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Male | 7,680 | 0.91 | 8,049 | 0.96 | 7,858 | 0.90 | 8,022 | 0.95 |
| Female | 7,126 | 0.91 | 7,457 | 0.96 | 7,269 | 0.90 | 7,430 | 0.95 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 20 | - | 23 | - | 22 | - | 23 | - |
| Asian | 3,640 | 0.91 | 3,687 | 0.95 | 3,668 | 0.90 | 3,674 | 0.93 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 78 | 0.85 | 82 | 0.93 | 81 | 0.83 | 80 | 0.93 |
| Filipino | 221 | 0.78 | 220 | 0.80 | 220 | 0.78 | 212 | 0.88 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,709 | 0.90 | 8,287 | 0.97 | 7,960 | 0.87 | 8,269 | 0.95 |
| Black or African American | 148 | 0.92 | 150 | 0.96 | 144 | 0.90 | 140 | 0.95 |
| White | 1,785 | 0.91 | 1,795 | 0.95 | 1,806 | 0.90 | 1,786 | 0.95 |
| Two or more races | 1,208 | 0.91 | 1,265 | 0.96 | 1,229 | 0.89 | 1,271 | 0.96 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,817 | 0.90 | 7,214 | 0.97 | 6,990 | 0.87 | 7,203 | 0.95 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 7,992 | 0.92 | 8,295 | 0.96 | 8,140 | 0.90 | 8,252 | 0.95 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 12,214 | 0.86 | 12,912 | 0.96 | 12,532 | 0.80 | 12,865 | 0.92 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 2,595 | 0.31 | 2,597 | 0.25 | 2,598 | 0.50 | 2,590 | 0.49 |
| Migrant education | 264 | 0.89 | 296 | 0.97 | 279 | 0.86 | 299 | 0.96 |
| Not migrant education | 14,545 | 0.91 | 15,213 | 0.96 | 14,851 | 0.90 | 15,156 | 0.95 |
| Disability | 244 | 0.90 | 259 | 0.95 | 252 | 0.83 | 248 | 0.94 |
| No disability | 14,565 | 0.91 | 15,250 | 0.96 | 14,878 | 0.90 | 15,207 | 0.95 |
| Assigned accommodations | 5 | - | 6 | - | 6 | - | 5 | - |
| Not assigned accommodations | 14,804 | 0.91 | 15,503 | 0.96 | 15,124 | 0.90 | 15,450 | 0.95 |

Table 8.D.7 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Military | 117 | 0.87 | 115 | 0.95 | 114 | 0.84 | 111 | 0.93 |
| Not military | 14,692 | 0.91 | 15,394 | 0.96 | 15,016 | 0.90 | 15,344 | 0.95 |
| Homeless | 1,246 | 0.88 | 1,320 | 0.96 | 1,270 | 0.84 | 1,326 | 0.96 |
| Not homeless | 13,563 | 0.91 | 14,189 | 0.96 | 13,860 | 0.90 | 14,129 | 0.95 |
| Foster youth | 18 | - | 19 | - | 18 | - | 19 | - |
| Not foster youth | 14,791 | 0.91 | 15,490 | 0.96 | 15,112 | 0.90 | 15,436 | 0.95 |

Table 8.D.8 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Male | 7,499 | 0.96 | 7,630 | 0.94 | 7,044 | 0.97 |
| Female | 6,942 | 0.96 | 7,044 | 0.94 | 6,498 | 0.97 |
| Nonbinary | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 20 | - | 22 | - | 20 | - |
| Asian | 3,564 | 0.95 | 3,573 | 0.94 | 3,409 | 0.97 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 78 | 0.93 | 79 | 0.91 | 75 | 0.96 |
| Filipino | 220 | 0.86 | 212 | 0.88 | 212 | 0.92 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,521 | 0.96 | 7,741 | 0.93 | 7,007 | 0.97 |
| Black or African American | 145 | 0.96 | 133 | 0.94 | 128 | 0.98 |
| White | 1,719 | 0.95 | 1,725 | 0.94 | 1,599 | 0.97 |
| Two or more races | 1,177 | 0.96 | 1,192 | 0.94 | 1,095 | 0.97 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,631 | 0.96 | 6,779 | 0.93 | 6,165 | 0.97 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 7,813 | 0.96 | 7,898 | 0.94 | 7,380 | 0.97 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 11,851 | 0.94 | 12,088 | 0.89 | 10,962 | 0.96 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 2,593 | 0.35 | 2,589 | 0.54 | 2,583 | 0.56 |
| Migrant education | 258 | 0.95 | 276 | 0.93 | 242 | 0.97 |
| Not migrant education | 14,186 | 0.96 | 14,401 | 0.94 | 13,303 | 0.97 |
| Disability | 243 | 0.95 | 241 | 0.91 | 227 | 0.97 |
| No disability | 14,201 | 0.96 | 14,436 | 0.94 | 13,318 | 0.98 |
| Assigned accommodations | 5 | - | 5 | - | 4 | - |
| Not assigned accommodations | 14,439 | 0.96 | 14,672 | 0.94 | 13,541 | 0.97 |

Table 8.D.8 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Military | 115 | 0.94 | 108 | 0.91 | 107 | 0.96 |
| Not military | 14,329 | 0.96 | 14,569 | 0.94 | 13,438 | 0.97 |
| Homeless | 1,210 | 0.95 | 1,234 | 0.92 | 1,113 | 0.97 |
| Not homeless | 13,234 | 0.96 | 13,443 | 0.94 | 12,432 | 0.97 |
| Foster youth | 18 | - | 18 | - | 17 | - |
| Not foster youth | 14,426 | 0.96 | 14,659 | 0.94 | 13,528 | 0.97 |

Table 8.D.9 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Male | 7,015 | 0.89 | 7,240 | 0.96 | 7,179 | 0.85 | 7,153 | 0.96 |
| Female | 6,514 | 0.88 | 6,723 | 0.96 | 6,654 | 0.86 | 6,660 | 0.96 |
| Nonbinary | 6 | - | 6 | - | 6 | - | 6 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 17 | - | 17 | - | 17 | - | 17 | - |
| Asian | 2,686 | 0.88 | 2,658 | 0.94 | 2,694 | 0.84 | 2,615 | 0.95 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 66 | 0.89 | 70 | 0.95 | 66 | 0.78 | 68 | 0.91 |
| Filipino | 273 | 0.64 | 280 | 0.81 | 278 | 0.72 | 272 | 0.84 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,805 | 0.87 | 8,191 | 0.97 | 8,028 | 0.83 | 8,128 | 0.96 |
| Black or African American | 99 | 0.88 | 104 | 0.97 | 96 | 0.84 | 103 | 0.96 |
| White | 1,541 | 0.88 | 1,552 | 0.95 | 1,568 | 0.84 | 1,517 | 0.95 |
| Two or more races | 1,048 | 0.87 | 1,097 | 0.96 | 1,092 | 0.85 | 1,099 | 0.96 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,573 | 0.87 | 6,833 | 0.97 | 6,751 | 0.83 | 6,827 | 0.96 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 6,962 | 0.89 | 7,136 | 0.96 | 7,088 | 0.86 | 6,992 | 0.96 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 10,631 | 0.81 | 11,063 | 0.96 | 10,934 | 0.73 | 10,936 | 0.93 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 2,904 | 0.31 | 2,906 | 0.31 | 2,905 | 0.50 | 2,883 | 0.70 |
| Migrant education | 260 | 0.85 | 268 | 0.97 | 259 | 0.78 | 264 | 0.96 |
| Not migrant education | 13,275 | 0.89 | 13,701 | 0.96 | 13,580 | 0.86 | 13,555 | 0.96 |
| Disability | 159 | 0.92 | 170 | 0.97 | 167 | 0.85 | 163 | 0.94 |
| No disability | 13,376 | 0.89 | 13,799 | 0.96 | 13,672 | 0.86 | 13,656 | 0.96 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 13,535 | 0.89 | 13,969 | 0.96 | 13,839 | 0.86 | 13,819 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.9 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Military | 98 | 0.87 | 100 | 0.95 | 99 | 0.82 | 97 | 0.95 |
| Not military | 13,437 | 0.89 | 13,869 | 0.96 | 13,740 | 0.86 | 13,722 | 0.96 |
| Homeless | 1,097 | 0.86 | 1,155 | 0.96 | 1,128 | 0.81 | 1,148 | 0.96 |
| Not homeless | 12,438 | 0.89 | 12,814 | 0.96 | 12,711 | 0.86 | 12,671 | 0.96 |
| Foster youth | 14 | - | 16 | - | 15 | - | 16 | - |
| Not foster youth | 13,521 | 0.89 | 13,953 | 0.96 | 13,824 | 0.86 | 13,803 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.10 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Male | 6,800 | 0.95 | 6,863 | 0.87 | 6,331 | 0.96 |
| Female | 6,302 | 0.95 | 6,363 | 0.88 | 5,868 | 0.96 |
| Nonbinary | 6 | - | 6 | - | 6 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 17 | - | 17 | - | 17 | - |
| Asian | 2,592 | 0.94 | 2,547 | 0.86 | 2,415 | 0.95 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 65 | 0.95 | 64 | 0.83 | 61 | 0.95 |
| Filipino | 271 | 0.80 | 269 | 0.79 | 263 | 0.88 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,587 | 0.95 | 7,738 | 0.86 | 7,088 | 0.96 |
| Black or African American | 97 | 0.95 | 95 | 0.87 | 90 | 0.96 |
| White | 1,475 | 0.94 | 1,458 | 0.86 | 1,339 | 0.96 |
| Two or more races | 1,004 | 0.95 | 1,044 | 0.87 | 932 | 0.96 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6,339 | 0.95 | 6,481 | 0.86 | 5,881 | 0.96 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 6,769 | 0.95 | 6,751 | 0.88 | 6,324 | 0.96 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 10,206 | 0.93 | 10,352 | 0.80 | 9,331 | 0.94 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 2,902 | 0.31 | 2,880 | 0.60 | 2,874 | 0.62 |
| Migrant education | 255 | 0.94 | 250 | 0.85 | 236 | 0.96 |
| Not migrant education | 12,853 | 0.95 | 12,982 | 0.87 | 11,969 | 0.96 |
| Disability | 158 | 0.96 | 160 | 0.87 | 149 | 0.97 |
| No disability | 12,950 | 0.95 | 13,072 | 0.88 | 12,056 | 0.96 |
| Assigned accommodations | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 13,108 | 0.95 | 13,232 | 0.87 | 12,205 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.10 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Military | 96 | 0.95 | 96 | 0.85 | 91 | 0.96 |
| Not military | 13,012 | 0.95 | 13,136 | 0.87 | 12,114 | 0.96 |
| Homeless | 1,059 | 0.94 | 1,080 | 0.86 | 973 | 0.96 |
| Not homeless | 12,049 | 0.95 | 12,152 | 0.87 | 11,232 | 0.96 |
| Foster youth | 14 | - | 15 | - | 13 | - |
| Not foster youth | 13,094 | 0.95 | 13,217 | 0.87 | 12,192 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.11 Domain Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Male | 13,255 | 0.87 | 13,746 | 0.96 | 13,648 | 0.83 | 13,825 | 0.97 |
| Female | 10,473 | 0.89 | 10,736 | 0.96 | 10,708 | 0.84 | 10,749 | 0.97 |
| Nonbinary | 12 | - | 13 | - | 13 | - | 13 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 33 | 0.88 | 34 | 0.95 | 34 | 0.80 | 31 | 0.96 |
| Asian | 2,859 | 0.89 | 2,871 | 0.93 | 2,888 | 0.83 | 2,816 | 0.96 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 94 | 0.83 | 91 | 0.93 | 93 | 0.70 | 92 | 0.96 |
| Filipino | 496 | 0.74 | 499 | 0.82 | 498 | 0.66 | 488 | 0.88 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15,906 | 0.85 | 16,531 | 0.96 | 16,380 | 0.81 | 16,698 | 0.96 |
| Black or African American | 187 | 0.91 | 188 | 0.95 | 190 | 0.83 | 188 | 0.96 |
| White | 2,329 | 0.89 | 2,352 | 0.94 | 2,364 | 0.82 | 2,320 | 0.95 |
| Two or more races | 1,836 | 0.86 | 1,929 | 0.96 | 1,922 | 0.82 | 1,954 | 0.96 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 12,061 | 0.85 | 12,475 | 0.96 | 12,395 | 0.80 | 12,572 | 0.96 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 11,679 | 0.90 | 12,020 | 0.96 | 11,974 | 0.86 | 12,015 | 0.97 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 19,085 | 0.75 | 19,840 | 0.95 | 19,713 | 0.73 | 19,987 | 0.94 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 4,655 | 0.37 | 4,655 | 0.33 | 4,656 | 0.29 | 4,600 | 0.65 |
| Migrant education | 416 | 0.79 | 417 | 0.96 | 424 | 0.74 | 430 | 0.97 |
| Not migrant education | 23,324 | 0.88 | 24,078 | 0.96 | 23,945 | 0.84 | 24,157 | 0.97 |
| Disability | 145 | 0.90 | 151 | 0.96 | 151 | 0.85 | 155 | 0.96 |
| No disability | 23,595 | 0.88 | 24,344 | 0.96 | 24,218 | 0.84 | 24,432 | 0.97 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | 3 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
| Not assigned accommodations | 23,739 | 0.88 | 24,492 | 0.96 | 24,366 | 0.84 | 24,584 | 0.97 |

Table 8.D.11 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Listening** | **Listening** | **N Speaking** | **Speaking** | **N Reading** | **Reading** | **N Writing** | **Writing** |
| Military | 143 | 0.89 | 144 | 0.95 | 147 | 0.83 | 147 | 0.95 |
| Not military | 23,597 | 0.88 | 24,351 | 0.96 | 24,222 | 0.84 | 24,440 | 0.97 |
| Homeless | 1,723 | 0.84 | 1,811 | 0.96 | 1,796 | 0.79 | 1,831 | 0.96 |
| Not homeless | 22,017 | 0.88 | 22,684 | 0.96 | 22,573 | 0.84 | 22,756 | 0.97 |
| Foster youth | 39 | 0.81 | 39 | 0.97 | 37 | 0.74 | 39 | 0.98 |
| Not foster youth | 23,701 | 0.88 | 24,456 | 0.96 | 24,332 | 0.84 | 24,548 | 0.97 |

Table 8.D.12 Composite Reliability Estimates by Student Group—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Male | 12,841 | 0.95 | 13,284 | 0.86 | 12,237 | 0.96 |
| Female | 10,125 | 0.95 | 10,369 | 0.86 | 9,612 | 0.96 |
| Nonbinary | 12 | - | 13 | - | 12 | - |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 33 | 0.95 | 31 | 0.85 | 30 | 0.96 |
| Asian | 2,804 | 0.94 | 2,781 | 0.85 | 2,677 | 0.95 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 90 | 0.93 | 90 | 0.78 | 86 | 0.94 |
| Filipino | 493 | 0.85 | 486 | 0.75 | 480 | 0.89 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15,345 | 0.94 | 15,948 | 0.85 | 14,574 | 0.96 |
| Black or African American | 180 | 0.95 | 184 | 0.85 | 171 | 0.96 |
| White | 2,280 | 0.94 | 2,283 | 0.85 | 2,185 | 0.95 |
| Two or more races | 1,753 | 0.95 | 1,863 | 0.86 | 1,658 | 0.96 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 11,635 | 0.94 | 12,036 | 0.85 | 11,030 | 0.96 |
| Not economically disadvantaged | 11,343 | 0.95 | 11,630 | 0.87 | 10,831 | 0.96 |
| Calculated ELAS: EL | 18,329 | 0.92 | 19,070 | 0.80 | 17,277 | 0.94 |
| Calculated ELAS: IFEP | 4,649 | 0.39 | 4,596 | 0.38 | 4,584 | 0.52 |
| Migrant education | 390 | 0.92 | 408 | 0.81 | 368 | 0.94 |
| Not migrant education | 22,588 | 0.95 | 23,258 | 0.86 | 21,493 | 0.96 |
| Disability | 140 | 0.96 | 150 | 0.86 | 136 | 0.96 |
| No disability | 22,838 | 0.95 | 23,516 | 0.86 | 21,725 | 0.96 |
| Assigned accommodations | 1 | N/A | 3 | - | 1 | N/A |
| Not assigned accommodations | 22,977 | 0.95 | 23,663 | 0.86 | 21,860 | 0.96 |

Table 8.D.12 *(continuation)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **N Oral Language Composite** | **Oral Language Composite** | **N Written Language Composite** | **Written Language Composite** | **N Overall Score** | **Overall Score** |
| Military | 139 | 0.95 | 147 | 0.85 | 138 | 0.96 |
| Not military | 22,839 | 0.95 | 23,519 | 0.86 | 21,723 | 0.96 |
| Homeless | 1,660 | 0.94 | 1,744 | 0.84 | 1,564 | 0.95 |
| Not homeless | 21,318 | 0.95 | 21,922 | 0.86 | 20,297 | 0.96 |
| Foster youth | 38 | 0.94 | 36 | 0.81 | 34 | 0.95 |
| Not foster youth | 22,940 | 0.95 | 23,630 | 0.86 | 21,827 | 0.96 |

### Appendix 8.E: Classification Analyses

Table 8.E.1 Classification Accuracy at Each Performance Threshold Score—Oral Language Composite

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Cut Between Level 1 and Level 2** | **Cut Between Level 2 and Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 0.921 | 0.942 |
| 1 | 0.936 | 0.942 |
| 2 | 0.957 | 0.953 |
| 3–5 | 0.951 | 0.940 |
| 6–8 | 0.944 | 0.929 |
| 9–12 | 0.955 | 0.946 |

Table 8.E.2 Classification Accuracy at Each Performance Threshold Score—Written Language Composite

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Cut Between Level 1 and Level 2** | **Cut Between Level 2 and Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 0.963 | 0.977 |
| 1 | 0.952 | 0.960 |
| 2 | 0.952 | 0.955 |
| 3–5 | 0.955 | 0.960 |
| 6–8 | 0.917 | 0.942 |
| 9–12 | 0.917 | 0.933 |

Table 8.E.3 Classification Accuracy at Each Performance Threshold Score—Overall Score

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Cut Between Level 1 and Level 2** | **Cut Between Level 2 and Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 0.926 | 0.949 |
| 1 | 0.947 | 0.958 |
| 2 | 0.965 | 0.966 |
| 3–5 | 0.968 | 0.962 |
| 6–8 | 0.956 | 0.953 |
| 9–12 | 0.958 | 0.953 |

Table 8.E.4 Classification Consistency at Each Performance Threshold Score—Oral Language Composite

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Cut Between Level 1 and Level 2** | **Cut Between Level 2 and Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 0.897 | 0.923 |
| 1 | 0.915 | 0.924 |
| 2 | 0.939 | 0.937 |
| 3–5 | 0.934 | 0.924 |
| 6–8 | 0.925 | 0.911 |
| 9–12 | 0.938 | 0.930 |

Table 8.E.5 Classification Consistency at Each Performance Threshold Score—Written Language Composite

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Cut Between Level 1 and Level 2** | **Cut Between Level 2 and Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 0.948 | 0.969 |
| 1 | 0.933 | 0.944 |
| 2 | 0.932 | 0.937 |
| 3–5 | 0.940 | 0.948 |
| 6–8 | 0.885 | 0.921 |
| 9–12 | 0.885 | 0.910 |

Table 8.E.6 Classification Consistency at Each Performance Threshold Score—Overall Score

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade Level or Grade Span** | **Cut Between Level 1 and Level 2** | **Cut Between Level 2 and Level 3** |
| Kindergarten | 0.902 | 0.931 |
| 1 | 0.928 | 0.943 |
| 2 | 0.951 | 0.953 |
| 3–5 | 0.956 | 0.951 |
| 6–8 | 0.939 | 0.938 |
| 9–12 | 0.943 | 0.939 |

### Appendix 8.F: Correlations Between Initial ELPAC Domains

**Note:** “N/A” indicates repeated values.

Table 8.F.1 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Kindergarten

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Oral Language** | **Written Language** |
| Listening | 1.000 | 0.669 | 0.647 | 0.421 | 0.883 | 0.587 |
| Speaking | N/A | 1.000 | 0.654 | 0.400 | 0.940 | 0.580 |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.646 | 0.711 | 0.906 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.446 | 0.908 |
| Oral Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.637 |
| Written Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 |

Table 8.F.2 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade One

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Oral Language** | **Written Language** |
| Listening | 1.000 | 0.781 | 0.828 | 0.709 | 0.910 | 0.816 |
| Speaking | N/A | 1.000 | 0.825 | 0.646 | 0.970 | 0.778 |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.746 | 0.871 | 0.922 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.706 | 0.946 |
| Oral Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.836 |
| Written Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 |

Table 8.F.3 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Two

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Oral Language** | **Written Language** |
| Listening | 1.000 | 0.867 | 0.753 | 0.785 | 0.952 | 0.808 |
| Speaking | N/A | 1.000 | 0.752 | 0.849 | 0.978 | 0.846 |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.816 | 0.778 | 0.940 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.850 | 0.964 |
| Oral Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.859 |
| Written Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 |

Table 8.F.4 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Span Three Through Five

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Oral Language** | **Written Language** |
| Listening | 1.000 | 0.821 | 0.778 | 0.777 | 0.931 | 0.813 |
| Speaking | N/A | 1.000 | 0.791 | 0.858 | 0.972 | 0.866 |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.827 | 0.822 | 0.944 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.864 | 0.966 |
| Oral Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.884 |
| Written Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 |

Table 8.F.5 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Span Six Through Eight

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Oral Language** | **Written Language** |
| Listening | 1.000 | 0.782 | 0.763 | 0.763 | 0.914 | 0.800 |
| Speaking | N/A | 1.000 | 0.795 | 0.892 | 0.967 | 0.883 |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.818 | 0.827 | 0.957 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.890 | 0.949 |
| Oral Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.899 |
| Written Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 |

Table 8.F.6 Correlation Coefficients Among Four Domains and Composite Scores—Grade Span Nine Through Twelve

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Listening** | **Speaking** | **Reading** | **Writing** | **Oral Language** | **Written Language** |
| Listening | 1.000 | 0.812 | 0.777 | 0.807 | 0.927 | 0.838 |
| Speaking | N/A | 1.000 | 0.790 | 0.918 | 0.971 | 0.902 |
| Reading | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.784 | 0.823 | 0.948 |
| Writing | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.917 | 0.941 |
| Oral Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 | 0.919 |
| Written Language | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.000 |

## Quality Control Procedures

The California Department of Education (CDE) and ETS implemented rigorous quality control procedures throughout the test development, administration, scoring, analyses, and reporting processes for the Initial ELPAC. As part of this effort, ETS staff worked with its Office of Professional Standards Compliance, which publishes and maintains the *ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness* (ETS, 2014). These *Standards* support the goals of delivering technically sound, fair, and useful products and services; and assisting the public and auditors evaluating those products and services. Quality control procedures are outlined in this chapter.

### Quality Control of Item Development

ETS’ goal is to provide the best standards-based and innovative items for the Initial ELPAC. Items developed for the Initial ELPAC were subject to an extensive item review process. The item writers responsible for developing Initial ELPAC items were trained in ELPAC and ETS policies on quality control of item content, bias and sensitivity guidelines, as well as guidelines for accessibility, to ensure that the items allow the widest possible range of students to demonstrate their abilities.

Once a draft item was accepted for authoring—that is, once it was entered into ETS’ item bank and formatted for use in an assessment—ETS employed a series of internal reviews and an initial CDE review. These reviews used established criteria and specifications to judge the quality of an item’s content and ensured that each item measured what it was intended to measure. These reviews also examined the overall quality of the test items before presentation to the CDE and item reviewers. To finish the process, a group of California educators reviewed the items for accessibility, bias and sensitivity, and content, and made recommendations for item enhancement. The details on quality control of item development are described in section [*3.5 ETS Item Review Process*](#_ETS_Item_Review).

During administrations of the Initial ELPAC, when sufficient student response data on each item became available, ETS Psychometric Analysis & Research (PAR) staff conducted item analyses and a key check to examine whether the items performed as expected. ETS psychometric staff conducted a thorough evaluation of all item statistics using statistical criteria to flag items that were potentially problematic because of poor item performance, content issues, item bias, or accessibility challenges. Flagged items were then reviewed by ETS Assessment and Learning Technology Research & Development (ALTRD) staff to determine whether issues existed.

### Quality Control of Test Assembly and Delivery

The assembly of all test forms must conform to blueprints that represent a set of constraints and specifications. ETS conducted multiple levels of quality assurance (QA) checks on each assembled Initial ELPAC form to ensure it met the form-building specifications. Both ETS ALTRD and PAR staff reviewed and signed off on the accuracy of forms before the test forms were posted for CDE review. Detailed information related to test assembly can be found in [*Chapter 4: Test Assembly*](#_Test_Assembly).

In particular, the assembly of all test forms went through a certification process that involved various checks, including verifying that

* all item answers in the key were correctly identified and documented in the scoring system;
* items were scored correctly in the item bank and incorrect responses were scored as incorrect;
* all items assessed the intended standard;
* all content in the item was correct with the exception of distractors, which are intended to be incorrect;
* all items met the statistical criteria, to the extent possible;
* distractors were plausible;
* multiple-choice item options were parallel in structure;
* language was grade-level appropriate;
* no more than three multiple-choice items in a row had the same key;
* all graphics were correct (copyright, spelling, relevance, etc.);
* there were no unintended mechanical errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, and the like; and
* items adhered to the approved style guide.

Reviews were also conducted for functionality and sequencing during the user acceptance testing (UAT) process to ensure all items functioned as expected. Three cycles of UAT were conducted: the first by the test delivery system (TDS) vendor, the second by ETS, and the third by the CDE. CDE staff made a final quality check to ensure that all issues identified during UAT were resolved before the release of the operational assessment.

#### Quality Control of Test Assignment

State and federal laws (California *Education Code* sections 313 and 60810 and Titles I and Ill of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act) require that all students whose primary language is other than English be assessed for English language proficiency.

ELPAC regulations state that local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to administer a home language survey to students upon their first enrollment in a California public school. If a student’s primary language was other than English or American Sign Language, an LEA administered the Initial ELPAC to the student within 30 calendar days of the student’s first day of enrollment or 60 calendar days prior to instruction, but not before July 1.4F[[4]](#footnote-5) Parents/‌Guardians were to be notified in writing that their child would be administered the Initial ELPAC. These students had an English language acquisition status (ELAS) of To Be Determined (TBD) submitted to California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and were determined to be eligible for the Initial ELPAC in the Test Operations Management System (TOMS).

After the Initial ELPAC was administered, LEAs were required to inform parents/guardians within 30 calendar days of enrollment of the results of the Initial ELPAC, identifying the student as either initial fluent English proficient (IFEP) or English learner (EL). If the student was identified as an EL, the notification provided information on the English language instructional support program to be offered. In addition, those students who were designated as ELs must be administered the Summative ELPAC annually until they are reclassified as fluent English proficient.

Proficiency classifications (e.g., IFEP, EL) are found in CALPADS—the system used to maintain student data—in the ELAS field. Students who took the Initial ELPAC had an ELAS of TBD in CALPADS.

LEAs were able to access the Initial ELPAC Student Eligibility Report in TOMS for a list of students with an ELAS of TBD and who still needed to be administered the Initial ELPAC. Once a student’s calculated ELAS changed from TBD to EL or IFEP in CALPADS based on the results of the Initial ELPAC, the new ELAS was sent back to TOMS from CALPADS and the student no longer appeared on the Initial ELPAC Student Eligibility Report.

### Quality Control of Test Materials

Brief descriptions of the types of materials used for and during testing appear in the following subsections.

#### Developing Assessments

##### Computer-based Assessments

The steps taken to develop and ensure the quality of the computer-based assessments are described in [*Chapter 3: Item Development and Review*](#_Item_Development_and) and [*Chapter 4: Test Assembly*](#_Test_Assembly).

##### Paper–Pencil Forms

Test forms and response booklets were developed and reviewed by ETS staff to ensure that materials met quality standards. Each document was reviewed for accuracy, completeness, and alignment with supporting materials. Print-ready PDFs underwent a stringent quality control process to ensure that there was adequate space for student response.

#### Test Administration Manuals

ETS staff reviewed to verify that test instruction manuals accurately matched the test materials and testing processes. Editors reviewed each document for spelling, grammar, accuracy, and adherence to CDE style. Each document was approved by the CDE before being published to the ELPAC website. Only nonsecure documents were posted to this website. Secure materials, such as the *Initial ELPAC Directions for Administration*, were made available to designated LEA staff through the TOMS, which required a secure logon.

The manuals used in the administration of the Initial ELPAC are listed in subsection [*5.4.6 Instructions for Test Administration*](#_Instructions_for_Test)*.*

#### Collecting Test Materials

ETS processes ensure the security of assessments delivered using a variety of test modes and delivery methods.

##### Computer-based Assessments

During the 2021–22 Initial ELPAC administration, there were no test materials to be collected as a result of computer-based testing.

##### Paper–Pencil Forms

RSVP LEAs returned scannable kindergarten through grade two (K–2) Writing Answer Books for back scoring for tests administered through October 31, 2022. Upon receipt of the test materials, ETS personnel examined each shipment for a number of conditions, including physical damage, shipping errors, and omission of materials. The number of students recorded on the Group Information Sheet (GIS)—the precoded identification sheet that accompanied the grade-level test materials for a school—was compared to the number of Answer Books returned to ETS.

#### Processing Test Materials

Only the LEAs participating in the Rotating Score Validation Process (RSVP) were required to return scannable kindergarten through grade two Writing Answer Books for back-scoring. Upon receipt of the test materials, ETS personnel examined each shipment for a number of conditions, including physical damage, shipping errors, and omission of materials. The number of students recorded on the Group Information Sheet (GIS)—the precoded identification sheet that accompanied the grade-level test materials for a school—was compared to the number of Answer Books returned to ETS.

ETS’ image-scanning process, which captured security information electronically and compared scorable material quantities reported on the GIS to actual documents scanned, was used when processing returned Answer Books. LEAs were contacted by phone if there were any missing shipments or the quantity of materials returned was less than expected.

LEAs not included in the RSVP were instructed to securely destroy used Answer Books. However, these LEAs were able to reuse the unused Answer Books for the following year’s administration unless they were identified as being part of the RSVP, in which case they would need to order scannable Answer Books for the next administration.

For grades three through twelve, the student Writing item responses were sent to ETS for back-scoring through the TDS.

##### Computer-based Assessments

Computer-based tests submitted by students were transmitted from Cambium Assessment, Inc. (CAI) to ETS each day. Each system checked for the completeness of the student record and stopped records that were identified as having an error. (For example, the system would identify a test part that was missing a content registration ID, a unique identifier that matches the student’s opportunities.)

##### Paper–Pencil Forms

ETS’ image-scanning process, which captured security information electronically and compared scorable material quantities reported on the GIS to actual documents scanned, was used when processing returned Answer Books. LEAs were contacted by phone if there were any missing shipments or if a non-RSVP LEA sent materials back to ETS.

### Quality Control of Test Administration

The quality of test administration for the Initial ELPAC was monitored and controlled through several strategies.

A fully supported Outreach team that includes California Technical Assistance Center phone support and Success Agents, supported all LEAs in the administration of the ELPAC. In addition to providing guidance and answering questions, the Outreach team regularly conducted campaigns on particular administration topics to ensure all LEAs understood correct test administration procedures. Outreach was guided by individuals who managed communications to LEAs; provided regional and web-based trainings; and hosted a website, [the](https://www.caaspp.org/) ELPAC website, that housed a full range of manuals, videos, and other instructional and support materials.

The quality of test administration was further managed through comprehensive rules and guidelines for maintaining the security and standardization of the ELPAC. LEAs received training on these topics and were provided tools for reporting security incidents and resolving testing discrepancies for specific testing sessions.

The ETS Office of Testing Integrity (OTI) reinforced the quality control procedures for test administration, providing quality assurance services for all testing programs managed by ETS. The detailed procedures the OTI developed and applied in quality control are described in subsection [*5.7.1 ETS’ Office of Testing Integrity*](#_ETS’_Office_of).

### Quality Control of Scoring

ETS conforms to high standards of quality and fairness when scoring tests and reporting scores. These standards dictate that ETS provides accurate and understandable assessment results to the intended recipients. It is also ETS’ mission to provide appropriate guidelines for score interpretation and cautions about the limitations in the meaning and use of the test scores. Finally, ETS conducts analyses needed to ensure that the assessments are equitable for various student demographic groups.

#### Local Scoring Procedures for Speaking and Writing

The Speaking and Writing responses were scored locally by test examiners using the rubrics and anchor samples provided in the *Directions for Administration* and during the statewide and regional Administration and Scoring Trainings, as well as Moodle calibration sets.

Rater qualifications, rater certifications, and periodic rater calibrations are all processes used to control the reliability of constructed-response scoring. In addition, for the Initial ELPAC, raters were required to complete a training set before scoring any task type at any grade level or grade span. To complete the training set, raters scored samples of previously scored Writing responses and read annotations that explained the most accurate score for each response to refresh their training on appropriately applying the rubrics. Benchmark samples were available to raters throughout the scoring process for each prompt to exemplify responses at each score band on each rubric.

Trained raters were scheduled to score in four- or eight-hour shifts. Scoring leaders were qualified raters who provided feedback to raters to provide additional content support and offered corrective mentoring for struggling raters.

Each rater was assigned a secure user ID and password to log on to the scoring system and was required to sign a confidentiality agreement. System access for the rater was restricted to the hours that the rater was scheduled to work.

Prior to scoring in a task type at a particular grade level or grade span, a rater passed a calibration test that demonstrated sufficient training in ELPAC scoring criteria and an ability to score accurately. Scoring leaders read behind the raters throughout a shift and entered their own scores on responses that raters read.

Refer to subsection *12.4.1 Constructed-Response Scoring for Writing* of the *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 Technical Report* (CDE, 2020) for details about these processes.

#### Interrater Reliability Results

As described in subsection [*8.4.8.4 Interrater Reliability Results*](#_Interrater_Reliability_Results_1), Writing responses from the RSVP sample were used to evaluate interrater reliability of these responses. Approximately 1,200 Speaking responses were scored a second time to evaluate interrater reliability of Speaking test responses after local ratings were completed.

The statistics for interrater reliability for all items at all grades for Writing and Speaking responses are presented in table 8.11 and table 8.12, respectively. These statistics include the percentage of exact agreement and adjacent agreement between the two raters. The interrater results for Writing responses of all 1-, 2-, 3-, and 4-score point items, with only one exception of a 4-score point item in grade span six through eight showed strong agreement between local and ETS scores. The percent exact for 4-score point items was below expectations for Speaking responses. To gain more insights about this result, a study is underway to provide additional information into why the local and ETS scores for Speaking responses for these items were not as consistent as expected. Findings from the study will be used to improve the scoring quality of Speaking responses.

#### Machine-Scoring Procedures

To ensure valid item-level scoring for the Initial ELPAC, quality control procedures were employed by CAI, the ELPAC subcontractor responsible for providing the TDS and scoring machine-scorable items. CAI staff independently reviewed all Initial ELPAC forms by producing sample results for tests. The sample results were compared with the answer keys for each form to confirm the accuracy of scoring keys. The scores for all applicable items were recorded. A final comparison of the test map to each computer-based form as configured in the UAT environment ensured that no changes to the form were introduced prior to operational deployment.

A real-time, quality-monitoring component was built into the TDS. After a test was administered to a student, the TDS passed the resulting data to the QA system. QA conducted a series of data integrity checks, ensuring, for example, that the record for each test contained information for each item, keys for multiple-choice items, score points in each item, and the total number of operational items. In addition, QA also checked to ensure that the test record contained no data from items that might have been invalidated.

Data passed directly from the Quality Monitoring System to the database of record, which served as the repository for all test information, and from which all test information was pulled and transmitted to ETS in a predetermined results format.

#### Development of Scoring Specifications

A number of measures were taken to ascertain that the scoring keys were applied to the student responses as intended and the student scores were computed accurately. ETS built and reviewed the scoring system models based on the reporting specifications approved by the CDE. These specifications contain detailed scoring procedures, along with the procedures for determining whether a student has attempted a test and whether that student’s response data should be included in the statistical analyses and calculations for computing summary data.

Prior to the test administration, ETS ALTRD staff reviewed and verified the keys and scoring rubrics for each item. Then, these keys and rubrics were provided to CAI for implementing machine scoring of the selected-response items. Item responses to be human-scored were sent electronically to the ETS Online Network for Evaluation for scoring by trained, qualified raters. In addition, the student’s original response string was stored for data verification and auditing purposes. Standard quality inspections were performed on all data files, including the evaluation of each student data record for correctness and completeness. Student results were kept confidential and secure at all times.

ETS scoring specifications for the Initial ELPAC were completed, approved, and checked well in advance of the receipt of student response data. These specifications contained detailed scoring procedures, as well as the procedures for determining whether a student attempted a test and whether that student’s response data should be included in the statistical analyses and computing summary data.

#### Paper–Pencil Scoring

If an LEA was approved to administer the paper–pencil test version of the Initial ELPAC, student responses were entered into the DEI and scored electronically and by a rater, depending on the item type.

### Quality Control of Psychometric Processes

#### Scoring Verification

ETS developed two independent and parallel scoring structures to produce students’ scores: the Enterprise Score Key Management (eSKM) scoring system, which collected, scored, and delivered individual students’ scores to the ETS reporting system; and then the ETS PAR team computed individual student scores based on the same scoring specifications as described in subsection [*9.5.4 Development of Scoring Specifications*](#_Development_of_Scoring). The scores from the two sources were then compared for internal quality control. Any differences in the scores were discussed and resolved. All scores complied with the ETS scoring specifications and passed the parallel scoring process. This ensured the quality and accuracy of scoring and supported the transfer of scores into TOMS, the database of the student records scoring.

#### Psychometric Analyses

The psychometric procedures for the Initial ELPAC were developed, reviewed, and approved prior to the receipt of student response data. The ETS psychometric team also developed specifications for each of the psychometric analyses performed. These specifications contain detailed descriptions of the analysis steps such as sample inclusion, analyses methods, and special handling of the data.

All psychometric analyses conducted at ETS underwent comprehensive quality checks by a team of psychometricians and data analysts. Detailed checklists and psychometric specifications were developed by members of the team for each of the statistical procedures performed on Initial ELPAC results data, including item analyses, differential item functioning analyses, item response theory (IRT) calibration, equating, and scaling.

Detailed checklists were developed by members of the team for each of the statistical procedures. Classical item analyses were performed to evaluate the performance of the operational items. Classical item statistics included item difficulty and correlations between item scores and total scores. Items that were flagged for questionable statistical attributes were sent to ETS ALTRD staff for review; their comments were then reviewed by the psychometricians before the review by the CDE. The ETS ALTRD and PAR teams worked together to evaluate and make recommendations to the CDE about any problematic items that should be removed from IRT calibration.

IRT calibration of field test items included checks to ascertain that the input files were established accurately. Checks were also made on the number of items, number of students with valid scores, IRT item difficulty and discrimination estimates, standard errors for the item difficulty estimates, and the equating and scaling process. Two psychometricians conducted parallel calibration processing and compared the results to check for any inconsistency. Psychometricians also performed detailed reviews of relevant statistics to determine whether the chosen IRT model fits the data. ETS then presented and reviewed the calibration results with the CDE for approval.

Once raw-to-scale-score conversion tables for each form were generated, psychometricians carried out quality control checks on each scoring table to verify

* all possible raw scores for each form were included in the tables;
* the lowest obtainable scale score and the highest obtainable scale score matched the specifications for each grade level, respectively; and
* the threshold score for the performance level was correctly identified.

After all quality control steps were completed and any differences were resolved, one final inspection of scoring tables was conducted prior to uploading the tables to eSKM for score reporting.

### Quality Control of Reporting

To ensure the quality of Initial ELPAC results, for both individual student and summary reports, three general areas were evaluated:

1. Comparison of report formats with input sources from the CDE-approved samples
2. Validation of the report data through quality control checks performed by ETS’ Data Quality Services and Center of Reporting & Scoring Services teams, as well as running of all Student Score Reports (SSRs) through ETS’ patented QC Interrogator software, which compares elements of the SSR to acceptable values to identify errors and is used in conjunction with human review to detect errors on every score report batch as part of quality control procedures
3. Proofreading of the quality control and production reports by the CDE and ETS prior to making reports available to the LEA for download in TOMS and California Educator Reporting System as well as via the LEA’s student information system

All reports were required to include a single, accurate LEA code, an LEA name, and a school name. All elements conformed to the CDE’s official county/district/school (CDS) code and naming records. From the start of processing through scoring and reporting, the CDS Master File was used to verify and confirm accurate codes and names. The CDE provided a revised LEA Master File to ETS throughout the year as updates became available.

After the reports were validated in accordance with the CDE’s requirements, a set of reports representing all possible grade levels, content areas, and reporting outcomes was provided to the CDE and ETS for review and approval. Electronic reports were sent on the actual report template to the CDE. The CDE and ETS reviewed and approved the reports after a thorough examination.

Upon the CDE’s approval of the reports generated for the quality control LEAs, ETS proceeded with the first batch of report production. The reviewed set of reports incorporated CDE-selected LEAs and provided the final check prior to generating all reports and making them available electronically for download in TOMS and for student information systems through an application programming interface.

#### Exclusion of Student Scores from Summary Reports

Students who did not meet the student participation rule by logging on to all four domains of the Initial ELPAC and then were subsequently reclassified by the LEA with an ELAS of English only were excluded from the summary report information.

An exception to the requirement to log on to all four domains to meet the participation rule is if a domain exemption exists for one or more domains or the student was assigned a locally determined alternate assessment for one or more domains; and the student logged on to the nonexempt domain(s) or the domain(s) for which the system flag for a locally determined alternate assessment had not been set. Students who were identified to take the Initial ELPAC and assigned to take a locally determined alternate assessment for a domain received the lowest obtainable score for the domain. Students who were assigned a domain exemption for only one domain within a composite and took the general Initial ELPAC for the remaining domain received an interpolated scale score predicted from the raw score of the tested domain for that composite. Those scores contributed to summary report statistics.

### Quality Control of End-to-End Testing

ETS conducted end-to-end testing prior to the start of the test administration. The purpose of this testing is to verify that all systems, processes, and resources were ready for the operational administration. Once released from processing, the test results were sent through the system for scoring and reporting. SSRs were created, along with data files for subject-matter experts in the teams to review and verify.

#### Computer-based Assessments

ETS employed a number of strategies to verify ongoing systems performance, including monitoring of system availability and system usage. Time was allotted for UAT to confirm that the systems met requirements and to make identified corrections before final deployment. To accomplish system acceptance and sign-off, ETS deployed systems to a staging area, which mirrors the final production environment, for operational testing and UAT. Final approval by the CDE triggered final deployment of the system.

To begin the quality control process for end-to-end testing of the administration, the ETS program and resolutions teams prepared by entering responses in computer-based assessments for all grade spans and domains. These responses were entered for fictitious students in selected schools and across several LEAs. Each student’s test was completed with responses that were all correct, all incorrect, and combinations of correct and incorrect. These response combinations were the expected results across performance levels and score ranges. The responses were sent for processing, including for system quality control of computer-based assessments.

Once released from processing, the test results were sent through the system for scoring and reporting. SSRs were created, along with data files for subject-matter experts in the teams to review and verify. Individual SSRs were generated on the basis of the fictitious students when 100 percent quality control was demonstrated by ETS’ Resolution staff.

#### Paper–Pencil Tests

The DEI underwent UAT to ensure that the correct test items were available for a grade-level assessment in the DEI. Then, during testing, information technology personnel monitored daily feeds to ensure the completeness and timeliness of records sent for hand scoring.

The processes followed to test the DEI from end to end are described in the previous subsection, [*9.8.1 Computer-based Assessments*](#_Computer-based_Assessments).

### References

California Department of Education. (2020). *Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California 2018–2019 technical report* [Unpublished report]*.* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Educational Testing Service. (2014). *ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

## Continuous Improvement

This chapter presents the various procedures used to gather information to improve the Initial English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

### 2021–22 Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey

The ELPAC program annually solicits feedback from educators through the Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey. LEA and test site staff, as well as test administrators and test examiners, were invited to participate in the 2021–22 Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey. Its goal was to highlight successes and identify areas for improvement. A total of 4,834 survey respondents participated in this survey for the 2021–‍22 administration, compared to 1,615 respondents for the previous year. The California Department of Education (CDE) and ETS use key recommendations from educators to implement positive changes in the following administration year.

Educators provided valuable feedback for potential improvements to the future administration of the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) and the ELPAC by reporting some lessons they learned in 2021–‍22. Based on those lessons and suggestions for improvement, the *CAASPP and ELPAC Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey and Focus Groups Report* (CDE, 2022) presents recommendations for the CDE, with the goal of enhancing the administrative support provided to LEAs and schools for future CAASPP and ELPAC test administrations. Refer also to subsection [*5.3.4 Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey*](#_Feedback_for_Continuous_1) for assessment-specific results.

ETS administered the CAASPP and ELPAC Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey to local educational agencies (LEAs) in May 2022 as well as an Initial ELPAC survey in November 2021 (ETS, 2022). The survey focused on gathering information and data from educators who were part of the ELPAC administration to highlight successes and to identify areas for immediate and long-term improvement. The focus of the survey questions centered on preparation, training, and test administration, including remote testing. Refer to subsection [*5.3.4 Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey*](#_Feedback_for_Continuous_1) for details about the results of the Continuous Improvement Survey.

#### Communications

During the 2021–22 test administration year, the CDE and ETS worked to streamline communications and provide LEAs with timely and relevant information throughout the year. One example of these efforts is the monthly ELPAC email communication, which is sent to LEA coordinators. After the results from the 2020–21 survey determined the need for a monthly CAASPP communication, that need was addressed. Monthly CAASPP emails were sent to the field during the 2021–22 test administration year, and survey respondents were asked about the helpfulness of this communication. These improvements will be continued during the 2022–23 administration.

#### Outreach

In response to the LEA feedback, ETS is implementing the following improvements for the 2022–23 operational administration:

* Moving Data Entry Interface instructions to test administration manuals instead of having the content in a separate manual
* Updating regularly both the online Get Answers lookup tool as well as Anita, the chatbot, with new and frequently asked questions
* Providing Coffee Sessions on the second Tuesday of every month to give LEAs an opportunity to ask questions and receive timely updates
* Creating new demonstration videos and updating existing videos, where possible, with suggestions provided by LEAs
* Providing training on the use of accessibility resources in the classroom and how to make these resources available to students during test administration
* Providing hands-on training, in conjunction with self-paced video modules, to assist educators with how to identify, match, and use accessibility resources to meet students’ needs
* Improving the usability of the ETS-developed program websites by simplifying the display of information and offering materials more readily, when possible

### Improvement in the *Directions for Administration*

Improvements that will be implemented to the Initial ELPAC 2022–23 administration:

* The Initial ELPAC *Direction for Administration (DFAs)* will now include tabs on the even pages to make the domain sections more visible.
* The Speaking domain practice question will be revised in both the *DFAs* and the test delivery system (TDS) to mirror the question asked on the braille assessment, where the student is asked about a favorite food.

### Improvement on Administration and Scoring Training

The Sacramento County Office of Education included, within the Moodle Training Site, a survey for LEA coordinators. Three hundred and ninety LEA coordinators responded. Ninety-seven percent agreed that the Initial ELPAC LEA Certification reflected careful planning, 94 percent agreed that the materials were well organized, 94 percent agreed that resources supported learning, and 87 percent reported that they can locate needed resources.

Improvements that will be implemented to the Initial ELPAC 2022–23 Administration and Scoring Training include the following:

* The Examiner Training and Calibration course in Moodle will be redesigned to create separate Training and Calibration sections by grade level or grade span and follow the successful model from the Summative ELPAC launch in October 2021.
* The Trainer Resources course will be reorganized from one course into two courses, one for Speaking and one for Writing. This change will assist new LEA trainers in navigating all the materials in Moodle. This reorganization will follow the suggested agenda and training formats in the training binder as well as the models for in‑person training.
* More than 180 Speaking trainer vignettes will be written and filmed and added to the Speaking training quizzes to model after the successful changes made to Summative ELPAC training Speaking quizzes.
* Each of the nine grade-level or grade-span test examiner calibration certifications will have two separate certifications, one for Speaking and one for Writing.
* More than 200 Writing graphic vignettes will be written and created and added to the Writing training quizzes to model how in-person trainers would describe rubrics and scores for written responses.
* Accessibility will be increased within Moodle and all the training and calibration quizzes.
* A 2022–23 What’s New video will be filmed.

### Accessibility Resources

As part of the ELPAC, the Initial ELPAC is administered using the TDS created by Cambium Assessment, Inc. for other California assessments. As such, implementation of new computer-based universal tools, designated supports, and accommodations are aligned with the TDS.

There will be no changes to student accessibility resources during the 2022–23 test administration.

### References

California Department of Education. (2022). *2021–22 CAASPP and ELPAC feedback for continuous improvement survey and focus groups report*. [Unpublished manuscript]. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

ETS. (2022). *Report for 2021–22 Initial ELPAC Feedback for Continuous Improvement Survey*. [Unpublished report]. Princeton, NJ: ETS.

1. Data for 2021–22 was retrieved from the *CalEdFacts* web page on the CDE website. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. This definition was retrieved from the CDE California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) web page on the CDE website. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. This technical report is based on the versions of the Accessibility Matrix that was available during the 2021–22 ELPAC administration. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. This requirement was extended by 45 days—for a total of 75 days—for LEAs affected by the wildfires in summer and fall 2021 per Executive Order N-18-21. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)