California Department of Education
Report to the Governor, the State Legislature, and the
Director of Finance:

Recommendations for Expanding California's Comprehensive Assessment System

Prepared by the

Assessment Development and Administration Division
District, School, and Innovation Branch

March 2016

Description: Report on recommendations expanding the statewide pupil assessment program

Authority: Section 60604 of the *Education Code*

Recipient: The Governor, appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature, and Director of Finance

Due Date: On or before March 1, 2016

California Department of Education
Recommendations for Expanding California's Comprehensive Assessment System

Contents

Executive Summary

With the enactment of Assembly Bill 484 in January 2014, California set out to reimagine and redefine what statewide assessments could look like, a vision that included a comprehensive system amenable to improving teaching and learning throughout the state. That vision was brought about by California *Education Code* Section 60602.5(a), which requires California's comprehensive assessment system to "provide a system of assessments of pupils that has the primary purposes of assisting teachers, administrators, and pupils and their parents; improving teaching and learning; and promoting high-quality teaching and learning using a variety of assessment approaches and item types."

The building of that system began with the implementation of the Smarter Balanced English language arts/literacy and mathematics assessments aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Next will come the development of science summative assessments aligned to the California Next Generation Science Standards and the expansion of the system to potentially include summative, computer-based assessments for history–social science and state-supported assessment resources and tools.

The new vision also has called upon us to rethink what the state's role should be in this new context—a context that includes the Local Control and Accountability Plan and the federal education law, Every Student Succeeds Act.

The four recommendations presented in this report are the result of extensive feedback from stakeholders, collected since 2014, as well as the weighing of options through the assessment framework principles developed in consultation with WestEd, a nonprofit education organization that partners with the California Department of Education to inform decision making for California's comprehensive assessment system. Details on the framework, as well as the rationale for the recommendations, are detailed in the appendix, *Recommendations for Building a Next-Generation, Comprehensive Assessment System in California*), a report by WestEd.

This report is available on the CDE CAASPP System Web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/index.asp. If you have any questions regarding this report or need a copy of this report, please contact Michelle Center by phone at 916-324-9566 or by e-mail at mcenter@cde.ca.gov.

The Recommendations

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction's (SSPI's) 2013 report to the Legislature, *Recommendations for Transitioning California to a Future Assessment System* (California Department of Education [CDE], January 2013), describes how advances in assessment require and impact human and fiscal resources, in addition to the time it takes to build up a system. The implementation of a comprehensive assessment system such as that required by California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 60602.5—a system whose primary purposes are to assist teachers, administrators, and pupils and their parents/guardians; improve teaching and learning; and promote high-quality teaching and learning through multiple assessment approaches and item types—will take time to implement and requires a commitment to providing the resources necessary for such a paradigm shift in California's statewide assessment system.

With the initial stages of California's new assessment system under way, the SSPI is required, per California *EC* Section 60640(c) to submit recommendations for expanding the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) to the California State Board of Education, the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature and to the Director of Finance. The recommendations include a timeline for test development and cost estimates for subject areas, as appropriate. The supporting documentation provides the rationale for the recommendations, found in the appendix: *Recommendations for Building a Next-Generation, Comprehensive Assessment System in California*), a report by WestEd. The following recommendations, founded on the assessment framework principles, aim to expand the content areas included in computer-based testing and provide local educational agencies (LEAs) with resources and tools to improve teaching and learning while ensuring minimal intrusion on instructional time:

Recommendation 1—Develop and administer three state computer-based summative assessments for history–social science in elementary, middle, and high school.

Recommendation 2—Provide state-supported formative assessment resources that are aligned with the California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS) in the Digital Library.

Recommendation 3—Vet state-supported resources and tools that support implementation of a comprehensive assessment system and provide those resources for local use.

Recommendation 4—Provide regional assessment support to schools and districts on the implementation of the comprehensive assessment tools and resources.

Implementation Activities for the Recommendations

A comprehensive assessment system is comprised of a variety of high quality assessments, each with a designated purpose (e.g., instructional decision making, accountability). Within the system, the components must work together to support teaching and learning in a comprehensive, coherent, and connected way. California has unique challenges in regard to the diverse student population it serves, the necessary resources and supports to administer assessments, and the balance between state administered and state-supported assessments and resources. To implement the recommendations, the CDE proposes the activities outlined in this section of the report. Estimated costs associated with these activities and a timeline for development are provided following the activities.

❖ ***Implementation Activities for Recommendation 1***—*Develop and administer three state computer-based summative assessments for history–social science in elementary, middle, and high school.*

The assessments will generate both student and group measurement information and simultaneously sample content among students to reduce testing time. In addition, the test will include innovative item types, including constructed response, to ensure the measurement of critical thinking skills and analysis.

The implementation of this recommendation will require additional funding and additional CDE resources, including staffing. Further, this recommendation will require statute. The activities required for implementation will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Assessment design**. Develop—through the contractor, in coordination with California educators, and on the basis of the new history–social science framework—a test blueprint documenting the grades and content standards to be measured. Include geography in the middle school assessment and civics in the high school assessment.

  Conduct an initial analysis of how each standard (for the grades and content to be assessed) could be assessed in terms of item/task type and depth of knowledge.

- **Item and task development**. Develop guidelines for item writing and conduct item writing workshops, including California educators in the workshops.

- **Pilot testing**. Develop a sampling plan to include students with disabilities and English learners as well as develop pilot test administration manuals.

- **Test form construction**. Develop an item selection process and test forms that conform to industry standards.

- **Field testing**. Develop field test administration manuals and training modules; conduct preliminary integration testing; conduct a field test; and analyze the results of the field test.

- **Standard setting**. Convene a panel of educators, parents/guardians, and community representatives to participate; develop materials for and conduct the standard setting; produce a technical report on the standard setting.

- **Test administration, scoring, and preliminary results**. Develop test administration manuals; provide technical and technology assistance to LEAs; provide hand scoring for various items, and provide preliminary results without performance tasks as well as combined results that include the performance task results.

- **Analysis of test results**. Analyze test administration performance and individual item performance.

- **Reporting of statewide results**. Provide aggregated district, county, and statewide results on the CDE public reporting Web site and provide individual student test results to teachers and parents or guardians.

❖ ***Implementation Activities for Recommendation 2***—*Provide state-supported formative assessment resources that are aligned with the California Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS) in the Digital Library.*

The CDE, in consultation with experts on the CA NGSS, will collect and vet formative assessment resources (e.g., rubrics, interdisciplinary classroom activities, performance tasks) for inclusion in the Digital Library for use by California educators. These resources could be educator developed or resources commissioned by others. The vetting of resources will be conducted by trained members of the State Network of Educators as well as measurement experts, as appropriate.

The CDE will consult with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium regarding the inclusion of CA NGSS resources in the Digital Library as the preferred method of distributing formative assessment resources and CA NGSS professional development materials to California educators**.**

The implementation of this recommendation will require additional funding and

additional CDE resources, including staffing. The activities required for implementation will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Coordinate the collection of formative science assessment resources aligned with the CA NGSS; identify and consult with CA NGSS experts to develop the formative assessment resources; and develop and oversee a plan and timeline for the development and implementation of those resources.

- Work collaboratively with the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and member states to develop and implement a plan for adding established NGSS-aligned science resources to the Digital Library, including ensuring that the resources meet Digital Library quality criteria.

- Receive and review submissions through a convening of educators by grade span (elementary, middle, and high). The convening will occur one time per year for up to eight days.

- Provide training, materials, support, and technical assistance to schools and districts on how best to fully utilize the CA NGSS formative assessment resources.

- Provide training, materials, and support to California educators to guide the accurate interpretation of scores and support the effective use of results for instructional purposes.

❖ ***Implementation Activities for Recommendation 3****—Vet state-supported resources and tools that support implementation of a comprehensive assessment system and provide those resources for local use.*

The extensive stakeholder feedback, collected in 2014 and 2015, supports the need to begin the vetting of assessment resources and tools (e.g., rubrics, classroom activities, performance tasks, assessments) in several content areas (e.g., visual and performing arts, world languages, technology). The vetting process will consist of a review of local assessments and/or local resources (e.g., visual and performing arts portfolio rubric) submitted by LEAs. The vetting process will also include the development of criteria for exemplar resources and tools. The CDE will develop and provide training to California educators for use of the state-supported resources and tools.

The prioritization of the vetting of additional content areas will be based on a review of school and district needs as well as the plan/schedule for revisions to content standards. This review could be conducted with funding through a U.S. Department of Education (ED) state assessment audit grant, assuming the grant allows for local assessment audits. Details on the grant are forthcoming from the ED. If the grant is

not available for this purpose, the CDE will survey LEAs to set priorities for the collection and vetting of other content areas (e.g., visual and performing arts, world languages, technology). The vetting of resources will be conducted by trained members of the State Network of Educators as well as measurement experts, as appropriate. The vetting would occur on an annual cycle, according to the content area priorities established in the review process.

This recommendation would be a vehicle for sharing high quality assessments, resources, and tools and would include multiple years of vetting the multiple content areas, provided a convening of educators is held on an annual cycle. For example, the first year convening would consist of a collection and review of the determined first priority content area submissions, the second year convening would review the second content area submissions, and so on. The implementation of this recommendation will require additional funding and CDE resources, including staffing. The activities required for implementation will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Develop criteria that will be used to review resources and tools to ensure that they are aligned with and support the identified appropriate content standards. Those criteria will ensure that the resources are valid and appropriate for the intended use and are reliable.

- Plan for the potential impact on statewide assessments for scheduled review and/or revisions to content standards in all subject areas.

- CDE staff to serve as liaison to the ED, as needed, for applying for local assessment grants and support CDE grant activities, if funded. Grant activities could be comprised of the development of an application process for LEA submissions, including, but not limited to, application screening, rating criteria, and selection process.

- Develop, distribute, collect, and analyze results from a survey (if necessary) to prioritize the collection and vetting of other content areas (e.g., visual and performing arts, world languages, technology).

- Recruit, select, train, and coordinate activities of California educators for the State Network of Educators and assessment measurement experts to annually vet assessments, resources, and tools, including technical discussions and review of the submissions.

- Coordinate the annual solicitation for resources through the Request for Information (RFI) process and receive and review submissions through a convening of educators. The convening will occur one time per year for up to

five days. Annual educator convenings will be facilitated by CDE staff and will utilize the criteria developed to ensure the resources are appropriate, valid, and reliable.

- Develop and provide training to California educators on the state-supported resources and tools.

If the CDE applies for and receives assessment audit grant funds, the implementation of this recommendation would also include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Develop a plan for the state to implement the audit requirements.

- Develop a process for LEAs to apply for and receive grant funds to conduct local assessment audits.

- Conduct the monitoring of grant recipients and gather results of the local assessment audits to inform the priority of collection and vetting of resources.

- Utilize results to prioritize the needs of the district and therefore, prioritize the collection and review of the assessment resources and tools.

- ❖ ***Implementation Activities for Recommendation 4**—Provide regional assessment support to schools and districts on the implementation of the comprehensive assessment tools and resources.*

  The CDE will collaborate with a regional assessment network as a means to provide localized support and professional development to schools and districts. If determined feasible, this support may be conducted through a regional assessment network. After receiving training by the CDE, the regional assessment network would support schools and districts in implementing comprehensive assessment tools and resources and host regular meetings to provide relevant information and support.

  The demand for such support services is expected to increase over the next few years as the CAASPP System changes (e.g., addition of new Smarter Balanced reports; CA NGSS aligned tests; new alternate assessments for English language arts/literacy, mathematics, and science; and new primary language assessment), in addition to assessment resources and tools in other content areas.

  The implementation of this recommendation will require additional funding to support the activities of the regional assessment network. The activities required for implementation will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Develop presentation materials and conduct training workshops for the regional assessment network to be used as training for LEAs in support of the implementation of any new state assessments and state-supported assessment resources and tools.

- CDE staff would host quarterly meetings to provide assessment updates to support the regional activities.

Estimated Costs and Timelines

As stated earlier in this report, a commitment to providing the necessary resources will be required for the full implementation of a comprehensive assessment system that assists teachers, administrators, students, and parents/guardians; improves teaching and learning; and promotes high-quality teaching and learning through multiple assessment approaches and item types. It will also take time to fully implement California's new statewide assessment system. Per *EC* Section 60640(c), the recommendations must include a timeline for test development and cost estimates, by subject area, as appropriate.

Table 1, on the following page, provides the estimated costs and timelines for the recommendations presented in this report. The estimated costs reflect the implementation activities of the recommendations and include a combination of state operating costs and local assistance costs. The estimated costs to implement these recommendations are best estimates at this time. Cost estimates will be refined as contracts are released for bid and activities are completed for each phase of implementation.

Consideration should be made to the implementation timeline to potentially allow for a staggered approach. The recommendations could be implemented at various stages and does not necessarily need to conform to the estimated timeline in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Estimated Costs and Timeline

Recommendation	2016-17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
1. Develop history – social science computer-based summative assessments in grades 4, 7, and high school[1]			Development	Pilot Testing	Field Testing	Administration, Scoring and Reporting
Total State Operations Costs:		1 EPC [2] - $154,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000
Total Local Assistance Costs:			$3.5 million	$5.5 million	$6.5 million	$6 million
Total		$154,000	$3.654 million	$5.654 million	$6.654 million	$6.154 million
2. Develop CA NGSS formative assessment tools by California educators	Honoraria for CA educators; LEA training workshops	Provide ongoing support to LEAs				
Positions:	1 EPC[2] - $154,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA[3] – $62,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA – $62,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA – $62,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA – $62,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA – $62,000	1 EPC [2] - $154,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA – $62,000
Total PY Cost	$296,000	$296,000	$296,000	$296,000	$296,000	$296,000
Contract Operating Expenses:	$368,000	$236,000	$236,000	$236,000	$236,000	$236,000
Total State Operations Costs:	$664,000	$532,000	$532,000	$532,000	$532,000	$532,000

3. Collect, review, and provide to LEAs supported resources supporting additional content areas	Collect resources; CA educator reviews conducted	Provide ongoing support to LEAs				
Positions:	2 EPC [2] - $306,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 .5 AGPA[3] – $62,000	2 EPC [2] - $306,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 1 AGPA – 123,000	2 EPC [2] - $306,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 1 AGPA – 123,000	2 EPC [2] - $306,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 1 AGPA – 123,000	2 EPC [2] - $306,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 1 AGPA – 123,000	2 EPC [2] - $306,000 .5 EREC[3] - $80,000 1 AGPA – 123,000
Total PY Cost	$448,000	$448,000	$448,000	$448,000	$448,000	$448,000
Contract Operating Expenses:	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Total State Operations Costs	$698,000	$698,000	$698,000	$698,000	$698,000	$698,000

4. Provide regional-specific support to LEAs	Provide ongoing support through regional assessment network					
Total: State Operations Costs	$687,000	$687,000	$687,000	$687,000	$687,000	$687,000

	2016-17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
Total State Operations Costs:	**$2.049 million**	**$2.071 million**	**$2.071 million**	**$2.071 million**	**$2.071 million**	**$2.071 million**
Total Local Assistance Costs:			**$3.5 million**	**$5.5 million**	**$6.5 million**	**$6 million**
Total	**$2.049 million**	**$2.071 million**	**$5.571 million**	**$7.571 million**	**$8.571 million**	**$8.071 million**
Total All Years						**$33.904 million**

[1] Estimates for Recommendation 1 are based on current contract costs for the development, pilot test, and field testing of the CA NGSS-science assessments, excluding alternate assessments. The annual testing costs are based on the costs to administer the current California Standards Tests and California Modified Assessment science assessments in three grades with a slight increase for computer-based testing.

[2] The Personnel Year (PY) referenced in this table are Education Programs Consultant (EPC) positions, Education Research and Evaluation Consultant (EREC) positions and Associate Governmental Program Analyst (AGPA) positions.

[3] The .5 PY positions in Recommendations 2 and 3, EREC position would reflect a full-time consultant with psychometric expertise and a full-time AGPA position.

Recommendations for Building a Next-Generation, Comprehensive Assessment System in California

WestEd

WestEd.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

A new era for the assessment environment in California schools was ushered in during the 2013–14 school year with the passing of legislation eliminating many statewide tests that had been required for more than a decade as part of the state's Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The governor signed Assembly Bill 484 into law in June 2014. As part of this new law, the STAR program was replaced with a new program, the California Assessment of Performance and Progress (CAASPP). In addition, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) was charged with providing the California State Board of Education (SBE), and the appropriate policy and fiscal committees, with recommendations for expanding the CAASPP beyond the current set of required exams.

As part of this process, the California Department of Education (CDE) gathered suggestions from a wide range of stakeholders. Participants during this early phase of work included educators, administrators, subject matter experts, measurement specialists, experienced curriculum designers, and members of the higher education, policymaking, and business communities. These preliminary activities were intended to encourage broad thinking about the future of assessment in California and to efficiently capture ideas through surveys and focus group discussions.

In fall 2015, the CDE contracted with WestEd's Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Services (SAAS) program, to build on this initial work through a series of activities that could further inform the SSPI during his decision-making about recommendations to present to the SBE. These activities included the following:

- Review all existing documentation (e.g., records, reports, or summaries of historical activities) associated with this initiative, including those authored by the SSPI and the CDE. In addition, review all key resources about effective, next-generation assessment systems, such as research-supported guidelines for best practices in educational measurement, reports from national or professional organizations, and surveys of assessment practices across states.

- Develop a report that synthesizes all collected information and articulates a vision for a comprehensive, coherent assessment system in California. This report should provide a framework with guiding principles for the state's new multi-component assessment system.

- In partnership with the San Joaquin County Office of Education, convene panels of state policy leaders, to provide feedback on the draft framework and to consider possible strategies for expanding the CAASPP program. These panelists represented constituents in both the kindergarten through grade twelve and higher education communities.

- Review all input from panelists and, while considering the guiding principles spelled out in the framework, develop a set of recommendations for the CDE that are focused on a feasible, stakeholder-supported plan for effectively and responsibly expanding CAASPP.

Key Outcome #1: Framework for Development of California's Next-Generation Comprehensive Assessment System

A key outcome from this effort was the articulation of the following guiding principles for California's new comprehensive assessment system:

California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from

1. ... an integrated, coherent system of multiple measures, each working in unison with the others to reach key goals.

2. … a system that communicates and supports state priorities for instruction of all students.

3. ... a purpose-driven system in which each measure serves a specific purpose or addresses a particular need.

4. ... an inclusive system with measures that are fair and accessible to all students.

5. **...** a system that is guided by research and industry best-practice-supported expectations for technical quality.

6. ... an innovative system that capitalizes on existing and emerging technologies that enable effective and efficient testing.

7. ... a transparent system that provides clear guidelines for the administration, scoring, reporting, and use of results.

8. ... a dynamic, streamlined system that is feasible, efficient, and cost effective.

9. ... general guidance, resources, and tools from the CDE that support local-level decision-making about the combination of measures that is most appropriate in each situation.

These principles became the lens through which all possible suggestions for expansion were viewed. Doing so ensured a systematic process for carefully weighing the tradeoffs associated with each strategy for expanding the current system prior to developing the set of final recommendations presented in this report.

Key Outcome #2: Recommendations for Consideration by the CDE

A second outcome from this work is a set of recommendations for expanding the CAASPP that is in keeping with stakeholder input, research- and best-practice recommendations from content and assessment experts, and the guiding principles spelled out in the framework. The recommendations also take into consideration the current policy context, which includes several significant milestones, such as passing of the Every Student Succeeds Act, release of the President's Testing Action Plan, and the implementation of California's Local Control Accountability Plan.

Recommendation 1: Add new state measure(s) in history/social science. Stakeholders consistently suggested that adding these new measures will strengthen the current portfolio of summative assessments and address a current gap in the system. Specific recommendations include development of a high school civics assessment based on a small subset of the History-Social Science Content Standards and development of grade-specific or grade-span history/social science assessments. SAAS recognizes the long-term nature of this project and the prerequisite work that would be required regarding standards reviews and selection.

Recommendation 2. Maintain the federally required science assessments as grade-span assessments. Outreach indicated support for CDE's effort to maintain the high-quality grade-span assessments currently in place and to ensure that the assessments are aligned to California Next Generation Science Standards as adopted by the SBE.

Recommendation 3. Develop additional science resources that can be included in the Smarter Balanced Digital Library or a similar website. California stakeholders are committed to the vision of a comprehensive assessment system that looks beyond state- or federally required summative assessments and encompasses state-supported and locally developed assessment resources and tools for California educators. Adding science resources to the Digital Library would immediately address a commonly expressed need and provide vetted resources that meet the criteria for effective formative tools and processes.

Recommendation 4. Collect additional information about district-level assessment practices that may contribute in particular ways to a comprehensive assessment system. California should consider gathering information about the types of assessments currently used by local educational agencies (LEAs) prior to developing and/or vetting additional resources and tools. California's Comprehensive Assessment System is best served by an informed development process; knowing what LEAs currently use and trust, as well as what they might need, is critical to building an effective, cost-efficient system that minimizes intrusion into the instructional day. To do so, CDE can apply for an audit grant for fiscal year 2017 through the U.S. Department of Education. Once armed with that information, CDE will be well positioned to continue its journey toward a state-supported system that acknowledges the breadth, depth, and rich diversity of California's curriculum and instructional practices.

I. Introduction: Context for the Initiative

In June 2014, California *Education Code (EC)* Section 60640 (c) set forth the requirement that the SSPI provide the California SBE with recommendations for expanding the current CAASPP. This charge was as follows:

> *No later than March 1, 2016, the Superintendent shall submit to the state board recommendations on expanding the CAASPP to include additional assessments, for consideration at a regularly scheduled public meeting. The Superintendent shall also submit these recommendations to the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature and to the Director of Finance in accordance with all of the following: (1)*

In consultation with stakeholders, including, but not necessarily limited to, California teachers, individuals with expertise in assessing English learners and pupils with disabilities, parents, and measurement experts, the Superintendent shall make recommendations regarding assessments including the grade level, content, and type of assessment. These recommendations shall take into consideration the assessments already administered or planned pursuant to subdivision 60640(b). The Superintendent shall consider the use of consortium-developed assessments, various item types, computer-based testing, and a timeline for implementation. (2) The recommendations shall consider assessments in subjects, including, but not necessarily limited to, history-social science, technology, visual and performing arts, and other subjects as appropriate, as well as English language arts, mathematics, and science assessments to augment the assessments required under subdivision (b), and the use of various assessment options, including, but not necessarily limited to, computer-based tests, locally scored performance tasks, and portfolios. (3) The recommendations shall include the use of an assessment calendar that would schedule the assessments identified pursuant to paragraph 60640(2) over several years, the use of matrix sampling, if appropriate, and the use of population sampling. (4) The recommendations shall include a timeline for test development, and shall include cost estimates for subject areas, as appropriate. (5) Upon approval by the state board and the appropriation of funding for this purpose, the Superintendent shall develop and administer approved assessments. The state board shall approve test blueprints, achievement level descriptors, testing periods, performance standards, and a reporting plan for each approved assessment.

To support the SSPI with meeting the expectations called for in this statute, the CDE engaged in activities during the 2014–15 school year to ensure stakeholder engagement and reflect on the current assessment and accountability context, both at the state and federal levels. These "preliminary" activities were intended to serve as the foundation for subsequent steps in addressing the expectations of *EC* 60640(c). Key among these was a series of reports developed by the state's test contractor, Educational Testing Service (ETS), at the request of the CDE. These reports summarized the feedback collected from diverse stakeholder groups via focus group discussions and a survey. Outcomes from these foundational activities are summarized in Section II of this report.

Subsequently, in fall 2015, the CDE contracted with WestEd's SAAS program to study all existing documentation associated with this initiative, including those authored by the SSPI, and develop a report that articulated a vision for a comprehensive, coherent assessment system in California. SAAS staff were to build from the groundwork in place from the preliminary activities while completing the following specific tasks:

- **Step 1: Develop a California Assessment System Framework**. An assessment framework lays out guiding principles for building a comprehensive assessment system. Sub-steps in which SAAS engaged to complete this task included the following: (a) Reviewing records, reports, or summaries of all historical activities so the information could inform their understanding of the current context for this work; (b) collecting key resources about effective, next-generation assessment systems, such as research-supported guidelines for best practices in educational measurement and reports from national or professional

organizations; and (c) synthesizing all collected information to develop a draft framework, or set of guiding principles, for California's comprehensive assessment system. This work is described in greater detail in Section III of this report.

- **Step 2: Facilitate Advisory Panel Meetings.** Another key responsibility for SAAS assessment experts and researchers was the facilitation of advisory panel meetings convened by the San Joaquin County Office of Education (SJCOE). The purpose of the meetings was to review the draft framework and consider changes to the existing assessment system that might be in keeping with the draft framework principles. This work is described in greater detail in Section IV of this report.

- **Step 3: Develop Culminating Recommendations for the CDE.** As part of the scope of work, the SAAS team was charged with analyzing input from the advisory panels and using findings to develop a set of recommendations that describes measures that were not only suggested by the panelists, but were aligned to the Framework principles. It is important to note that the recommendations, as described in Section V, were intended to inform and support the CDE and the SSPI as the final recommendations were developed. The SSPI will submit his final recommendations to the SBE at its March 2016 board meeting.

II. Collection of Preliminary Stakeholder Input by the CDE: Survey and Regional Meetings

In this section, information about the data collection activities that occurred between May 2014 and August 2015 is summarized. During this time period, ETS, under the direction of CDE, gathered feedback from key stakeholder groups was collected through multiple activities, including in-person focus group discussions and online surveys.

The goal of this outreach was to provide the CDE with input about key elements of the CAASPP system. Specifically, participants were asked to provide input on the preferred purposes and content of potential assessments that might be added to the CAASPP system. Focus groups were convened and online surveys were conducted regarding the following content areas:

- History Social Science

- Science Digital Library

- Math End-Of-Course (EOC) Assessment

- Primary Language Assessment

- Science

- Technology

- Performing Arts

- Visual Arts

Many of the suggestions emerging from these activities were related to making the system more comprehensive through the addition of new summative assessments. A summary of these ideas and suggestions is provided in Table 1; please also see key resources in Appendices C and D.

Table 1. Summary of Input from Preliminary Activities (Focus Group Discussions and Online Surveys)

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
History-Social Science Assessments	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • Develop a summative assessment in history-social science. Test would have the following characteristics: computer adaptive with paper-pencil option; primarily scenario-based items and performance tasks; based on the overarching standards articulated in the history-social science framework rather than the individual content standards, with a focus on promoting analytical skills and conceptual understanding (like Common Core State Standards [CCSS]) rather than retention of facts; an early grade focus on core/foundational knowledge; and course-specific in higher grades instead of cumulative. • Develop diagnostic and interim/benchmark assessments for local testing. These tests could be used to hold teachers accountable for teaching and students for learning, to determine the degree to which standards have been met, and to guide course and program planning across grade levels for coherence and continuity. • Additional purposes for the test include informing and improving instruction, measuring student growth, and reinforcing the importance of the content area.	One or more participating stakeholders provided comments about the following: • Students that are newly arrived to the United States who have limited knowledge of the English language and U.S. history would not be tested. • State standards (adopted in 1998) may need to be modified to better align with the CCSS literacy standards for history/social sciences and with twenty-first century principles that prioritize teaching of concepts and skills. • New history-social science assessments might contribute unduly to the overall testing burden on students and schools. • Grade twelve students may not be motivated to perform well both on EOC and Advanced Placement exams. Less agreement among participating stakeholders emerged about the following: • Whether students in grades three through twelve should be tested annually or by grade span, with general support for annual testing at grades five and eight and EOC exams for grades ten through twelve.

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
Mathematics EOC Assessments	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • EOC assessments may be most useful in Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, and Integrated Math (1, 2, and 3). EOC assessments should not be developed for Advanced Placement (AP) courses. • The EOC assessments' primary purpose is to measure student achievement or mastery of the mathematics CCSS including mathematical practices. They also could be used to improve instruction; identify students needing additional support; enable student placement or determination of level of college- and career-readiness; inform decision-making about course grades; and as an alternative to the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE). • All students completing a specified EOC, regardless of grade level, would be required to take the associated test. • Students taking an EOC assessment should be provided "language support" in their first language. • Characteristics of the EOC assessments are as follows: computer adaptive with a paper-pencil option; item types could include SRs, TEs, CRs, scenario-based items, and performance tasks; integrated tasks and questions also could be included that assess more than one standard or sets of items linked to one stimulus; overall, the EOC assessments should be as similar to the Smarter Balanced assessment in mathematics assessment as possible in format, delivery, and eligible item types.	Participating stakeholders were not in agreement about the following: • Administering an EOC assessment to students also taking a Smarter Balanced assessment in mathematics. • Whether EOC assessment results should be used for accountability purposes or to inform LEA-level accountability (e.g., Local Control Accountability Plans) Nearly all, however, rejected the idea of using results to inform teacher evaluation decisions.

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
Performing Arts Assessment	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • Add a new performing arts assessment that is summative, but supplemented with formative options. The summative assessment would measure students' skills, abilities, knowledge, and growth over time in various art disciplines. Together, these measures would encourage "literacy" in the visual/performing arts, provide useful feedback for students and arts educators, and offer opportunities for students to self-evaluate and reflect. • Students would be tested at a minimum of once per grade band (three through five, six through eight, nine through twelve). All students would be tested in grades 4 and 7, with benchmark testing at grades two, five, and eight (other grades added as needed). • The high school assessment should be course-specific and/or based on student interest and experience. • These assessments may be computer-based, paper-pencil, performance tasks, and portfolio. Item/task types might include performance tasks, selected response (SR), constructed response (CR), and technology enhanced (TE) items. Multiple formats would ensure that teachers have the flexibility to select the measures that best align with their curriculum and with students' aptitudes and interests. • The new assessments should be aligned to Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) standards and associated arts curriculum, National Core Arts Standards, twenty-first century skills, and the four "Cs": critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration (if applicable).	One or more participating stakeholders provided comments about the following: • To support implementation, the state could develop rubrics for evaluating performance tasks and portfolio components, with an option for teachers to tailor rubrics to accommodate students with limited access, knowledge, and/or experience with the arts. • Having performing arts assessments would elevate and validate the importance of the arts, place the subject area on par with the tested content areas in terms of funding, ensure access to quality arts programs, and hold schools accountable for teaching visual/performing arts. • The adopted arts standards should be reviewed and updated on a five-year cycle. • Results from the performing arts assessment should not be used for decisions related to funding, teacher salary, or teacher tenure. • If the tests are used for program evaluation, the variability in accessibility of arts programs across districts and schools should be considered.

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
Primary Language Assessment (PLA)	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • Add a summative PLA to help ensure that students are achieving grade-level standards in their primary language while also measuring skills and knowledge reflected in the Smarter Balanced assessments (including speaking). • A PLA also could be used to evaluate dual-language or bilingual language programs. • The proposed target population would include ELs that are newly arrived (less than 12 months), current ELs (identified as ELs for 12 months or more), and ELs with disabilities. Also participating would be students in dual-language or bilingual programs or who receive recommendation to participate, and students attempting to earn the State Seal of Bi-literacy. • The PLA would have the following characteristics: aligned to CCSS en Español and primary language text; administered at grades three through eight and eleven; computer-based, preferably adaptive; include a one-on-one speaking component and linked to diagnostic and formative measures and tools that would be useful to educators. • Test features should be comparable to those found on the Smarter Balanced English Language Arts (ELA) assessment in terms of content assessed, length, rigor, item types (including performance tasks), and learning expectations. Practice tests may be needed to help students become accustomed to any new technology and/or delivery mode. • The cost of a PLA may be an important consideration, specifically in relation to administration and scoring (especially of performance tasks) of the test.	One or more participating stakeholders provided comments about the following: • The cost of a PLA may be an important consideration, specifically in relation to administration and scoring (especially of performance tasks) of the test. • A strong support for implementation would be a digital library that serves as a clearinghouse for educator-developed tools, to be used at each LEA's discretion • Students who earn a "deserving" rating on the PLA could be awarded the State Seal of Biliteracy (SSB) on their diplomas.

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
Science Assessments	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • A summative assessment is needed in science. It would have the following characteristics: computer adaptive with a paper-pencil option; "hands-on" and "virtual" tasks used, as well as a variety of item types (CR, SR [limited], performance tasks, and TE items); and aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). • Also needed are high school science EOC exams that are specific to key courses of science instruction, formative assessments, interim assessments, and an item bank for local testing. • Target population is students in grades five, eight, and eleven for state-mandated testing and all students in kindergarten through grade twelve for local testing. • Science assessments should be integrated across grades and content domains and/or all three content domains that correspond with the NGSS core disciplinary ideas (Biological Science/Life Science, Earth and Space Science, and Physical Science).	One or more participating stakeholders provided comments about the following: • Students with severe cognitive disabilities should be tested only at federally required grades in order to reduce the testing burden on these students. • The state may want to learn more about NGSS-based assessments developed by multi-state consortia. Benefits of doing so include access to a larger pool of items and leveraging of resources in ways that could reduce the costs and time needed to develop state-exclusive assessment materials. While performance expectations should be assessed at grade level for grades three through five, stakeholders were less clear about whether grades six through twelve should be assessed at grade level or across grade levels.
State-Supported and Expanded Digital Library (Focus on Science)	One or more participating stakeholders offered the following general suggestions about expanding the Digital Library (DL): • Add an introductory section that explains the DL purpose, how to use it, and how materials are submitted and included. • Include interim forms and items and formative tools and processes, with professional development materials specific to formative assessment practices (i.e., frequently asked	It is important to note that some participating stakeholders provided suggestions specific to the DL that may not fit the definition or purpose of the DL that is used to share formative assessment tools and resources. In this section, however, all comments were included, without consideration for the appropriateness for DL inclusion.

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
	questions, webinars, strategies, tutorials on the computer skills needed for online assessment).	
	• Link resources and instructional materials to specific content.	
	• Provide pre- and post-assessment questions that allow students to evaluate themselves and their peers.	
	• Provide summative assessment resources such as practice items and tests; a released item bank; and scoring rubrics, item response exemplars, and scoring and grading guides (e.g., with key terms and concepts). Item metadata might also be included, as well as test blueprints, readability measures for items and passages, and a glossary of terms.	
	• Include instructional resources such as exemplar lesson plans, model units, and curriculum materials (developed by teachers, curriculum specialists, and content experts) and links to curriculum guides and lesson plans.	
	• Include links to collaborative learning activities, community resources, event/field trip suggestions, resources for special populations (e.g., links to applications and assistive technology or ADA-related tools and activities).	
	Specifically in relation to expansion of the DL in science, one or more participating stakeholders offered the following suggestions:	
	• The introductory section should clarify the state's involvement with the NGSS (e.g., purpose, development process, implementation, connection between NGSS and CA NGSS, differences between 1998 CA science content standards and CA NGSS, glossary) and provide detailed information about	

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
	the CAASPP science assessments (test taker rights, accommodations, supports, use of results, assessment resources). • Include information about science careers, summer internships, scholarship opportunities, and general resources for students and parents to explore science opportunities and incorporate science and science topics into everyday life. • Include useful CA NGSS-aligned materials such as crosswalks that demonstrate points where science standards intersect/overlap with other content standards (e.g., pacing guides linking science and mathematics instruction, materials and tasks to support scientific writing related to ELA standards) as well as instructional resources (games, simulations, experiments, and interactive labs). • Provide information to support effective use of CAASPP science assessment results.	
Technology Assessment	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • Embed or integrate a new technology assessment into the state's assessment system that measures proficiency in both digital/information literacy and foundational skills. • Administer a stand-alone assessment at certain benchmark grades only, while embedding the assessment in all other grades. • Measure overarching themes and anchor standards across grade levels, resulting in a vertical progression of standards and skills. • Measure transferable skills (e.g., those linked to college- and career-readiness) that are relevant to and integrated with all tested content areas.	One or more participating stakeholders provided comments about the following: • Need common terminology related to technology and "digital citizenship" (social media etiquette, plagiarism, etc.) • Resistance to new assessment may emerge due to added testing burden, but a stand-alone assessment may encourage LEAs to add teachers who will focus on technology and improve technology-related course offerings.

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
	• Could be based on the Information & Communication Technology (ICT) Digital Literacy Action Plan, the California Library Standards, the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) profiles of learners, and/or the Career/Technical Education (CTE) anchor standards (identical across 15 industry sectors) • Desired characteristics of the assessment include the following: computer-based; includes portfolio option with scenario-based and performance tasks that allows students to demonstrate their familiarity with technology as they complete higher-order tasks; aligned to the CCSS in terms of technology and digital literacy.	
Visual Arts Assessment	One or more participating stakeholders offered these suggestions: • Add a new visual arts summative assessment that could be used to measure knowledge and skills associated with making art, analyzing/communicating about art, and artistic expression. The assessment could also measure foundational knowledge, technical skills to make art in specific media (mostly high school), critical thinking, artistic literacy, art in its cultural and historical context, and expression of artistic ideas and concepts. • All students who are enrolled in visual arts classes in grades four, six through eight, and nine through twelve would be tested. • The assessments should be aligned with the most recent version of the Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) standards as well as National Core Arts Standards. They should include categories of skills that are consistent across different media, and are sequential and developmental (increase in complexity). • Assessments for students in kindergarten through grade eight should focus on foundational knowledge, while assessments for high school students should focus on the creative process, performance, thinking/analytical skills, and should emphasize	Participating stakeholders were not in agreement about the following: • Whether all high school students who complete basic visual arts should take an introductory-level exam, and more advanced students should be administered more specialized course-based assessment. • Whether to offer a computer-adaptive test, a fixed form test, or a combination of the two. General agreement did emerge that a portfolio component should be a part of this assessment to allow flexibility in how students demonstrate what they know and can do, provide multiple ways for students to demonstrate knowledge and skills, and accommodate different learning styles and engage students. • Whether to test all students or use a population sampling approach. One or more participating stakeholders provided

Content Area and/or Topic	Summary of Comments about Content Area or Topic	Cautions or Other Considerations
	performance tasks, portfolios, and artist statements.	comments about the following: • Having an assessment would validate the importance of visual art as a subject and provide an opportunity for feedback for students, parents, and programs. By implementing a visual arts assessment, the state would be holding districts and schools accountable for providing all students equal access to high-quality arts programs. Doing so may increase funding to develop, staff, and sustain high-quality art programs and encourage hiring art specialist teachers and offering visual arts professional development for all teachers. • Results from the new assessment should not be used to evaluate teacher performance. • Results from the new visual arts assessment would not be formally reported to parents.

Outcomes from this preliminary phase of work served as the foundation for subsequent steps in the process of addressing the expectations of *EC* Section 60640 (c).

III. Development of a California Assessment Framework

In Section III, the process used to develop the California assessment framework is described. This discussion is followed by a presentation of the guiding principles embedded in the framework, entitled *Development of a Research-Supported Framework to Guide the Enhancement of California's Next-Generation Comprehensive Assessment System*.

To support the SSPI with his charge of recommendations for expanding the CAASPP as appropriate, the CDE elected to consult with nationally recognized assessment experts and researchers from WestEd's SAAS program to ensure that any recommendations for system improvement or expansion that emerged were in keeping with guidelines from the educational assessment and measurement community about best practices in state testing. SAAS staff examined a number of key resources and synthesized recommendations from those documents to develop a framework that is designed to inform considerations for enhancing and/or improving the state's comprehensive system of assessments.

The researchers first worked with the CDE to develop a description of a comprehensive assessment system. This description is grounded in the understanding that a state's comprehensive assessment system includes all measures—whether developed locally, commercially, or by the state or administered at the classroom, school, district, or state levels. These measures should work together to support teaching and learning in a comprehensive, coherent, and connected way. For this reason, an efficient system will include a wide variety of high-quality assessments that produce trustworthy and useful information about what students know and can do in key grades and content areas with minimal disruption to instruction (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2015). Many features of these measures will vary, such as the assessment type (e.g., screening, diagnostic, placement, formative, interim/benchmark, summative), assessment purpose (e.g., for instructional decision-making, for accountability, or for admission to a group or program), and delivery mode (e.g., paper-pencil or computer supported, administered individually or to a group of students). As a whole, these diverse measures provide information that is useful to students, parents, educators, administrators, policymakers, the general public, and/or state leaders.

SAAS staff then worked independently to gather seminal research and measurement resources and collected documentation about the design and implementation of assessment initiatives in California. Documents that were reviewed included the following:

- Research and best-practice literature on responsible testing practices from organizations such as the American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education (2015; *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*); CCSSO (see Appendix I for key resource); National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST); National

Governing Board (oversees the National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP]; see Appendix L for key resource); Council of Great City Schools (see Appendix K for key resource); and National Research Council (2002)

- CDE documentation (see Appendix B for key resources), including:

    o *A Blueprint for Great Schools*

    o *A Blueprint for Great Schools Version 2.0*

    o *Recommendations for Transitioning California to a Future Assessment System*

    o Assembly Bills 250 and 484

- Documented California stakeholder assessment input on a variety of content areas and assessments

- Reports and literature on the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS; see Appendix E for key resources), including:

    o *Developing Assessments for the Next Generation Science Standards*

    o National Science Teachers Association position statement*: Assessment*

    o *Science Assessment Item Collaborative: Assessment Framework for the Next Generation Science Standards*

- U.S. Department of Education peer review of state assessment systems: *Non-Regulatory Guidance for States for Meeting Requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.* (See Appendices F and G for key resources.)

- Assessment policies related to the California Local Control Funding Formula (see Appendix J for a summary of state priority areas and indicators)

- Assessment practices of states across the nation (see Appendix N for a summary by state)

Researchers synthesized information from this wide range of resources into a framework that could be used as a foundation for the development/enhancement of a comprehensive assessment system for the state of California. Through this effort, the SAAS team identified key themes and consistent messages that describe a vision for the state's future assessment system and that are supported by research and best-practice recommendations. Each of these framework principles is introduced with the following text:

California stakeholders—including students, educators, and parents—envision and will benefit from...

1. **...an integrated, coherent system of multiple measures**, all working in unison to (a) model and enable effective teaching practices that promote student engagement and

optimal learning; and (b) yield trustworthy performance data that can be used in a wide range of content areas.

2. **…a system that communicates and supports state priorities** for instruction of all students, including expectations for learning related to rigorous college- and career-ready standards, qualifying for postsecondary education and training (e.g., A-G subject requirements), and critical twenty-first century skills.

3. **...a purpose-driven system** in which each measure in this system—whether traditional selected response items, a writing prompt, performance- or portfolio-based, a culminating project, or other assessment type—serves a specific purpose or addresses a particular need.

4. **...an inclusive system** in which each measure is developed, administered, and scored using research-supported recommendations (e.g., universal design for assessment, bias and sensitivity reviews) for ensuring it is fair and accessible to *all* students, including English learners and students with disabilities.

5. **...a system that is guided by research and industry best-practice-supported expectations** for ensuring that each measure in this system meets high standards for technical quality. For each assessment in this system, the body of evidence to support test use should include (a) a statement of test purpose and target population for testing and (b) specification of the content standards on which the test is based. If designed for high-stakes purposes such as school- or state-level accountability, the body of evidence also should include (c) evidence of alignment to those standards; (d) specification of the rationale for the approach to each measure (e.g., research-based recommendations about best practices in specific content areas such as science); and (e) appropriate evidence of technical quality, including validity for the intended purpose and its reliability.

6. **...an innovative system** that capitalizes on existing and emerging technologies that enable effective and efficient testing of all students and the timely and responsible use of results by a range of stakeholders.

7. **...a transparent system** that provides clear guidelines for appropriate administration, scoring, reporting, and use of results.

8. **...a dynamic, streamlined system** that is feasible, efficient, and cost-effective; designed to yield actionable information about what students or groups of students know and does so in strategic ways (e.g., matrix sampling, frequency of assessment) in order to minimize burden to local educational agency staff and disruption to instruction.

9. **...general guidance, resources, and tools from the CDE** that support local-level decision-making about the combination of measures that is most appropriate in each situation.

The principles that appear in this framework, which are presented in Table 2 with the associated sources of information for each, were developed to represent core beliefs by California stakeholders

about the state's assessment system and are inclusive of research-based recommendations, best-practice expectations from states across the nation and within districts in California, and experience-based recommendations from the SSPI and the CDE. It is important to note, that the order in which these are presented is not intended to signal that one is a higher priority than another; the goal is to provide the state with broad guidance that it can customize to meet its needs. Attending to this information situates the state as a national model for implementation of an innovative comprehensive and cohesive assessment system.

Table 2: Crosswalk of Proposed Framework Principles to Supporting Documentation: How Do Each of the Sources of Information Support the Framework Principles?

Framework Principle		California Documents	Research Literature	Stakeholder Input	State Scan	NGSS References
Integrated and Coherent 1. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from an integrated, coherent system of multiple measures, all working in unison to...	1a. ...model and enable effective teaching practices that promote student engagement and optimal learning.	X	X	X		X
	1b. ..yield trustworthy performance data that can be used in a wide range of content areas.	X	X	X		X
Supportive 2. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from a system that communicates and supports state priorities for instruction of all students, including expectations for learning related to rigorous college- and career-ready standards, qualifying for postsecondary education and training (e.g., A–G subject requirements), and critical twenty-first century skills.		X	X	X		X

Framework Principle		California Documents	Research Literature	Stakeholder Input	State Scan	NGSS References
Purpose-Driven 3. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from a purpose-driven system in which each measure in this system — whether traditional selected response items, a writing prompt, performance- or portfolio-based, a culminating project, or other assessment type — serves a specific purpose or addresses a particular need.		X	X	X	X	X
Fair and Inclusive 4. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from an inclusive system in which each measure is developed, administered, and scored using research-supported recommendations (e.g., universal design for assessment, bias and sensitivity reviews) for ensuring it is fair and accessible to *all* students, including English learners and students with disabilities.		X	X	X	X	X
Supported by Research and Best Practice Recommendations 5. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from a system that is guided by research and	5a. ...a statement of test purpose and target population for testing.	X	X	X	X	X
	5b. ...specification of the content standards on which the test is based.	X	X	X	X	X
	5c. If designed for high-stakes purposes such as school- or state-level accountability, the body of evidence should also include... ...evidence of alignment to those standards.	X	X	X	X	X

Framework Principle		California Documents	Research Literature	Stakeholder Input	State Scan	NGSS References
industry best-practice-supported expectations for ensuring that each measure in this system meets the highest standards for technical quality. For each assessment in this system, the body of evidence to support test use should include...	...specification of the rationale for the approach to each measure (e.g., research-based recommendations about best testing practices in specific content areas such as science).		X	X		X
	...appropriate evidence of technical quality, including validity for the intended purpose and its reliability.	X	X			X
Innovative, Effective, and Efficient 6. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from an innovative system that capitalizes on existing and emerging technologies that enable effective and efficient testing of all students and the timely and responsible use of results by a range of stakeholders.		X		X		X
Clear Guidelines For Administration and Use 7. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from a transparent system that provides clear guidelines for appropriate administration, scoring, reporting, and use of results.			X	X		X

Framework Principle	California Documents	Research Literature	Stakeholder Input	State Scan	NGSS References
Feasible and Cost-Effective 8. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from a dynamic, streamlined system that is feasible, efficient, and cost-effective; designed to yield actionable information about what students or groups of students know and does so in strategic ways (e.g., matrix sampling, frequency of assessment) in order to minimize burden to local educational agency staff and disruption to instruction.	X		X		X
Recognizes State Role 9. California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from general guidance, resources, and tools from the CDE that support local-level decision-making about the combination of measures that is most appropriate in each situation.	X	X	X	X	X

IV. Advisory Panel Meetings and Recommendations

Following the collection of preliminary input and development of the draft framework, meetings were held with selected advisors from across the state to collect additional input from key stakeholder groups and policy leaders. In Section IV, the processes used to identify and convene advisory panel members are described, as well as the activities in which the panelists engaged and their suggestions, recommendations, and comments regarding assessment expansion or improvement.

Advisory Panel Process

In fall 2015, San Joaquin County Office of Education, on behalf of the CDE, convened select groups of California policymakers/leaders and school and district leaders in face-to-face meetings to collect high-level input about the future of California's assessment system and the possible expansion of the CAASPP. These meetings were facilitated by experienced County Office of Education staff and SAAS assessment experts. Input from the advisory panels was intended to supplement information previously collected by the CDE to help inform the SSPI's decision-making as he determines the final recommendations that will be presented to the SBE at its March 2016 meeting.

Three advisory panel meetings were held, two incorporating a diverse set of kindergarten through grade twelve stakeholders (one in northern California and one in southern California) and one convening higher education leaders (please see Appendix M for information about panelists attending the meetings). At each meeting, the draft framework principles were reviewed and advisory panelists were asked to provide additional information for improving the description of a comprehensive assessment system. Panelists were provided a handout to assist in understanding what currently is included in the CAASPP in response to various federal and state mandates. The role of the advisory panel members was to review the current state assessment system requirements and make suggestions about what an "ideal" system might look like if new assessments could be added. Participants were informed about the emerging requirements in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, specifically in relation to the maintenance of annual testing in grades three through eight and high school in English language arts/literacy and mathematics and grade-span testing in science.

With the draft framework principles in mind, participants were asked to identify particular gaps in the assessment system in terms of specific content areas, grade levels, and/or student populations or groups not currently represented. After discussing these gaps as a large group, facilitators and panelists broke out into three smaller groups to discuss potential additions and/or changes to the assessment system. While groups were encouraged to reach consensus, all suggestions/ideas were captured on a data collection template created for this purpose. Information recorded included the proposed new assessment's name; the test's purpose; the content area, grade(s), and student population(s) tested; a delivery mode; proposed item types; and who was primarily responsible for the development and use of this test. The ultimate goal of the activity was to have the advisors carefully consider all options for enhancing or improving the current CAASPP system *in light of the framework principles*, clarify the rationale for each recommendation, and provide a prioritized list of changes to the current system that they believed were necessary *and* feasible.

Advisory Panel Findings

A number of specific recommendations emerged from the three advisory panels. First among those recommendations was a list of assessments that kindergarten through grade twelve panelists at the two sessions (North and South) thought might strengthen the current system, rated by level of importance (Priority Levels 1–6). Table 3 provides detailed information about the assessments that those panelists recommended adding to the state's comprehensive system and the level of priority associated with each assessment.

Table 3. K–12 Advisory Panelists Recommendations for Expanding CAASPP, by Group Session

Session Group	Assessments & Priority Level	Grades	Assessment Type	Responsibility	Comments
North					
1	1. Civics	6–8 & 9–12	Summative (EOC or project-based)	State	--
	2. Kindergarten Readiness	K	Formative	State support	Need task force
	3. ELA & Math	1 & 2	Formative & Summative	State support	Need task force
	4. History/Social Science	Each grade span	Summative	State support	Key concepts
	5. World Languages	6 & 12	Summative	State support	Not required
2	1. CA NGSS-Based Science	5, 8, & 10	Summative (no expansion, NGSS-based)	State	---
	2. History/Social Science or Civics	TBD	Civics Skills Sets (possibly EOC)	State support	LEAs may develop
	3. ELA & Math	2, 9, & 10	Interim, Formative	State support	Smarter Balanced
	4. Career Readiness Skills	6–12	Summative	State support	Need task force
	5. Kindergarten Readiness	K	Formative	State support	LEA developed
3	1. History/Social Science	5, 6–8, 9–12	Summative	State	Review standards
	2. Arts, World Languages, or CTE	TBD	Summative	State support	LEA choice

Session Group	Assessments & Priority Level	Grades	Assessment Type	Responsibility	Comments
	3. ELA & Math	9 & 10	Interim	State support	Focus on rubrics
	4. Science	5, 8, & 10	Summative (no expansion, new approach)	State	Matrix sampling
	5. ---	---	---	---	---
South					
1	1. Social/Emotional Health	K–3	Formative	State support	Intervention focus
	2. Primary Language Assessment	TBD	Summative (oral proficiency)	State	Spanish first
	3. Civics	Each grade span	Summative (possibly project-based)	State support	Item bank
	4. ACT/SAT	11	Summative	State	New information
	5. Kindergarten Readiness	K	Formative	State support	Population sampling
2	1. Science	Each grade span	Summative	State	Use literacy standards
	2. Replacement for CAHSEE	9	Cumulative	State	ELA & math
	3. Primary Language Assessment	3–8 & 11	Formative (inform decision-making)	State support	Authentic for ELs
	4. Academic Readiness Tool	End of K	Formative	State support	Intervention focus
	5. Social Science	Each grade span	Formative (inform decision-making)	State support	Use literacy standards

Session Group	Assessments & Priority Level	Grades	Assessment Type	Responsibility	Comments
3	1. Early Learning Indicators	K–2	Formative	State support	Not required
	2. School Climate Survey	3–12	Annual measure	State support	Student satisfaction
	3. Whole Child Portfolio	3–12	Formative	State support	Achievement focus
	4. Science	5, 8, & 10	Summative	State support	Performance tasks
	5. History/Social Science	3–12	Summative	State support	LEA developed

Overall, the following suggestions appeared in multiple groups across the two kindergarten through grade twelve sessions:

- All groups endorsed the addition of a history/social science assessment.

- Nearly all groups (5 of 6) recommended adding some type of kindergarten/primary grade readiness assessment or measure of achievement in English language arts (ELA) and math at grades one and two.

- Nearly all groups (5 of 6) reported that they were in favor of maintaining the state's current testing of science once at each grade span.

While the higher education panelists were not asked to provide recommendations for new assessments, as with the kindergarten through grade twelve panelists, they were encouraged to engage in large-group discussions that raised a number of suggestions for consideration as the state moves forward with its development of a comprehensive assessment system. Those suggestions emerged from all three panels include the following:

- Consider ways to ensure full measurement of college-readiness via multiple measures.

- Explore strategies for reducing testing burden while still providing students, schools, and parents with valuable information about students (e.g., content and population sampling).

- When feasible, encourage a state-support role in which the CDE enables effective local-level decision-making about assessments through guidance documents, training modules, expansion of the current Digital Library to include additional content areas, and/or review and vetting of particular materials (e.g., templates or rubrics).

- Districts may want to collaborate in the development of measures in content areas such as visual and performing arts, world languages, primary language, or career/technical education.

V. Culminating Recommendations for the CDE

As previously described in Sections III and IV, SAAS staff engaged in a series of steps to ensure a full understanding of the California context for assessment. In particular, this work included a study of research-supported guidelines for a comprehensive assessment system, as well as review of input collected from a wide range of stakeholders. The next task was to sort through all of this information and develop a set of culminating recommendations that not only represented stakeholder values, but also adhered to the principles articulated in the Framework and acknowledged the assessment landscape as the reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was emerging.

As these recommendations took shape, it was clear that tradeoffs would need to be considered between stakeholder input, the Framework guiding principles, the California context, and assessment policy research. Several challenges emerged as the SAAS team developed a set of recommendations attempting to balance the needs of these sometimes competing interests. First,

while many stakeholders expressed interest in adding a required summative assessment in a range of content areas, doing so would violate Principle 8:

> *California stakeholders — including students, educators, and parents — envision and will benefit from a dynamic, streamlined system that is feasible, efficient, and cost-effective; designed to yield actionable information about what students or groups of students know and does so in strategic ways (e.g., matrix sampling, frequency of assessment) in order to minimize burden to local educational agency staff and disruption to instruction.*

If the state were to add all the assessments that were suggested, the system would be prohibitively burdensome to students and schools and costly. Since the Framework calls for a comprehensive system that includes state *supported*—not just state-*required*—assessments, many strong ideas were presented that may warrant further consideration by local-level assessment decision-makers.

A second challenge was attending to the changing policy context for this project. Each phase of work informed the next, and it was essential that SAAS staff continue to work closely with the CDE to ensure that outcomes would be reasonable, given the current context in California and across the nation. Key among important contextual factors included the following:

1. Activities related to reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and December 2015 passing of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (Appendix H)

2. Implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula and the accompanying Local Control Accountability Plan (Appendix J)

3. Emergence of the U.S. Department of Education's Testing Action Plan (Appendix G) and updated guidelines for federal peer review (Appendix F)

Finally, SAAS researchers needed to ensure that Guiding Principle 1 remained at the forefront of this work; in an effective and efficient comprehensive assessment system, all measures—whether developed locally, commercially, or by the state or administered at the classroom, school, district, or state levels—must work together to support teaching and learning in a coherent and deeply connected way. It is evident from both the stakeholder groups and advisory panels that many state constituents maintain the belief that for a content area to be truly valued by parents and policymakers, the state education agency (SEA) must develop and administer a summative assessment in that content area. While administering a test may lend importance and attention to a particular content area for purposes related to accountability, this viewpoint could not be the rationale for adding new state assessments that may not meet the criteria spelled out in the Framework. In fact, given the new ESSA and the state-adopted LCAP as required through the LCFF legislation, SAAS staff elected to recommend adding very few additional state-mandated assessments, but rather, develop a robust set of resources that value the breadth and depth of a well-rounded curriculum and emphasize the importance of the right assessment for the right purpose.

While SAAS staff is recommending the addition of only one subject/content area to the state-required arena of summative assessments (history/social science), also recommended is a significant investment of state-supported assessment resources to support a comprehensive, well-rounded

curriculum for California students. Indeed, SAAS assessment experts recommend that the CDE support these efforts to counter the notion that the only curriculum that counts is the curriculum that gets tested. We further note that with the implementation of the Local Control Accountability Plan, LEAs can determine what makes the most sense for their community to hold them accountable. Finally, it must be acknowledged that implementation of any one of these recommendations will necessitate careful consideration of all potential consequences of expanding the CAASPP and may require legislative action or changes in state or local funding formulas, and such processes are not necessarily under the sole control of the CDE.

Recommendations to the CDE for a Next-Generation, Comprehensive Assessment System

Recommendation 1. Add new state measure(s) in history/social science. As shown in Table 4 below, every small group that participated in the North and South advisory panel meetings advocated for the addition of one or more new measures in the history/social sciences content area. In fact, it was the only content area that had agreement across all six advisory panel groups. In addition, the higher education advisory panel articulated general support for instruction and assessment that promotes critical reading and expository writing skills, and that request may be partially addressed through the ideas for new assessments that emerged in the kindergarten through grade twelve panels. While consensus did not emerge about the specific content or grade levels for the assessment, given the general sense from stakeholders that the addition of a state-delivered assessment in the history/social sciences content area may address a current gap in the system, SAAS researchers sought to provide the CDE with research- and best practice-supported recommendations for implementing a history/social sciences assessment component into its emerging next generation, comprehensive assessment system. Specific recommendations follow. Given the stakeholder input and the advisory panel discussion, it is recommended that the CDE consider implementation of these recommendations in the following order:

a) **Review history/social science standards.** The *Draft History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools* (still under review at this time) provides an important backdrop from which to begin considering the foundation for any new state-supported assessments in history/social science assessment priorities. The CDE may want to invest in a review of the current content standards to ensure that any future assessments are consistent with the newly designed history/social science framework, reflect what the state currently values regarding history/social science, and continue to embody the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for college- and career-readiness and responsible citizenship. Depending on the findings of such a review, and assuming legislation allows for it, a formal standards revision process may ensue. This effort may benefit from incorporation of standards specifically linked to emerging state expectations in terms of technology literacy. As it likely will take 3–5 years to develop and field test the new measures in this content area, stakeholders will want assurances that the standards continue to provide a solid foundation for the new assessments.

b) **Develop a high school civics assessment.** Advisory panel members expressed a strong conviction to make sure there was an assessment that measured students' knowledge of Civics. To gain a greater understanding of the type and purpose of assessment, SAAS assessment experts recommend that CDE convene a panel of educators and social science

content/curriculum experts to identify a small subset of standards from the History/Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools for grades six through twelve on which a new state-supported Civics assessment might be based.

SAAS assessment researchers suggest that this assessment be designed to be administered at any high school grade (nine through twelve) that each district determines is most appropriate given the grade(s) at which the identified Civics standards are taught in that district. This measure could be primarily computer-supported and use selected-response items that can be rapidly scored (perhaps locally) and results reported. Because advisory group members appeared most interested in system-level (to what extent have our content standards and associated curricula prepared students for responsible citizenship?) and cohort-level (to what extent are this year's students prepared for responsible citizenship?) information, the CDE may want to consider development of a survey-type test that provides a broad scan of what students know and can do in relation to a small subset of the history/social science standards that are strongly linked to responsible citizenship.

While the SAAS team recognizes that efficiencies such as population sampling (identifying a representative sample of students for assessment, as done with the National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP]), also would provide the system- and cohort-level information stakeholders seek, after weighing the tradeoffs associated with such an approach (e.g., potential lack of effort if students know they will not receive individual results; frustration from parents and community members who believe students should be held individually accountable for this high-priority content), key lessons learned in other states suggest that a census approach is advisable. The SAAS team also considered content sampling for this assessment, but determined that the challenges of using this approach (determining how the content will be distributed across forms and across students) are substantial. Given that the California civics test, as recommended, is focused on only a small core set of standards that can be tested at any high school grade, testing time should be minimal and unlikely to create undue burden for students, schools, or districts.

c) **Develop new standards-based history/social science tests.** Develop multiple, parallel forms of a state test of the history/social studies standards for elementary and middle school. Based on the advisory panel discussions, SAAS recommends an assessment administered at both the elementary and middle school levels. However we would suggest that final decisions regarding grade levels and test type be made after adoption of the new Framework and a subsequent review of the standards as described in 1(a) above.

Should CDE determine that grade-specific exams are most informative and useful for teachers, schools, and parents, the SAAS team recommends testing at grade four (with an emphasis on California history) and grade seven (with an emphasis on world history and geography). Each of these exams can be designed to yield student-level information about what students know and can do in relation to the grade-specific standards and their progress toward state expectations for college- and career-readiness at the end of high school. As with the state's current Smarter Balanced assessments, each student would be tested on the full depth and breadth of the history/social science standards at those grades via selected- and constructed-response items and performance tasks. Ideally, some portion of the assessment developed for the middle grades

will address the literacy standards in history/social studies and any emerging technology literacy standards.

Should the state, however, determine that a cumulative assessment (i.e., one that assesses sets of standards for grade spans such as three through five and six through eight) is preferable, content experts can work with the test contractor to apply a content sampling approach. This work would follow identification of the essential standards, skills, knowledge and abilities that students should know from each particular grade span. In this scenario, the SAAS team recommends a matrix-sampled approach with testing at the end of grades five and eight. Because preliminary stakeholder feedback and advisory group panelist each noted that the California parent community strongly prefers to receive student-level information when students take a test, this testing approach also should be able to yield individual student results.

d) **Continue to explore assessment and assessment resource options in U.S. history.** Conduct further study to explore the advisability and feasibility of developing a U.S. History assessment to be administered during high school. Given California's experience with EOC assessment, along with the state's desire to limit intrusion on instructional time, the SAAS team does not recommend adding an assessment based on this course or content at this time. As the advisory panelists noted, locally developed measures (e.g., final exams) and assessments such as the Advanced Placement tests do provide the state and districts with general information about what high school students know and can do in relation to the standards focused on U.S. history.

As an alternative to a summative test in this area, the CDE may want to consider providing resources for the development of model educator-developed performance tasks and/or culminating projects that could be vetted by district-level curriculum and instruction specialists and posted on a shared site for use by U.S. History teachers across the state.

Table 4. Summary of History/Social Science Assessments Recommended for Addition to California's Comprehensive Assessment System

Location	Priority	Assessment Name	Subject/ Content Area	Grade(s)	Student Population(s)	Assessment Type	Delivery Mode	Item Type(s)	Purpose	Responsibility	Notes
North	1	Civics	Civics	6–8 9–12	All Students	Capstone Project EOC			Encourage Civic Mindedness and Involvement	State	
North	4	History/ Social Science	History/ Social Science	3–5 6–8 9–12	All Students	Summative Capstone Project EOC					Should focus on key concepts. Should include financial literacy and money management.
North	2	History/ Social Science/ Civics	Civics Skill Sets (e.g., ability to acquire historical/ current information to develop opinions based on evidence and research)		All Students				Program Evaluation Inform Instruction	State-Supported	State validates LEA-developed tests. U.S. Citizenship test should be reviewed prior to developing new Civics test; high school students should be able to pass that test. Possibly could be integrated into ELA tests, as long as it is clear which items measure history/social science content.

Location	Priority	Assessment Name	Subject/ Content Area	Grade(s)	Student Population(s)	Assessment Type	Delivery Mode	Item Type(s)	Purpose	Responsibility	Notes
North	1	History / Social Science	History/ Social Science	5 6–8 9–12	Matrix Sampling	Summative— Annually	Computer-Supported	SR CR Performance Tasks	Systems Check Sampling Inform Instruction	State State-Supported Local	Test at middle & high school and at the end of elementary. Could serve as system-level check for those grades. Revise the standards before developing the test. State-supported item bank or rubric may be useful. Could be linked to LCAP in some way.
South	3	Civics	Civics	3–5 6–8 9–12	All Students 6–8 or 9–12	Project-Based	Project			State-Supported	State supported assessment or item bank, with LEA implementation.
South	6	CA History US History Civics	CA History US History Civics		All Students	EOC Interim			Program Evaluation Systems Check		Already have AP and IB, and do not want an EOC. Should be local choice but state supported. Matrix sampling may work, key questions are more about system than about individual students. Maybe PTs administered as interim civics test.

Location	Priority	Assessment Name	Subject/ Content Area	Grade(s)	Student Population(s)	Assessment Type	Delivery Mode	Item Type(s)	Purpose	Responsibility	Notes
South	5	Social Science	Social Science	3–5 6–8 9–12	All Students				Inform Instruction	State-Supported	Incorporate as measure of literacy standards in ELA?
South	5	History/ Social Science	History/ Social Science	3–12	All Students			Performance Tasks Portfolio Rubrics	Measure Student Achievement	State-Supported Local	Locally developed State financed. State provides professional development and means for distribution.

Recommendation 2. Maintain the federally required science assessments as grade span assessments. The SAAS team understands that the CDE has begun the process to develop new, innovative science assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) as adopted by the SBE. Given the stakeholder interest and input as well as the advisory panel discussions, support of the state's intent to build NGSS-aligned assessments based on a grade-span of standards (e.g., grades three through five and grades six through eight) is evident. In addition, developing a high school assessment that is flexible enough (e.g., making the test available in either grades ten, eleven, or twelve) to accommodate varying course structures and sequences offered across the state will respond to advisory panel suggestions, as well as meet the diverse needs of LEAs.

Table 5. Summary of Science Assessment Recommendations from the Advisory Panels

Location	Priority	Assessment Name	Subject/ Content Area	Grade(s)	Student Population(s)	Assessment Type	Delivery Mode	Item Type(s)	Purpose	Responsibility	Notes
North	8	NGSS-Aligned Science	Science	3–5 6–8 9–12	All Students	Summative EOC		Lab Items	State-Level Accountability	State	NGSS-Aligned Assessment should be developed to replace the current California Standards Test, California Modified Assessment, and California Alternate Performance Assessment in Science. A summative test should be administered to the minimum number of grade spans, i.e., no more than what is federally required. The development and roll out of this assessment needs to be a different protocol than the current science tests and should include teachers and training for teachers before the assessment. Also, the assessment should include lab items. Consider a summative EOC exam, as well as a project- or lab-based experiment for a course.

Location	Priority	Assessment Name	Subject/ Content Area	Grade(s)	Student Population(s)	Assessment Type	Delivery Mode	Item Type(s)	Purpose	Responsibility	Notes
North	1	ESEA-Required NGSS-Science	Science	5, 8, and 10	All Students	Unit Embedded Summative (by grade)		Performance Tasks	School-Level Accountability District-Level Accountability State-Level Accountability	State	
North	6	NGSS-Science	Science	3–12	All Students	End-of-Unit Summative		Performance Tasks	School-Level Accountability District-Level Accountability State-Level Accountability	State	Assessment would be supplemented with Performance Tasks, Curriculum-embedded modules, and Formative blocks.
North	4	Science	Science	No Expan-sion	Matrix Sampling (at the end of the cumulative exam)		Computer Supported				No extension past federal law.

Location	Priority	Assessment Name	Subject/ Content Area	Grade(s)	Student Population(s)	Assessment Type	Delivery Mode	Item Type(s)	Purpose	Responsibility	Notes
South	1	Science	Science	3–5 6–8 9–12	All Students					State State-Supported	How might we capitalize on the literacy standards? Science, in lieu of current ELA/Math, needs to be different—project-based, NGSS-aligned, available in Spanish and other languages, less testing, matrix sampling.
South	4	Science Assessment	Science	5, 8, 10	All Students			Performance Tasks	Measure Student Achievement	State-Supported Local	State-supported performance task item bank. What if we offered up some type of process, example LAUSD, could share with us their module of project-based learning and the state's role was for alignment and our role was to facilitate sharing to other districts that do not have the resources as LAUSD. More resources put in and doing the child support role. To develop performance-state assessments is expensive. Rather do one than have the performance-based section be weak.

Recommendation 3. Develop additional science resources that can be included in the Smarter Balanced Digital Library or a similar Website. While the CDE specifically sought out information regarding the addition of science content to the Digital Library, the advisory panel members embraced the idea of a state-supported model that would provide rigorous, robust resources to the California teaching community in all subject areas, including science. The SAAS team agrees that the Digital Library would benefit greatly from the addition of science resources that meet the Digital Library criteria for being included as a formative process. Additionally, SAAS assessment experts recommend that any new science resources included in the Digital Library would also contain resources specifically around the needs of English Learners and students with disabilities. California's educators may also benefit from the addition of resources in English language arts, particularly those that address ELA literacy across the content areas (e.g., history, science and technical subjects).

Recommendation 4. Collect additional information about district-level assessments that may contribute in particular ways to a comprehensive assessment system. The two associated recommendations below are tailored to the unique California context in terms of educational practice and policy. They also represent the most current thinking about the role of assessment and how it can more closely align with curriculum and instruction in the state. As described in Section III, a comprehensive assessment system recognizes the need for a strategic balance of state and local level roles and responsibilities. To maximize this strategic balance, the SAAS team strongly encourages the state to pursue appropriate opportunities to serve in a state-supported role, providing just-in-time resources for California's teachers, administrators, and parents.

a) **Consider applying for funds to be made available by U.S. Department of Education (ED) in FY 2017 for the purpose of conducting assessment audits.** Beginning with FY17 funds, Section 1202 of the ESSA provides for grants to states, and for states to make sub-grants to districts, to conduct state and district audits for purposes such as collecting feedback on test use from stakeholder groups. ED encourages states to strategically limit the amount of instructional time used to administer state tests and suggests a 2 percent cap on time used for that purpose (see *the Testing Action Plan (2015), Appendix G)*. While the CAASPP program currently is well under the 2 percent limit that is recommended, the many and varied assessments administered by local educational agencies (LEAs) must be considered when evaluating the impact of testing on instructional time. For this reason, SAAS recommends that the CDE consider applying for funds that will be made available for the purpose of conducing local assessment audits. While these funds are expected to go out as sub-grants to LEAs, the SAAS team suggests that CDE consider developing templates, guiding questions and resources to guide these audits as well as collect information to inform future decisions regarding additional state-delivered assessments or state-supported resources.

SAAS assessment experts believe this type of research or audit is essential to the task of building a truly effective and comprehensive assessment system that meets the guiding principles spelled out in the assessment Framework. With a clearer understanding of the full portfolio of assessments currently administered in districts and schools, the CDE will be better positioned to provide and/or produce state-supported materials to support the depth and breadth of a full, well-rounded curriculum.

b) **Consistent with information gained through assessment audits as described in Recommendation 4 (a), or a like process, develop and/or vet state-supported resources and tools that support implementation of a comprehensive assessment system.** It is important to consider California's context, including the state's Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) when developing recommendations for the state's comprehensive assessment system. Within the LCAP process, districts must involve their communities in meeting the eight State Priorities and in decision-making about how to ensure appropriate and adequate delivery of services to the students they serve. As part of the process, districts must determine effective indicators of progress and develop strategies for ongoing monitoring of these indicators. While statewide, mandated assessments will likely be a part of that process, fair and technically sound school- and district-developed measures that are designed for the characteristics of these local communities must also emerge.

For that reason, in addition to the Digital Library resources previously discussed, the CDE may want to pursue development of other resources that will impact teaching and learning and build toward a robust, comprehensive assessment system that is inclusive of all curricula delivered in California schools. For example, the state may want to consider developing, purchasing, or hosting a bank of performance tasks in particular content areas and/or grades. Other such resources include rubrics for scoring essays and or performance tasks, observational protocols, and guidelines for creating portfolio assessments. Developing and/or providing additional resources can be informed by the audit process described in Recommendation 4 (a) so all new state investments work in conjunction with existing local resources and commitments.

Currently, the content areas and grades that are not included in the state-delivered assessment system include, but are not limited to, visual and performing arts, technology, world languages, and grades kindergarten through grade three, nine, ten and twelve. Based on the stakeholder input, the SAAS team recommends that the CDE consider developing or vetting assessment resources in these areas/grades first so as to support the monitoring of student learning at the LEA or school level across the full curriculum. While developing and/or endorsement of such resources will require substantial fiscal support, such an investment would be fully in keeping with research- and best practice recommendations for an SEA seeking to implement a robust, strategically balanced, comprehensive assessment system.

VI. Cost Estimates and Implementation Timeline

To assist the CDE in developing appropriate and realistic budgets and timelines, the SAAS team has provided broad technical consultation and guidance regarding cost estimates and implementation features of these recommendations. However, we understand that the SSPI is responsible for making recommendations to the SBE and the fiscal and policy legislative committees which may vary in content from the recommendations provided in this report. Therefore, the actual cost and implementation timelines will be dependent upon the ultimate set of recommendations put forward.

Appendix A. References and Resources

Achieve. (2014). *Student assessment inventory for school districts*. Washington, DC: Author.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2010). *Principles for a comprehensive assessment system*. Policy Brief, February. Washington, DC: Author.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association (APA), and National Council on Measurement in Education. *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. (2014). Washington, DC: APA.

California Assembly Bill 250, Ch. 608. Reg. Sess. (Cali. October 8, 2011).

California Assembly Bill 484, Ch. 489. Reg. Sess. (Cali, October 2, 2013).

California Assembly Bill No. 205, Chapter 608. (2011).

California Department of Education (CDE). (2011). *A blueprint for great schools: Transition advisory team report*. Sacramento: Author.

CDE. (2015). *A blueprint for great schools, version 2.0*. Sacramento: Author.

California Department of Education, District, School, and Innovation Branch, Assessment Development and Administration Division. (2013). *Recommendations for transitioning California to a future assessment system*. Sacramento: Author.

Center on Education Policy (CEP). (2011). *State high school tests: Changes in state policies and the impact of the college and career readiness movement*. Washington, DC: Author.

Committee on Best Practices for State Assessment Systems, National Research Council. (2010). *State assessment systems, exploring best practices and innovations: Summary of two workshops*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Committee on Developing Assessments of Science Proficiency in K–12, Board on Testing and Assessment and Board on Science Education, National Research Council. (2014). *Developing assessments for the Next Generation Science Standards*. J.W. Pellegrino, M.R. Wilson, J.A. Koenig, and A.S. Beatty, Editors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2015). *Science assessment item collaborative assessment framework for the Next Generation Science Standards.* Washington, DC: Author.

CCSSO. (2013). *States' commitment to high-quality assessments aligned to college- and career-readiness*. Washington, DC: Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *Performance counts: Assessment systems that support high-quality learning*. Washington, DC: CCSSO.

Darling-Hammond, L., Herman, J., Pellegrino, J., Abedi, J., Aber, L., Baker, E., Bennett, R., Gordon, E., Haertel, E., Hakuta, K., Ho, A., Linn, R., Pearson, D., Popham, J., Resnick, L., Schoenfeld, A., Shavelson, R., Shepard, L., Shulman, L., and Steele, C. (2013). *Criteria for high quality assessment*. Palo Alto: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE).

Education Commission of the States. (2014). *State summative assessments: The changing landscape*. Denver, CO: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2010). *An American examination system*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Next Generation Assessment Systems, Washington, DC. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2014). *Initial science stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): *Contract #5417*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *CAASPP history–social science assessment stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): Contract #150012. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *CAASPP mathematics end-of-course assessment stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): *Contract #150012*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *CAASPP performing arts assessment stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): *Contract #150012.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *CAASPP primary language assessment stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): *Contract #5417.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *CAASPP technology assessment stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): *Contract #5417*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *CAASPP visual arts assessment stakeholder meetings and online survey report* (draft): *Contract #5417.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

National Science Teachers Association. (2001). *NSTA position statement: Assessment*. Retrieved from: http://www.nsta.org

Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) and Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy. (2011). *The road ahead for state assessments*. Boston, MA: Rennie Center.

Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE). *The cost of new higher quality assessments: A comprehensive analysis of the potential costs for future state assessments*. Palo Alto: Author.

Torlakson, T. (2011). *A blueprint for great schools: Transition advisory team report.* Sacramento, CA: CDE.

Torlakson, T. (2013). *Report to the governor and the state legislature: Recommendations for transitioning California to a future assessment system*. Sacramento, CA: CDE.

Torlakson, T. (2015). *A blueprint for great schools: Version 2.0*. Sacramento, CA: CDE.

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Peer review of state assessment systems: Non-regulatory guidance for states for meeting requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended*. Washington, DC: USED, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Appendix B. Synthesis of CDE-Provided Documentation

A Blueprint for Great Schools and A Blueprint for Great Schools 2.0
Assessment System Goals   • Provide a robust, integrated system of indicators that measure standards more fully, including higher-order thinking and performance skills   • Provide a complete picture of school performance to students, teachers, and parents   • Provide opportunities for informed decisions about students, teachers, and schools   • Provide broader measures of growth and learning that better assess twenty-first century skills and the demands of a technology-driven, knowledge-based society, as well as offer more useful information regarding college and career readiness   • Foster meaningful, relevant, and engaging learning that supports the acquisition of the knowledge, language, lifelong learning skills, and dispositions needed to succeed in today's world (e.g., the ability to apply complex knowledge to solve problems, collaborate, communicate, inquire, and learn independently)   • Encourage creativity and flexibility to meet the demands of the future and the full range of student needs   • Create multiple pathways to success   • Build on strengths and needs of diverse learners   • Incorporate a birth-to-grade-three system that includes readiness data and aligned standards and assessments   • Conduct continuous evaluation and improvement of measures through systems of review, judgment, and intervention

	A Blueprint for Great Schools and A Blueprint for Great Schools 2.0
Types of Assessments	• Summative • Diagnostic • Formative • Interim or Benchmark
Recommendations & Considerations	• Include measures of school capacity, student opportunities to learn, and resources connected to opportunities to learn • Rethink the design of the CAHSEE to incorporate diagnostic information over time • Support the development of the "whole student" (e.g., cognitive, linguistic, health, social, emotional, cultural, community influences) • Support high levels of literacy and bi-literacy • Incorporate measures of physical education opportunities and performance • Communicate the shift in California's student assessment system from "test and judge" to "assess to improve" and the fundamental movement from sole reliance on standardized testing to a multiple-measures approach
Content Standards & Alignment	• California academic content standards • Twenty-first century skills • Develop standards that address the needs of English language learners and support English language and bi-literacy development • Develop standards for social and emotional learning (SEL) for pre-K through high school, building on existing California and national models

Assembly Bill 250	
Assessment System Goals	• Integration of twenty-first century skills, critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, creativity, and innovation, as a competency-based approach to learning in all core academic content areas • Promote higher-order thinking skills and interdisciplinary approaches that integrate the use of supportive technologies, inquiry, and problem-based learning to provide contexts for students to apply learning in relevant, real-world scenarios that prepare them for college, career, and citizenship in the twenty-first century
Types of Assessments	• Assessments based on high-quality, research- and evidence-based academic content standards
Recommendations & Considerations	• System must encourage educators to move beyond a focus on basic competency in core subjects to promote deeper learning and understanding of academic content at significantly higher levels
Content Standards & Alignment	• ELA, mathematics, history-social science, science, health education, visual and performing arts, and world languages • Twenty-first century skills

Assembly Bill 484	

Assessment System Goals	• Provide a system of assessments designed to:
	
	    o assist teachers, administrators, parents, and students
	
	    o improve teaching and learning
	
	    o promote high-quality teaching and learning using a variety of assessment approaches and item types
	
	    o produce scores that can be aggregated and disaggregated for the purpose of holding schools and LEAs accountable for the achievement of all their students in learning the California academic content standards.
	
	• Provide information on academic status/progress of students for students, parents, and teachers
	
	• Provide information that allows for the improvement of teaching and learning
	
	• Assess pupils for a broad range of academic skills and knowledge including both basic academic skills and the ability of students to apply those skills

Types of Assessments	• Summative – Smarter Balanced (ELA and mathematics in grades three through eight and eleven) • Summative – Science in grade bands three through five, six through eight, and ten through twelve • Summative – California Alternate Performance Assessment (ELA and mathematics in grades two to eleven; science in grade bands three through five, six through eight, and ten through twelve) • Early Assessment Program • California High School Exit Exam • Diagnostic • Primary language assessment (aligned to ELA standards) • Interim tools (Smarter Balanced) • Formative tools (Smarter Balanced)

Assembly Bill 484	
Recommendations & Considerations	• Ensure that all assessment procedures, items, instruments, and scoring systems are independently reviewed to ensure that they meet high standards of statistical reliability, validity, and fairness • Include assessments that are comparable to the NAEP and other national and international assessment efforts, so that California's local and state test results are reported in a manner that corresponds to the national test results • Include an appropriate balance of types of assessment instruments • Minimize the amount of instructional time devoted to assessments administered • Assessment system should consider the incorporation of additional assessments (proposed by the State Superintendent) in subjects, including, but not necessarily limited to, history-social science, technology, visual and performing arts, and other subjects as appropriate (in addition to ELA, mathematics, and science assessments) and the use of various assessment options, including, but not necessarily limited to, computer-based tests, locally scored performance tasks, and portfolios
Content Standards & Alignment	• Academically rigorous content standards and performance standards in all major subject areas • Performance standards should be designed to lead to specific grade level benchmarks of academic achievement for each subject area tested within each grade level, and be based on the knowledge and skills that pupils will need in order to succeed in the information-based, global economy of the twenty-first century

Recommendations for Transitioning California to a Future Assessment System	
Assessment System Goals	• Include multiple methods for measuring student achievement and be inclusive of all students • Be designed to use students' testing time and resources as effectively and efficiently as possible • Provide accurate and timely information on the assessment system and student achievement that is readily available and understandable to parents, teachers, schools, and the public; has a positive influence on instruction; and is appropriate for holding schools and LEAs accountable for student progress • Be integrated — utilize various types of assessments for different purposes that model effective instruction and include matrix testing to allow for assessment of subjects beyond federal accountability requirements of ELA, mathematics and science • Maintain a continuous cycle of improvement
Types of Assessments	• Summative – Smarter Balanced (ELA and mathematics in grades three through eight and eleven), science • Summative – Consortia assessments for students with severe cognitive disabilities • State-provided interim, formative, and diagnostic tools • State-supported interim, formative, and diagnostic assessments (LEA created) for kindergarten through grade twelve (working group recommendation) • Primary language assessment (working group recommendation) • English proficiency assessment (working group recommendation) • Writing assessments that produce year-to-year comparisons and inform graduation requirements and CCR (working group recommendation) • Alternate assessment for students that score below intermediate on the ELPA (working group recommendation) • EOC assessments that serve multiple purposes (e.g., graduation requirements) (working group recommendation)

Recommendations for Transitioning California to a Future Assessment System	
Recommendations & Considerations	• Assessment system should support valid year-to-year comparisons for individual students (working group recommendation)
	• Assessment system should consider including assessments covering literacy, visual and performing arts, world languages, health education, English language development, and history-social science (working group recommendation)
	• Assessments must conform to rigorous industry standards for test development, model high-quality teaching and learning activities, have a clear purpose and if possible, be designed to achieve multiple purposes
	• Assessments should promote high-level cognitive skills and, innovative (and multiple) ways of demonstrating knowledge,
	• Determine the continued need and purpose of academic assessments in languages other than English once SBAC assessments are operational
	• Consider approaches to allow for reducing testing (e.g., alternatives to the CAHSEE, the use of matriculation exams, matrix testing)
	• Strive for even distribution of testing time across grades (working group recommendation)
	• Conduct comparability studies
	• Emphasize performance-based assessments that require critical thinking and reasoning
	• Provide multiple state-defined pathways for high school graduation (working group recommendation)
Content Standards & Alignment	• Alignment to standards (CCSS) that will prepare students for the challenges of a constantly changing world and require students to use problem solving and critical thinking skills to perform well
	• Twenty-first century skills and promotion of research-based instructional practices
	• Cover the breadth of the curriculum, serve to communicate clear expectations and encourage teaching the full curriculum while modeling high-quality teaching and learning

Appendix C. Synthesis of California Stakeholder Feedback

Primary Language Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Summative assessment • Include diagnostic and formative assessments/tools (stakeholders indicated diagnostic information was the most important) • Include practice tests to allow students to become accustomed to technology/delivery mode
Purpose	• Ensure that students are meeting grade-level standards in their primary language • Measure skills and knowledge reflected in Smarter Balanced assessments as well as CCSS (including speaking) • Award deserving students with the State Seal of Biliteracy (SSB) on their diplomas • Evaluate (rather than penalize) dual-language or bilingual language programs
Students Tested	• ELs that are newly arrived (< 12 months), current ELs (identified as ELs for >12 months), ELs with disabilities • Students in dual-language or bilingual instruction programs or who receive recommendation to participate • Students attempting to earn the State Seal of Biliteracy
Grades Tested	• Ability to measure student performance in kindergarten through grade twelve, with summative testing in grades three through eight and eleven
Format	• Majority of stakeholders indicated PLA should be computer-based and adaptive • Stakeholders acknowledged that a paper-pencil would be necessary for some students • Included speaking component would be one-on-one • Some stakeholders suggested including performance tasks • Comparable to the Smarter Balanced ELA (domains included, length, rigor, item types, PLDs) • Include a multi-tiered accessibility framework

Primary Language Assessment	
Alignment	• Common Core State Standards (en Español) • Primary language texts
Accountability	• EL students who have not been reclassified as fluent English proficient • Students who receive general content instruction in a language other than English • Some felt that a PLA should be used in a way similar to the use of Smarter Balanced ELA; others felt it should not be used for API or AYP
Considerations	• Include a digital library • Primary language assessments should be made available for all content areas (particularly science) and languages (LEA decision) • Comparability between a PLA and Smarter Balanced ELA • Cost and responsibility for cost • Administration and scoring of performance tasks (if included)

Science Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Summative (state testing) • Formative and interim assessments (local testing) and tools (e.g., item banks) • Stakeholders also expressed interest in having high school science end-of-course (EOC) exams that were specific to course of instruction
Students Tested	• All students
Grades Tested	• Grades five, eight, and eleven (state testing) • Kindergarten through grade twelve (local testing)
Format	• Computer-based and adaptive with a paper-pencil option • Stakeholders favored "hands-on" and "virtual" tasks for assessing the three NGSS dimensions • Stakeholders favored use of a variety of item types (CR, SR, task-centered, TEI) and recommended limiting the use of discrete MC items • Stakeholders recommended use of performance-based tasks to assess the majority of NGSS performance expectations
Alignment	• Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) • Stakeholders favored integrated science assessments across grades and content domains and/or all three content domains that correspond with the NGSS core disciplinary ideas (Biological Science/Life Science, Earth and Space Science, and Physical Science)
Performance Expectations	• Grades three through five – majority of stakeholders stated performance expectations should be assessed at grade level • Grades six through eight – stakeholders split on whether performance expectations should be assessed at grade level or across grade levels • Grades nine through twelve – stakeholders split on whether performance expectations should be assessed at grade level or across grade levels

Science Assessment	
Alternate Assessment	• Stakeholders recommended assessing students with severe cognitive disabilities only at federally required grades in order to reduce the burden on students • Stakeholders recommended using assessments similar to the CMA and CAPA • Assessment should be aligned to NGSS
Considerations	• Stakeholders expressed interest in assessments developed by an NGSS consortium, citing benefits of a larger pool of NGSS-aligned items and tests that would reduce the costs and time needed to develop state-exclusive assessment materials.

History Social Science Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Summative assessment (state testing) • Diagnostic and interim/benchmark assessments (local testing)
Purpose	• Hold teachers accountable for teaching and students for learning • Determine the degree to which standards have been met in order to strengthen instruction and vertical curriculum alignment (guiding course and program planning across grade levels for coherence and continuity) • Informing and improving instruction • Measure student growth • Reinforce the importance/end the marginalization of the subject
Students Tested	• All students at each grade level that receive social sciences instruction • Students that are newly arrived to the United States (with limited knowledge of the English language and U.S. history) should not be tested
Grades Tested	• All students in grades three through twelve should be tested annually or at least once per kindergarten through grade eight grade band with EOC exams in grades ten through twelve • Emphasis on annual testing in six through eight grade band (greatest preference for grade eight) • Stakeholders agreed that assessments should not be cumulative and should be grade/course specific
Format	• Stakeholders believed that a computer-based and adaptive test would be engaging and equitable • All item types should be included, specifically scenario-based items and performance tasks
Alignment	• Assessments should focus on analytical skills and conceptual understanding (skills focused on the CCSS) rather than retention of facts • Early grades should focus on core/foundational knowledge • Assessment should be based on the overarching standards articulated in the history-social science framework rather than the individual content standards

Accountability	• There was no consensus by stakeholders as to whether the assessment should be used for accountability purposes or as a graduation requirement
Considerations	• Current standards (1998) must be modified to align with CCSS and twenty-first century skills and prioritize teaching of concepts and skills
	• Some stakeholders felt that a history-social science assessment would contribute to over testing
	• Concern about motivation for grade twelve students to perform well on test
	• Concern about competition between EOC exams and Advanced Placement exams

Mathematics EOC Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Summative assessment
Purpose	• Measure student achievement or mastery of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for mathematics and mathematics practices • Improve instruction and identify necessary student interventions • Scores may be used for student placement and readiness or improving course grades for students • Serve as an alternative to the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)
Students Tested	• All students completing a specific course should be required to take an EOC regardless of grade level
Courses Tested	• Algebra I • Geometry • Algebra II • Integrated Math 1, 2, and 3 • EOCs should not be developed for AP courses
Format	• As similar to the Smarter Balanced Mathematics assessment as possible in format, delivery, and included item types • Computer-based and adaptive with paper-pencil option • Item types to include are MC, TEI, CR, SR, scenario-based, and performance tasks • Preference for integrated tasks and questions that cover more than one standard • Include sets of scaffolded items
Alignment	• Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for Mathematics

Mathematics EOC Assessment	
Accountability	• Stakeholders provided mixed recommendations about how the results of an EOC might be used for accountability • Most stakeholders rejected the idea of using results to inform teacher accountability • Some stakeholders supported some use of results for accountability for professional evaluation • Some stakeholders thought using results to inform LEA-level accountability (e.g., Local Control Accountability Plans) was appropriate • Most stakeholders stated EOC results should not be used for state or federal accountability purposes
Considerations	• Stakeholders were split (some for [obtaining accurate information], some against [over testing]) on their concern about students having to take an EOC the same year as the Smarter Balanced Mathematics assessment • Should be designed for multiple platforms, operating systems, and devices • Stakeholders stated that students should be provided "language support" in their first or best language

Technology Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Stakeholders recommended embedding or integrating into the existing content assessments
Purpose	• Measure proficiency in both digital/information literacy and foundational skills • Other suggestions included common terminology related to technology and "digital citizenship" (social media etiquette, plagiarism, etc.) • Focus on overarching themes and anchor standards across grade levels (resulting in a vertical progression of standards and skills) • Focus on transferable skills (college- and career-readiness skills) that are relevant to and integrated with all tested content areas
Students Tested	• All students
Grades Tested	• All grades that have content area testing • Some stakeholders suggested a stand-alone assessment be given at certain benchmark grades only, while embedding in most other grades
Format	• Computer-based • Portfolio option (students would complete scenario-based and performance tasks) to have students demonstrate actual comfort and ability using technology and demonstrate higher-order processes
Alignment	• Instances in the CCSS where technology and digital literacy is referenced explicitly as being integrated with the content area • Stakeholders recognized the need to identify and select more specific standards as to what "technology" covers • Suggestions included the ICT Digital Literacy Action Plan, the California Library Standards, ISTE profiles of learners, CTE anchor standards (that are the same across 15 industry sectors)
Considerations	• Stakeholders acknowledged that a separate assessment on technology might be needed for some content areas, but also might face pushback as to too much testing • A standalone assessment may encourage LEAs to add teachers who will focus on technology and improve technology offerings

Performing Arts Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Summative assessments • Formative assessments
Purpose	• Measure students' skills, abilities, knowledge, and growth over time in art disciplines • Encourage "literacy" in the visual/performing arts and arts standards • Provide useful feedback for students and arts programs to encourage growth and self-reflection • Elevate and validate the importance of the arts, and place the subject on par with other tested content areas (increase funding)
Students Tested	• All students
Grades Tested	• Minimum once per grade band (three through five, six through eight, nine through twelve) • Summative testing in grades four and seven • Benchmark testing at grades two, five, and eight (with other grades added as needed) • Some stakeholders wanted testing in all grades kindergarten through grade eight • High school assessment would be course-specific and/or based on student interest and experience
Format	• Multiple formats—computer-based, paper-pencil, performance tasks, portfolio • Item/task types include performance tasks, MC, CR, TEI
Alignment	• Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) standards and associated arts curriculum • National Core Arts Standards • Twenty-first century skills • Four Cs: critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration (if applicable)

Performing Arts Assessment	
Features	• Offer opportunities for students to self-assess and reflect • Should measure student growth over time • Develop rubrics for evaluating performance tasks and portfolio components with an option for teachers to tailor rubrics to meet students' needs and accommodate students with limited access, knowledge, and/or experience with the arts
Accountability	• Ensure access to quality arts programs • Hold schools accountable for teaching visual/performing arts and arts standards • Hold students accountable to standardized expectations and requirements
Considerations	• Results from the performing arts assessment should not be used for decisions related to funding, teacher salary, or teacher tenure • Districts and schools vary in terms of the art program opportunities that can be offered, which should be taken into consideration for program evaluation • Possibility of individual (e.g., solo performance) and group or ensemble (e.g., choir, orchestra) assessment • Adopted arts standards should be reviewed and updated on a five-year cycle • Ensure that teachers have flexibility to select the assessment that best aligns with their curriculum, and align to students' aptitude and art discipline

Visual Arts Assessment	
Assessment Type	• Summative assessment
Purpose	• Measure knowledge and skills associated with making art, analyzing/communicating about art/artistic expression • Measure foundational knowledge, technical skills to make art in specific media (mostly high school), critical thinking, artistic literacy, art in its cultural and historical context, expression of artistic ideas and concepts • Validate the importance of art as a subject, one that should be taught throughout a student's educational experience • Provide feedback for students, parents, and arts programs • Inform instruction and advocacy
Students Tested	• Students enrolled in visual arts classes • Some stakeholders encouraged population sampling to prevent over testing and allow more testing options to be implemented
Grades Tested	• Grade four • Middle school • High school — stakeholders suggested that in high school students should take introductory-level exam for all students who completed basic visual arts, while offering more specialized course-based assessments to advanced students
Format	• Stakeholders were divided with regard to offering a computer-adaptive test, a fixed form test, or a combination of the two • Stakeholders agreed there would need to be a portfolio component to allow flexibility in how students can demonstrate what they know (provide multiple ways for students to demonstrate knowledge and skills, as well as accommodate different learning styles and engage students) • Students would explain the intent and content of the work, as well as the process used to create work
Alignment	• Aligned with the most recent version of the California state standards for visual arts as well as National Core Arts Standards

Visual Arts Assessment	
Features	• Measure student growth year to year • Include categories of skills that are consistent across different media, and are sequential and developmental (increase in complexity) • Assessment for kindergarten through grade eight students should focus on foundational knowledge • Assessment for high school students should focus on the creative process, performance, thinking/analytical skills, and should emphasize performance tasks, portfolios, and artist statements
Accountability	• Hold districts and schools accountable for providing all students equal access to high-quality arts programs
Considerations	• Assessment results should not be used to evaluate teacher performance • Implementing an assessment could increase funding to develop, staff, and sustain high-quality art programs • Implementing an assessment could encourage hiring art specialist teachers and offering visual arts professional development for all teachers • Should the visual arts assessment be cumulative or grade/course specific? • Stakeholders want schools to indicate that they do not offer arts courses on a report that goes home to parents • Difficulty of evaluating visual arts because of its open-ended nature • Logistics of managing multiple means of testing and teachers having to collect and score portfolios/student work

Science Digital Library
General Resources   • Introduction to the science digital library — purpose, how to use it, how materials are submitted and included   • Explanation of the CA NGSS (purpose, development process, implementation, connection between NGSS and CA NGSS, differences between 1998 CA science content standards and CA NGSS, glossary)   • Detailed information about the CAASPP science assessments (test taker rights, accommodations, supports, use of results, assessment resources)   • Information on science careers, summer internships, scholarship opportunities, and general resources for students and parents to explore science opportunities and incorporate science and science topics into everyday life   • Up-to-date list of frequently asked questions
Classroom Practices Resources   • Exemplar lesson plans, model units, and curriculum materials (developed by teachers, curriculum specialists, and science content experts)   • Information on key materials and links to curriculum guides and lesson plans that are aligned to CA NGSS   • Crosswalk documents for past curriculum or lesson plans to CA NGSS   ◦ Materials that demonstrate points where science standards intersect/overlap with other content standards (e.g., pacing guides linking science and mathematics instruction, materials and tasks to support scientific writing related to ELA standards)   • Games, simulations, experiments, and interactive labs as instructional resources   • Links to community resources (collaborative opportunities), media resources (learning opportunities), event/field trip suggestions   • Resources for special populations (links to applications and assistive technology, ADA-related tools and activities)
Summative Assessment Resources   • Practice test materials (i.e., pre-assembled practice test forms) developed by test contractor that mirror CA NGSS assessments and provide feedback to students and teachers   • Test item bank for teachers to build sample tests or select individual or discrete item sets   • Released test item bank for review of the CAASPP science assessment (not for building a practice assessment)   ◦ Include alignment explanation, rationales, item metadata, links to content and instructional materials   • Test blueprint, scoring rubrics with exemplar responses, readability measures for items and passages, glossary for science terms   • Tutorials on the computer skills needed for computer-based assessment   • Information on using CAASPP science assessment results

Science Digital Library	
Formative Assessment Resources	• Interim and formative assessment test forms and items, with content linked to resource and instructional materials • Pre- and post-assessment questions (allow students to evaluate themselves and their peers) • Item response exemplars with explanations of scoring and grading • Materials for review (i.e., key terms, key concepts) • Professional development materials specific to formative assessment practices (i.e., frequently asked questions, webinars, strategies)
Professional Development Resources	• Integrating CA NGSS and technology into instruction, updates on science and technology • Curriculum and assessment development, unit and lesson planning (provide samples), assessment literacy, how-to guides • Supporting English language learners and students with disabilities • Curated pool of professional development resources (videos, MOOCs, podcasts, in-person seminars, workshops, and courses) and providers • Online professional learning community for teachers to share ideas (e.g., discussion board, blog)

Appendix D. Synthesis of Letters from California Stakeholders to the State Board of Education Regarding Assessments

Synthesis of Letters from California Stakeholders to the State Board of Education Regarding Assessments	

Biology End-of-Course (EOC)	• Correspondents were opposed to satisfying ESEA requirements with an NGSS EOC assessment for biological sciences
	
	  ○ An assessment covering only a single science discipline would cause LEAs and schools to slight the other science disciplines
	
	  ○ Correspondents felt it was inconsistent with the NGSS's cross-cutting concepts that link the disciplines holistically, and they noted that this decision is at odds with recommendations from the National Research Council and feedback from stakeholders
	
	• As an alternative, correspondents suggested administering a grade eleven assessment of integrated sciences, including a sample of NGSS performance expectations from all high school science disciplines

Science Assessments (Grades five and eight)	• Correspondents believed that the science assessment in grade five should integrate NGSS performance expectations from kindergarten through grade five, not just grades three through five, on account of the standards' learning progressions ○ One writer suggested that an assessment — perhaps a diagnostic assessment only — be administered in grade two to cover NGSS performance expectations in kindergarten through grade two • For these same reasons, correspondents believed that the science assessment in grade eight should integrate NGSS performance expectations covering grades six through eight, not just grade eight alone

English Language Learners	• Correspondents asked that the board request a report on number and percentage of English language learners who take Smarter Balanced assessments with any designated supports or accommodations, and which designated supports and accommodations were the most implemented
	
	• They also recommend that:
	
	  ○ issues of validity specific to ELL accessibility through designated supports and accommodations be part of the first-year independent evaluation study plan;
	
	  ○ such a review include an evaluation of the format of the "stacked Spanish math" assessment to see if having the two languages presented in visually distinct ways would help the students distinguish one language from the other; and
	
	  ○ when designating the State Determined Whole School Model, the Board give particular attention to models that address the student subgroups, such as English learners, that triggered the school improvement grant under ESEA

Synthesis of Letters from California Stakeholders to the State Board of Education Regarding Assessments
Attendance Data for AYP Purposes	• Correspondents expressed concern about the use of average daily attendance data for AYP purposes. They believe, based on research, that chronic absenteeism is a more meaningful indicator of achievement. • If average daily attendance is adopted, the state should move from a 93 percent target to a 97 percent target because research shows that it is a more meaningful indicator than 93 percent.

Appendix E. Synthesis of Best Practices for Assessing Next Generation Science Standards

	Developing Assessments for the Next Generation Science Standards

Assessment System Goals	• A coherently designed multilevel assessment system that includes:
	
	   ○ Assessments designed for use in the classroom as part of day-to-day instruction (support teaching and learning)
	
	   ○ Assessments designed for monitoring purposes that include both on-demand and classroom-embedded components
	
	   ○ A set of indicators designed to monitor the quality of instruction to ensure that students have the opportunity to learn science
	
	• The purposes for which information about student learning is needed should govern the design and use of assessments
	
	• Students will need multiple and varied assessment opportunities to demonstrate their competence on the NGSS performance expectations for a given grade level
	
	• A good assessment system can play a critical role in providing fair and accurate measures of the learning of all students and providing students with multiple ways of demonstrating their competency. Such an assessment system will include formats and presentation of tasks and scoring procedures that reflect multiple dimensions of diversity, including culture, language, ethnicity, gender, and disability. Individuals with expertise in diversity should be integral participants in developing state assessment systems

Recommendations & Considerations	• Measuring the learning described in the NGSS will require assessments that are significantly different from those in current use • The design of the system and its individual components will depend on multiple decisions, such as choice of content and practices to be assessed, locus of control over administration and scoring decisions, specification of local assessment requirements, and the level and types of auditing and monitoring. These components and choices can lead to the design of multiple types of assessment systems • External assessments would consist of sets of multicomponent tasks. To the extent possible, these tasks should include — as a significant and visible aspect of the assessment — multiple performance-based questions. When appropriate, computer-based technology should be used to broaden and deepen the range of performances used on these assessments • Information from external on-demand assessments (i.e., assessments that are administered at a time mandated by the state) will need to be supplemented with information gathered from classroom-embedded assessments (i.e., assessments that are administered at a time determined by the district or school that fit the instructional sequence in the classroom) to fully cover the breadth and depth of the performance expectations. Both kinds of assessments will need to be designed to produce information that is appropriate and valid to support a specific monitoring purpose

Developing Assessments for the Next Generation Science Standards	
	• Designing the links among the components of the assessment system (i.e., between the on-demand components and the classroom-embedded assessment information) will be a key challenge • If significant consequences are attached only to the on-demand assessments, instructional activities are likely to be focused on preparation for those assessments (teaching to the test) • Monitoring assessments should be administered at least once, but no more than twice, in each grade span (kindergarten through grade eight, six through eight, nine through twelve) • Matrix sampling will be an important tool in the design of assessments for monitoring purposes to ensure that there is proper coverage of the full breadth and depth of the NGSS performance expectations
Content Standards & Alignment	• Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)

National Science Teachers Association Position Statement	
Assessment System Goals	• Quality science assessments provide information on students': o Understanding of science content and process knowledge and skills o Ability to think critically and solve simple to complex problems o Capabilities of designing scientific experiments, analyzing data, and drawing conclusions o Capacities to see and articulate relationships between science topics and real-world issues/concerns o Skills using mathematics as a tool for science learning • Science assessments are tools for managing and evaluating efforts to ensure all students receive the science education necessary to prepare them for participation in our nation's decision-making processes and lifelong learning of science in a technology-rich workplace
Recommendations & Considerations	• Multiple forms of science assessment should be used to measure student achievement and understanding, and multiple pieces of assessment data should be used for high stakes science testing decisions • Science assessment results should be used to improve science learning and improve student/teacher/assessment performance

Content Standards & Alignment	• Science assessments should have a clear purpose and align with standards-based teaching

Science Assessment Item Collaborative Assessment Framework for the Next Generation Science Standards	
Assessment System Goals	• Both the *Developing Assessments for the Next Generation Science Standards* and *Systems for State Science Assessment* emphasize the need for a full system of assessments that includes multiple approaches (e.g., large-scale and classroom-based) to meet a range of purposes (e.g., to guide instruction, for program evaluation, or to test achievement) in a cohesive manner • *Developing Assessments for the Next Generation Science Standards* recommends that a system of assessments, from formative classroom assessment through summative standardized assessment, will best support the approach of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)
Recommendations & Considerations	• Priorities for assessment at each grade level or grade band will be based on the overall architecture of the assessment system (formative, interim, and summative), state priorities for curriculum and instruction, the scope and purpose of the assessment system, and fiscal implications, as well as on the need to adhere as closely as possible to the vision of the NGSS and the kindergarten through grade twelve Framework in supporting all students in achieving all standards • The large-scale summative assessment will be limited in the breadth of NGSS PEs that can be assessed. Included in the NGSS for each performance expectation are assessment boundary statements that "specify the limits to large scale assessment"
Content Standards & Alignment	• Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)

	A System of Assessment for NGSS Science in California: A Discussion Document
Assessment System Goals	• To communicate and clarify the goals of the NGSS to impact teaching, learning and assessment. • To support the teaching and learning of science at all levels-from early elementary through high school • To address and integrate the three dimensions of the performance expectations of NGSS • To support the development of teacher and administrator expertise in using such assessments by providing a curated bank of examples of curriculum-embedded performance tasks that can be used to assess student performance on all three NGSS dimensions, and by professional development to support their use • To provide data on performance at the student, class, school, district and state level • Fulfill federally mandated requirements while prioritizing the preceding goals

Assessment System Design	• Assessment system is composed of both state mandated assessments and periodic classroom assessments
	
	   ○ State mandated assessments are computer-based and composed of two components:
	
	      ▪ An online test using multiple item formats (selected response, constructed response, scenario-based, simulations aligned with, and integrated across, the three NGSS dimensions: Disciplinary Core Ideas, Cross Cutting Concepts and Science and Engineering Practices)
	
	      ▪ one or two on-line performance tasks (utilizing matrix sampling, hand scored with machine scoring, where feasible)
	
	• Periodic classroom assessments utilize a state supported test bank including two types of tasks:
	
	   ○ Stand-alone, short performance tasks
	
	   ○ Longer curriculum-embedded performance tasks (CEPT) that would be embedded in the learning cycle of a unit

Performance Assessment Recommendations	• The use of good task design practices to construct assessments that meet intended purposes and meet standards of technical quality, using a mix of short response (selected or constructed), and both simulation-based and classroom-based performance tasks • The inclusion of classroom based performance tasks as part of the assessment system. These tasks should be curriculum-embedded, and produce well-defined student work products to be scored following a well-developed scoring rubric. Along with the task and its instructional context, both the required products and the scoring rubric should be communicated to teachers administering the tasks in their classroom

A System of Assessment for NGSS Science in California: A Discussion Document	
	• The provision of a curated resource bank of high-quality NGSS-aligned performance tasks suitable for use as formative and/or unit summative assessment tasks
	• The support of teachers through professional development to use this resource as part of a coherent system of embedded assessments, curricula, and instructional supports
	• The development of tools, protocols and processes to support curriculum, instruction and assessment in the service of equitable outcomes.
	• Minimizing the cost of developing performance assessment tasks through economies of scale, engagement of district networks, and cross-state collaboration.
	• Engaging with stakeholders more actively, and developing the capacity of educational leaders and policymakers to deeply understand and champion research-based reforms in assessment
	• Engaging with the public more actively, and provide timely, accessible information about the new assessment systems and the NGSS
Content Standards & Alignment	• Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)

Appendix F. Synthesis of Revised Peer Review Guidance

U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems   Non Regulatory Guidance for States

Assessment System Goals	• The state has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments) (Critical Element 4.7)

Required Assessments	• The state's assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards) in (Critical Element 1.3):
	
	   o Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades three through eight and at least once in high school (grades ten through twelve)
	
	   o Science at least once in each of three grade spans (three through five, six through nine, and ten through twelve)

Students Assessed	• The state requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools (Critical Element 1.4) • Policies state that all students with disabilities and all English learners (unless the state exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/language arts assessment in the state) must be included in the assessment system (Critical Element 1.4) • If the state administers native language assessments, the state requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except that if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years (Critical Element 1.4) • The state's participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the state's assessment system. In addition, if the state administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the state has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data (Critical Element 1.5)
Content Standards & Alignment	• The state formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the state (Critical Element 1.1) • The state's academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; were developed with broad stakeholder

U.S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems   Non Regulatory Guidance for States
involvement (Critical Element 1.2)
• The state has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the state's validity evidence includes evidence that the state's assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the state's academic content standards, including (Critical Element 3.1):
o Documentation of adequate alignment between the state's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process) the full range of the state's academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; and
o If the state administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the state's academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities

Appendix G. Synthesis of U.S. Department of Education—Fact Sheet: Testing Action Plan

Fact Sheet: Testing Action Plan	

Key Recommendations	• All assessments should be fully integrated with instruction
	
	• Testing should provide students with the opportunity to make real-world connections and apply what they know in ways that foster critical thinking skills
	
	• Assessment reports should:
	    o state test purpose and rationale for administering the measure;
	    o provide timely, actionable feedback to students, parents, and educators; and
	    o guide responsible use of results
	
	• Data from assessments should inform decision-making about how and where to allocate limited resources
	
	• Assessments should serve a particular purpose and play an essential role in improving teaching and learning
	
	• Assessments should meet high standards for technical quality, specifically in relation to:
	    o measuring the full depth and breadth of the content standards; and
	    o providing accurate information about student achievement and growth
	
	• Assessments should be fair for all students
	
	• The ideal assessment system includes different types of measures, tools, and tests — including innovative measures that may be performance- or portfolio-based — each providing unique information about what students know and can do
	
	• Those responsible for designing and implementing assessment systems should conduct reviews of the system components on a regular basis to monitor burden and eliminate redundancies
	
	• Statewide standardized testing at any grade should require no more than 2 percent of total instructional time

Appendix H. Comparison of NCLB and ESSA

	NCLB	ESSA
Reading / Language Arts & Mathematics Assessments	Annual testing in reading or language arts and mathematics in each of grades three through eight and once in grades ten through twelve.	Annual testing in reading or language arts and mathematics in each of grades three through eight and once in high school.
Science Assessments	Annual testing in science once in grades three through five; once in grades six through nine; and once in grades ten through twelve.	Annual testing in science once in grades three through five; once in grades six through nine; and once in grades ten through twelve.
Student Data Requirements	States must provide disaggregated data of student performance.	States must provide disaggregated data of student performance.
Participation Requirements	States must maintain an at least 95 percent participation rate on state assessments to meet "Adequate Yearly Progress" requirements.	States must maintain an at least 95 percent participation rate on states assessments and factor the participation rate into school ratings. States can pass opt-out laws regarding state testing participation. However, states must have an action plan to respond to the participation rate falling below 95 percent.
Assessing Students With Disabilities	For students with disabilities, states must provide alternative assessments and accommodations as needed.	For each tested subject, there is a 1 percent cap on the number of students who can take an alternative assessment. States must ensure that students receive necessary accommodations to take state assessments.
Assessing English Language Learners	English language learner (ELL) students in kindergarten through grade twelve must be annually assessed for English proficiency, though these scores are not included in accountability calculations for AYP purposes.	ELL students in kindergarten through grade twelve must be annually assessed for English proficiency.

	NCLB	ESSA
Inclusion of Results for English Language Learners	Include test results of ELL students, who have been enrolled for one year, for accountability purposes. ELL students (in their first year of enrollment in a U.S. school) have the option of taking the reading or language arts state assessments, in addition to taking the English language proficiency assessment. ELL students must take the state mathematics assessment regardless.	States have two choices: 1. Include math test results of ELL students, who have been enrolled for at least a year, in the accountability system (as indicated in NCLB) 2. In the first year, report test scores (both math and reading) but exclude them from accountability system. Include a measure of student growth on the assessments in the second year. In the third year, include proficiency on those assessments for accountability purposes.
Assessment Types	N/A	State assessments may include projects, portfolios, and extended-performance tasks.
Piloting of Local Assessments	N/A	Piloting of local assessments is allowed, with the potential for these to be used as state assessment, provided they are reliable, valid, and comparable (e.g., use of SAT or ACT as high school assessment).
Piloting of Innovative Assessments	N/A	Innovative assessment pilot allows up to seven states and a consortia (that does not exceed four states) to pilot new tests. These assessments may include competency- or performance-based tests, and removes the requirement for states to use annual state tests for accountability purposes.
Grade eight Mathematics Exemption	N/A	Grade eight students in advanced math courses (with an end-of-course exam) can take the associated exam in lieu of the grade eight mathematics test.

Appendix I. Synthesis of Council of Chief State School Officers – Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems: A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden

Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems: A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden	

State Role and Establishing Goal	• Individual State Education Agencies (SEAs) will need to determine their role in establishing efficient and effective system of high-quality assessments.
	
	• SEAs have the option to create a state task force, which can engage stakeholders and create increased ownership for process and results.
	
	• In supporting school districts in evaluating assessments, SEAs can take role of support and catalyst (e.g., support collaboration among districts, support regional service centers in partnering with districts, provide and develop resources, provide funds for evaluation).
	
	• In establishing role, SEAs should engage key stakeholders throughout process and maintain transparent communication.
	
	• Communication plan should: share goal, identify key stakeholders, agree on key message(s), determine best tactics or strategies to reach various stakeholders at different points of process, be clear about how stakeholders will be engaged, and measures for communication effectiveness
	
	• SEAs should consider:
	    o The key elements of a high-quality system of assessment that best and most efficiently advanced college- and career-ready teaching and learning;
	
	    o Current assessments are being administered at all levels, and which can be eliminated or reduced due to low-quality, redundancy, and/or not serving a core purpose; and
	
	    o What can and should be done to enhance the system of assessments to improve quality and build a more comprehensive system that best measures the full range of knowledge and skills, improve teaching, and advanced growth of all students toward college- and career-ready outcomes.

Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems: A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden	
Data Collection	• SEAs can collaborate with district leaders to identify best process for collecting and analyzing assessment data. • Creating a task force may be an ideal option for states with capacity challenges, or in cases where state boards or state legislatures have asked for a review. • Having district leaders lead data collection may also be an effective option. Achieve is working with districts to develop a comprehensive process, including tools, to evaluate assessments and determine the minimum testing necessary for essential diagnostic, instructional, and accountability purposes. • SEAs may also choose to collaborate with outside vendor, university, or other partner; this can encourage collaboration among school districts and provide support for districts with limited capacity. • For testing system review, include all known district- and state-level assessments. • For each assessment, determine its purpose and gauge if there is overlap between assessments. • Clarify what constitutes "test preparation" and collect data on how much instructional time is devoted to test preparation. • Collect detailed information about each assessment, including: grade and course/subject assessed, which students are eligible or required to take test, assessment type, item type(s), mode of administration, test administration time, testing window, test frequency, number of years assessment has been administered, intended assessment purpose, current use of assessment, who uses the assessment data, time between test administration and results returned, and time spent preparing for assessment.
Stakeholder Engagement	• SEA leaders should gather consistent feedback from stakeholders in a variety of ways (e.g., interviews, focus groups, email, public hearings). • States should consider how important subcategories or unique stakeholders are included in the feedback process (example of a stakeholder representation table is on p. 12). • Stakeholder discussions should obtain feedback from stakeholders on the use and value of an assessment, and additional information, including unintended consequences that arise due to testing.

	Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems: **A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden**

Evaluating Data	• Data analysis will help determine which assessments provide meaningful information.
	
	 • Data analysis can be done by an SEA, task force, or third-party partner.
	
	 • Evaluation includes gauging the reliability, validity, alignment, and accessibility of an assessment, particularly for students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs).
	
	 • States can use data to determine:
	
	     o The overall quality of assessments, including the differences in number of assessments administered at different grade levels and in different subjects; and
	
	     o The average amount of time spent on testing at each grade level, including the overall average time, to gauge what percent of a student's school year is spent on testing (including time spent on test preparation).
	
	 • Based on stakeholder input, states identify assessments that are low-quality or redundant.
	
	 • States determine how to account for additional issues that might arise during data review.

Developing and Implementing Recommendations	• States should consider how assessments contribute to a coherent, comprehensive assessment system with questions that include the following:
	
	     o Does assessment system provide necessary information to users at all levels with a minimum testing?
	
	     o Is there appropriate balance between administered assessments and the information they provide?
	
	     o How much assessment should be devote to providing feedback for accountability purposes vs. program evaluation purposes vs. instructional or diagnostic purposes?
	
	 • States should also consider:
	
	     o Whether or not assessments might be modified (e.g., shortened in length, administered less often, modified to improve test quality, administered to fewer students);
	
	     o The cost benefit of each assessment, including administrative costs (i.e., personnel required to manage, administer, implement, and access and use results) and opportunity costs (i.e., benefit, value, or resources that must be foregone to implement an assessment);
	
	     o The elimination of assessments that do not support an overall high-quality, comprehensive system;

Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems: A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden	
	○ Whether to place a limit on the overall time students spend practicing for and taking assessments; and ○ How changes to assessment system may impact accountability systems or educator evaluation systems. - States should establish comprehensive stakeholder communications strategy to share information about changes to assessment system, and elucidate how stakeholder input informed decision-making process.
Supporting Use of Assessment Data	- States should develop multiple modes of communication for each stakeholder group regarding the purpose of an assessment and how data from different assessments can be used. - SEA leaders might reach out to legislators to keep them information about: the purpose of different types of assessments, how assessment data is used, and how new assessments get added. - States should consider what additional supports they might provide to further efficient and effective use of the assessment system. - States should consider collaboration between state and teacher/leader preparation programs to ensure that people entering these roles have necessary knowledge and understanding of state assessment system.
Examples of State Actions for High-Quality Assessment Systems	**Colorado:** The state legislature mandated a Task Force to study the implications of state and local assessment systems for school districts, public schools, charter schools, educators, and students. The Task Force made recommendations for streamlining the system, where appropriate. **Connecticut:** Governor Malloy announced the convening of the High School Assessment work group, tasked with exploring ways to reduce the testing burden for grade eleven students. This work group has submitted an interim recommendation to the State Board of Education. The state is also providing Assessment Reduction Grants to districts; these grants will provide technical assistance to districts for the purpose of reducing testing. Districts that received these grants were announced on February 23, 2015; these districts were required to complete an assessment inventory by June 30, 2015. **Delaware:** Governor Markel launched a review of state, district, and school tests with the purpose of decreasing testing burden and increasing instructional time. Through the Assessment Inventory Project Grants, the state is providing financial resources to support districts and charter schools in completing the test inventory. **Florida:** Based on an Assessment Investigation requested by the governor, the state passed a bill that caps the amount of time students spend taking tests to 45 hours a year. **Idaho:** The state has completed the Idaho Comprehensive Assessment Program Inventory and has documented average testing times. Idaho is working on piloting an assessment inventory in districts.

Comprehensive Statewide Assessment Systems:
A Framework for the Role of the State Education Agency in Improving Quality and Reducing Burden

- **Illinois:** The State Assessment Review Task Force is reviewing how local districts use standardized assessment. The Illinois State Board of Education has released the Student Assessment Inventory for School Districts, a guide that is adapted from Achieve's assessment inventory. Illinois has also developed the Assessment Inventory Facilitation Process, a companion guide for districts using the assessment inventory.

- **Maryland:** Lawmakers passed a bill that established the Commission to Review Maryland's Use of Assessments and Testing in Public Schools. This Commission will be required to survey local, state, and federally mandated tests, with a report of findings due by July 1, 2016.

- **Minnesota:** The state convened a Testing Reduction Advisory Group that made several recommendations on how to create a high-quality balanced assessment system.

- **New Jersey:** The legislature mandated Study Commission on the Use of Student Assessments in New Jersey, with an interim report issued in December 2014.

- **New Mexico:** The New Mexico Statewide Assessment Program: Required Assessments has been completed.

- **North Carolina:** A testing report has been released. The North Carolina State Board of Education has convened a Task Force on Summative Assessments that is considering testing options to begin in the 2016–17 school year. This Task Force is focused on reducing testing time and burden.

- **Ohio:** The state released Testing Report and Recommendations, a comprehensive evaluation of the Ohio testing landscape, with focus on the amount of time students spend on testing. The Ohio Department of Education surveyed districts and held conversations with education stakeholders regarding testing time. Based on data and conversations, the state made informed decisions and proposed recommendations on how to reduce testing time for students.

- **Rhode Island:** The state is conducting a multifaceted Assessment Project that will review state and local assessments with the purpose of streamlining the assessment system. Rhode Island will work closely with several districts to examine assessment systems.

- **Tennessee:** In response to concerns about excess testing time, Education Commission McQueen announced the formation of a testing task force to examine school-level tests, determining how these tests align with state tests. This summer, the task force will report on results from a district assessment survey.

Appendix J. Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)—State Priority Areas and Indicators

State Priority Area	Indicator(s)
Student Achievement	• Performance on standardized tests • Score on Academic Performance Index • Share of students that are CCR • Share of ELs that become English proficient • EL reclassification rate • Share of students that pass AP exams with a 3 or higher • Share of students determined prepared for college by the EAP
Student Engagement	• School attendance rates • Chronic absenteeism rates • Middle school dropout rates • High school dropout rates • High school graduation rates
Other Student Outcomes	• Other indicators of student performance in required areas of study; may include performance on other exams
School Climate	• Student expulsion rates • Student suspension rates • Other local measures

State Priority Area	Indicator(s)
Parental Involvement	• Efforts to seek parent input • Promotion of parental participation
Basic Services	• Rate of teacher miss-assignment • Student access to standards-aligned instructional materials • Facilities in good repair
Implementation of the CCSS	• Implementation of CCSS for all students, including ELs
Course Access	• Student access and enrollment in all required areas of study

Appendix K. Synthesis of Council of Great City Schools—Student Testing in America's Great City Schools: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis

Council of Great City Schools	Student Testing in America's Great City Schools: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis
General Assessment Data	• 401 unique tests were administered across subjects in the 66 Great City School systems • Students in the 66 districts were required to take an average of 112.3 tests between pre-kindergarten and grade twelve. This number does not include optional tests, diagnostic tests for students with disabilities or English learners, or school- or teacher-developed required tests • Students in the 66 urban school districts sat for tests more than 6,570 times • The average student in these districts takes eight standardized tests per year (e.g., two NCLB tests and three formative exams in two subjects) • These tests are required more by districts than by states, and they vary considerably across districts even within the same state • The total costs of district assessments do not constitute a large share of an average urban school system's total budget • In general, researchers found that data generated from testing was not always extensively used
Testing Time	• Average amount of time devoted to mandated tests among grade eight students (highest of pre-kindergarten through grade twelve) was 4.22 days, or 2.34 percent of school time. o Does not include time to administer or prepare for testing, nor does it include sample, optional, and special-population testing • Students spent between 6.2 hours and 8.9 hours testing (depending on grade) for NCLB (1/3 of total testing time) • Testing time is determined as much by the number of times assessments are given as it is by the number of assessments • Few of the state-developed or acquired exams were as time-consuming as the PARCC or SBAC exams were in 2014–15 • End-of-course (EOC) testing: 1–1.5 hours (34 percent of districts), 1.5–2 hours (23.4 percent of districts), 3+ hours (23.4 percent of districts)

Council of Great City Schools	*Student Testing in America's Great City Schools: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis*
	• ELL testing typically occurred once a year and required less than 2 hours per student • Students spent 7.2–10.8 hours taking formative assessments (depending on grade) • Students spent 5.2–10.9 hours taking SLO exams • Students spent 2.9–9.3 hours taking "other" mandated assessments (depending on grade) • Students spent about 20 hours on college preparation and entrance exams in high school • Some students spent an additional 1.9–5.1 hours taking assessments only given to a sample of students (e.g., NAEP) • There is no correlation between the amount of mandated testing time and the reading and math scores in grades four and eight on NAEP
Parents' Perception of Assessment	• 78 percent of responding parents agreed or strongly agreed that "accountability for how well my child is educated is important, and it begins with accurate measurement of what he/she is learning in school." This support drops significantly when the word "test" appears • The sentence, "It is important to have an accurate measure of what my child knows," is supported or strongly supported by 82 percent of public school parents in our polling. Language about "testing" is not • Parents respond more favorably to the need for improving tests than to references to more rigorous or harder tests. Wording about "harder" tests or "more rigorous" tests do not resonate well with parents • Parents support replacing current tests with "better" tests • Survey results indicate that parents want to know how their own child is doing in school, and how testing will help ensure equal access to a high-quality education • These results are consistent with a recent poll by Education Post that found that a plurality of parents thought that standardized tests are fair and have a positive impact, but also thought that tests are overused and are not necessarily helping their children improve
Alignment	• There is sometimes redundancy in the exams districts give • In a number of instances, districts use standardized assessments for purposes other than those for which they were designed. Some of these applications are state-recommended or state-required policies, and some originate locally • The findings suggest that some tests are not well aligned to each other, are not specifically aligned with college- or career-ready

Council of Great City Schools *Student Testing in America's Great City Schools: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis*	
	standards, and often do not assess student mastery of any specific content
Summative Assessments	• Many states and districts use NCLB summative assessments as:
	o a factor in annual teacher and/or principal evaluation systems;
	o identification of school or district priority status;
	o computation of district, school, and/or teacher value-added measures; or
	o decision-making for student promotion decisions at certain grade levels
	• 100 percent of those surveyed administer summative state exams as a result of requirements of the 2001–02 reauthorization of ESEA known as NCLB
	• The majority of city school districts administered either PARCC or SBAC during the past school year
	o 22.7 percent administered PARCC assessments, 25.8 percent administered SBAC assessments
	o 35 percent administered the same statewide assessments in reading and math as they did in 2013–14 (e.g., Texas, Virginia)
	o 16.7 percent administered a new state-developed college- and career-ready (CCR) assessment (e.g., Georgia, Florida)
	• Data also indicated that continual changes at the state level added to the inability of school districts to track and evaluate their reforms
	o Between 2011 and 2014, 46 percent of all state-mandated summative tests administered in the 66 districts changed in a way that prevented those districts from tracking student achievement over an extended period
	o In 2015, because of the advent of new college- and career-ready tests, the state summative assessments in 65 percent of the city school systems had changed (there were almost no tests in 2015 that had also been given in 2011)
Formative Assessments	• 59.1 percent of districts administered districtwide formative assessments during the school year
	• 10.6 percent of districts administered formative assessments mandated by the state for some students in some grades and administered their own formative assessments for other students and grades

Council of Great City Schools — *Student Testing in America's Great City Schools: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis*	
	• Almost 50 percent of the districts using formative assessments administered them three times during the school year
	• 37.9 percent of the districts reported that they developed the formative exams themselves — sometimes on their own and sometimes based on a state requirement
	• 21.2 percent of the districts reported using a commercially developed formative test; 7.6 percent reported using one of the PARCC or SBAC formative tests
	• Some of the formative assessments were part of state applications for U.S. Department of Education waivers to NCLB or Race-to-the-Top grants
EOC, Career and Technical Exams, and Student Learning Outcomes	• 71.2 percent of districts reported students take EOC exams to fulfill NCLB, sometimes in addition to their state-required summative test
	• 46.8 percent of districts reported that EOC exams factor into their state accountability measures
	• The use of EOC exams as part of final course grades varies considerably. In some states, EOCs are intended to replace final examinations and they accounted for 20 percent of a final course grade
	• 47 percent of districts are required by their state to administer a CTE exam if a students is taking a CTE course(s) (may be in addition to state summative exams and EOC tests)
	• 37.9 percent of districts report that students are required to take exams in non-NCLB-tested grades and subjects, over and above state summative tests, formative exams, and EOC tests. These are sometimes known as Student Learning Objective (SLO) assessments or value-added measures
	• Some 64.3 percent of districts using SLOs report that they were included in their state's accountability system
Other Mandated Assessments	• "Other Mandated Assessments" are mandated by the districts themselves for all students at a designated grade level and are in addition to state summative tests, EOC exams, formative assessments, and SLOs. The most prevalent assessments from the survey results in this mandated category included the following (in order of prevalence): ACT Plan, ACT Explore, NWEA-MAP, DIBELS, CogAT, ITBS, and STAR
	• Other instruments in this category include norm-referenced exams (e.g., Terranova, SAT-10), various screening devices (e.g., Running Records, Fountas and Pinnell), and pre-K assessments (when they are administered to everyone in a particular grade)
	• Districts overall report administering over 100 unique assessments in this category
	• The data collected for this project indicated that there was often considerable redundancy in these exams (e.g., students taking

Council of Great City Schools *Student Testing in America's Great City Schools: An Inventory and Preliminary Analysis*
both NWEA-MAP and STAR three times a year despite the fact that they are both computer adaptive, both administered in the same subjects, and likely yield comparable information on the same students)   • Many nationally normed exams were developed prior to the creation of CCR standards (e.g., Stanford 10 and Iowa Test of Basic Skills)

Appendix L. Scan of NAEP, TIMSS, and PISA

	Content Area	Grade(s)	Testing Period	Testing Platform	Item Types	Notes
Scan of NAEP, TIMSS, and PISA						
National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)	• Math • Reading • Science • Writing • Arts • Civics • Economics • Geography • U.S. History • Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL)	• 4, 8, and 12 for main assessments • Ages 9, 13, or 17 for long-term trend assessments	• Every 2 years (reading and math) from late January through early March • Testing year varies for the other subjects • Every four years for long-term trend assessments throughout the school year	• Paper-pencil • Computer-based (beginning in 2017 for reading, math, and writing, with additional subjects to be added in 2018 and 2019)	• Multiple choice • Constructed response	• Assessment is administered to a nationally representative sample of students. • Assessment is designed to be used as a "barometer" of student achievement across the United States.
Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)	• Math • Science	• 4, 8, and 12	• Every 4 years	• Paper-pencil	• Constructed response • Selected response	• International assessment that provides math and science achievement of U.S. students in comparison with that of students in other countries

Scan of NAEP, TIMSS, and PISA						
Program for International Student Assessment (PISA)	• Mathematics literacy • Science literacy • Reading literacy	• 15-year-old students	• Every 3 years	• Paper-pencil	• Constructed response • Selected response	• International assessment • PISA 2015 included an optional financial literacy assessment, which was administered to students in the United States. • Note that science was the main subject area for the 2015 assessment although all subject areas were tested. • PISA is designed to measure "literacy" broadly, not students' mastery of specific knowledge, skills, and concepts. • Tasks emphasize application of knowledge to everyday, real-world situations.

Appendix M. Advisory Panel Attendance

"North" Advisory Panel

Nancy Aaberg, Superintendent, Yuba City Unified School District

Teri Burns, Legislative Advocate, California School Boards Association (CSBA)

Sue Burr, Member, Assessment Liaison, SBE

Nancy Chaires Espinoza, Trustee, Elk Grove Unified School District

Patricia de Cos, Staff, Deputy Executive Director, SBE

Shannah Estep, Director of Standards, Assessment and Instruction, California Office to Reform Education (CORE) Districts

Dave Gordon, Superintendent, Sacramento County Office of Education

Sherry Griffith, Executive Director, California State Parent Teachers Association (PTA)

Angela McNeece, Director for North Inland Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA); Co-Chair State SELPA Assessment, Evaluation and Instruction Committee

Efrain Mercado, Policy Director, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)

Jennifer Pettey, Chair of Assessment and Testing Committee, California Teachers Association (CTA); Grade Eleven English International Baccalaureate Teacher

Kimberly Rodriguez, Education Consultant, State Senate Pro Tempore Office

Norma Sanchez, Staff, Department of Instruction and Professional Development, CTA

Brad Strong, Senior Director, Education Policy, Children Now

Ting Sun, Member, Assessment Liaison, SBE

Craig Wheaton, Superintendent, Visalia Unified School District; Region 11 State Director, Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)

"South" Advisory Panel

Leslie Boozer, Superintendent, Fontana Unified School District

Teri Burns, Legislative Advocate, CSBA

Valerie Chrisman, Curriculum and Instruction Steering Committee Chair, CCSESA

Jose Dorado, Los Angeles Unified School District Elementary Math Coordinator, CORE

Tanya Golden, Teacher, ABC Unified, California Federation of Teachers

Dave Hansen, Superintendent, Riverside Unified, ACSA

Somer Harding, Member, Advisory Commission on Special Education

Carla Herrera, Member, Instructional Quality Commission

Celia Jaffe, Vice President for Education, California State PTA

Rob Manwaring, Senior Policy and Fiscal Advisor, Children Now

Carlye Olsen, Director of Assessments, Whittier Union Unified School District

David Rattray, Executive Vice President, Education & Workforce Development, LA Chamber

Norma Sanchez, Staff, Instruction and Professional Development, CTA

Steve Seal, Assessment and Testing Committee, Vice Chair, CTA

Rick Simpson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Speaker's Office

Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, Executive Director, Californians Together

Ilene Strauss, Vice President, SBE

Higher Education Advisory Panel

Carolina Cardenas, Director of Academic Outreach and Early Assessment, California State University, Office of the Chancellor

Dave Conley, Director of the Center for Educational Policy Research, University of Oregon

Joan Herman, Co-Director (Emeritus), Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards & Student Testing (CRESST), UCLA

Mia Keeley, California Community College (CCC) Chancellor's Office

Harold Levine, Dean of the School of Education, UC Davis

Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions at University of California, UC Office of the President

Denise Noldon, Vice Chancellor for student services, CCC Chancellor's Office

Nancy Brynelson, Co-Director of the Center for the Advancement of Reading, CSU, Office of the Chancellor

Paul Sherfey, Vice President, Linked Learning Alliance

Appendix N. Scan of State Assessment Systems

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Alabama	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	K test is paper-pencil
	ACT Aspire	English, reading, writing, mathematics, science	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards, college and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based and/or paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	ACT Explore	English, mathematics, reading, science	8	College and career readiness	Fall		MC		ACT Explore and ACT Plan have evolved into ACT Aspire.
	ACT Plus Writing	English, mathematics, reading, science, writing	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based	MC, CR for writing portion		
	ACT QualityCore end-of-course (EOC)	English 10	10	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring			Y	
	ACT QualityCore EOC	Algebra I	Course grade	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring			Y	

[1] SR = selected response, CR = constructed response, MC = multiple choice, TEI = technology enhanced item.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	12	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based	MC		
	Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA)	English language arts, mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Yearlong	Criterion-referenced	Portfolio	Y	
	Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA)	Science	5, 7, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Yearlong	Criterion-referenced	Portfolio	Y	
Alaska	Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based (fixed form in 2015–16, adaptive in 2016–17 and thereafter); paper-pencil available for schools that are not technologically ready	Few MCs; items that will require students to analyze, perform multi-step tasks, solve problems, and apply what they know to new situations	Y	Accommodations are available to students with disabilities and English language learners for all Alaska assessments.
	AMP	Science	4, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil available		Y	First administration of AMP science (assessing same content) in Spring 2016.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Kindergarten Development Profile	Physical well-being, health, and motor development; social and emotional development; approaches to learning; cognition and general knowledge; communication, language, and literacy	K–1	School readiness	Fall	Observation-based		Y	
	Early Literacy Screeners	Phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development (oral skills, reading fluency, reading comprehension)	K–2 and students in grade 3 identified as delayed in grade 2	School readiness	Yearlong			Y	Screeners (interim assessments) are chosen by districts from a list of state-approved tools.
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	Alaska Alternate Assessment	Science	4, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards				Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	SAT, ACT, or ACT WorkKeys	SAT: reading, writing and language, mathematics; ACT: English, reading, math, science; WorkKeys: Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11	College and career readiness	November–April (windows vary)	ACT: computer-based; SAT: paper-pencil; WorkKeys: paper-pencil and computer-based versions available	MC, CR	Y	Students are required to take one of the three assessments.
American Samoa	Standards Based Assessment (SBA)	Reading, mathematics, writing	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	SBA	Science	4, 7, 11	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	SBA	Social studies	5, 8, 12	Proficiency on state standards					Tool is currently under development. No update as of January 2016.
	Stanford Achievement Test	Reading, mathematics		Performance relative to peers					Assessment is used to compare achievement of American Samoa students with that of U.S. students.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	English Language Proficiency Tool	Reading, writing, speaking, listening		English language proficiency					Tool is currently under development. No update as of January 2016.
Arizona	Arizona's Measurement of Educational Readiness to Inform Teaching (AzMERIT)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil and computer-based versions available	MC, CR (writing portion/editing tasks)	Y	
	AzMERIT	ELA, Geometry, Algebra I and II	9–11	Proficiency on state standards, EOC	Fall, Spring	Paper-pencil and computer-based versions available	MC, CR (writing portion/editing tasks)	Y	
	Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS)	Science	4, 8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		MC	Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	AIMS Alternate (AIMS A)	Science	4, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil and computer-based (multiple choice section may be completed online)	MC, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Fall, Spring			Y	Used as placement and reassessment test.
	U.S. Citizenship Test	Civics	High school	Citizenship competency			MC	Y	Beginning with the class of 2017, students must correctly answer at least 60 percent of the 100-question test, based on U.S. Immigration and Naturalization civics questions.
Arkansas	ACT Aspire	English, reading, mathematics, science, writing	3–10	Proficiency on state standards, college and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, CR, TEI	Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	English language arts, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	Arkansas Alternate Portfolio Assessment	Science	5, 7, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Due by March 2016	Portfolio of student work		Y	
	Iowa Assessments	Reading comprehension, mathematics problem solving	1–2	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT	English, reading, mathematics, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based or paper-pencil (school choice)	MC	N	
	English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21)	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	SR, short CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Qualls Early Learning Inventory (QELI)	Development in behavioral characteristics	K, any grade 1 students who did not attend K	School readiness	Beginning of the school year			Y	
California	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended response, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	California Standards Test (CST)	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		MC	Y	
	California Modified Assessment (CMA)	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		MC	Y	
	California Alternate Assessment (CAA) Field Test	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	The CAPA for ELA and mathematics has been eliminated.
	California English Language Development Test (CELDT)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Summer–Fall	Paper-pencil		Y	
	Physical Fitness Test (PFT): FitnessGram	Physical fitness	5, 7, 9	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		Performance tasks	Y	
	Desired Results Developmental Profile–Kindergarten (DRDP-K)	Development in various domains	K	School readiness		Observation-based		N	
	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)	ELA, mathematics	10, later grades for those who haven't passed	High school graduation readiness	District decision (from list of approved dates)	Paper-pencil	MC, writing task	See notes	Currently suspended through the 2017–2018 school year.
	California High School Proficiency Examination (CHSPE)	ELA, mathematics	16 years of age and older	High school graduation readiness	Twice a year—Once in Fall, once in Spring			N	For individuals who want to leave high school early.
	ELA Standards-Based Tests in Spanish (STS)	ELA	2–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			N	Optional.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Colorado	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–9	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended response, TEI, performance tasks	Y	Includes Colorado Spanish Language Arts (CSLA), reading assessment in Spanish for grades 3 and 4, and writing assessment for grade 4. State is required to administer writing assessment in Spanish to grade 3 if there are NCLB funds to pay for it.
	Colorado Measure of Academic Success (CMAS)	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	CMAS	Social studies	4, 7	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	This assessment will be administered on a sampling basis to one-third of the schools.
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, writing, mathematics	3–10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	Includes teacher-administered testlets as well as computer-administered testlets (about 5–7). Each testlet has an engagement activity and 3–8 questions.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Colorado Alternate Assessments (CoAlt)	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, supported performance tasks	Y	Teachers observe students as they complete assessment questions. Teachers then score student performance using a rubric.
	CoAlt	Social studies	4, 7, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, supported performance tasks	Y	Teachers observe students as they complete assessment questions. Teachers then score student performance using a rubric.
	Colorado (CO) ACT	Reading, writing, mathematics, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring		MC, CR	See Notes.	The CO ACT is no longer administered. The state is currently seeking a new assessment.
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	K test and Alternate ACCESS for grades 1–12 is paper-pencil.
	WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Fall or within two weeks of enrollment	Paper-pencil		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	School Readiness Assessments Early Literacy (READ Act) Assessments	Literacy	K–3	School readiness	Yearlong			Y	State-mandated, locally determined assessments.
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI)	ACT Aspire	English, reading, writing, mathematics, science	3–10	Proficiency on state standards, college and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based (grades 6–9/10); Paper-pencil (grades 3–5)	SR, CR, TEI	Y	Interim assessments (computer-based only) take place in Fall and Winter.
	Standards Based Assessment (SBA)	CNMI History	High school course grade	Proficiency on course standards	Spring			Y	
	SBA	Chamorro and Carolinian Language Heritage Studies (CCLHS)	4, 6, and 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
Connecticut	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended response, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil (optional online version is available)	MC, short CR	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA)	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	CTAA is the state's branding of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment.
	CMT/Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) Skills Checklist	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Yearlong; submitted in Spring	Working document to be completed by teacher		Y	For students with significant cognitive disabilities.
	CAPT	Science	10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil (optional online version is available for accommodations)	MC, short CR	Y	
	Language Assessment Scales (LAS) Links	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil available		Y	
	SAT	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	11	Proficiency on state standards, college readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC	Y	Note that "the essay portion of the SAT will not be administered as part of the Connecticut school-day SAT state assessment."

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Delaware	Smarter Balanced	English language arts, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended response, TEI, performance tasks	Y	Accommodations available for students with special needs, (i.e., Braille, Text to Speech, American Sign Language, and several language translations).
	Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS)	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, TEI	Y	Accommodations available for students with special needs, such as Braille and translated version in Spanish.
	DCAS	Social studies	4, 7	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, TEI	Y	Accommodations available for students with special needs, such as Braille and translated version in Spanish.
	DCAS EOC Assessments	Algebra II (optional), Integrated Mathematics III (optional), U.S. History (required)	High school	Proficiency on course standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, TEI	See Content Area.	Accommodations available for students with special needs, such as Braille and translated version in Spanish.
	DCAS-Alt1	Reading, mathematics	3–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	One-on-one testing; teacher uses script and materials provided	MC	Y	Test administrator enters student responses into an online system

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	DCAS-Alt1	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	One-on-one testing; teacher uses script and materials provided	MC	Y	Test administrator enters student responses into an online system
	DCAS-Alt1	Social studies	4, 7, 9	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	One-on-one testing; teacher uses script and materials provided	MC	Y	Test administrator enters student responses into an online system
	ACCESS for ELLs Language Proficiency Test	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	W-APT (computer-based placement test) for grades K–12 and MODEL (paper-pencil placement test) for grades K–1 can be administered at any time during school year.
	Delaware Early Learner Survey		K	School readiness	Within the first 30 days of school	Survey		Y	
	Preliminary SAT (PSAT)	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	10	College readiness	Fall	Paper-pencil	MC	Y	
	SAT	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	11	College readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC, CR	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
District of Columbia	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended response, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	DC Science Assessment	Science	5, 8, high school biology	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		SR, CR, TEI	Y	This fall, additional items will be field tested as an optional formative assessment, and feedback will be solicited.
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System Alternate (DC CAS-ALT) Assessment	Science	5, 8, high school biology	Proficiency on state standards	Yearlong; data collection window closes in Spring	Portfolio		Y	
	DC CAS Health and Physical Education Assessment	Health, physical education	5, 8, course grade	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	K test is paper-pencil.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Federated States of Micronesia	National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT)	English	6, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	NMCT	Mathematics	4, 6, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
Florida	Florida Standards Assessments (FSAs)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	Retakes for ELA grade 10 occur in the Fall.
	FSA EOC	Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II	Middle and high school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring, Summer	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	
	Statewide Science Assessment	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	Florida EOC Assessments	Algebra I (retakes only), Biology I, Geometry (retakes only), U.S. History, Civics	Middle and high school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring, Summer	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	All students completing Algebra I or Geometry courses in 2014–15 and after will take the FSA EOC Assessment in those subject areas.
	Grade 10 FCAT 2.0 Reading Retake	Reading	10	High school graduation readiness	Once in Fall, once in Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Florida Alternate Assessment	Reading, mathematics	3–10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Florida Alternate Assessment	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Florida Alternate Assessment	Writing Field Test	4–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs 2.0	Listening, speaking, reading, writing	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	Alternate version administered to students in grades 1–12.
	Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (PERT)	Reading, writing, mathematics	11	Readiness for credit-bearing college courses	Local decision	Computer-based		Y	Required for "students scoring within specified ranges on the 10th grade FCAT Reading 2.0 (Level 2 or 3) and Algebra I EOC) exam (Level 2, 3 or 4)." Scores on other college and career readiness assessments (ACT, SAT) can be used to meet this requirement.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)	Reading	K–12	Proficiency on state standards	Yearlong			N	
	Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS)	Development	K	School readiness	Fall (within first 39 instructional days of school year)		Teacher observation, SR, performance tasks	Y	
	ACT Plan	English, mathematics, reading, science	High school	College and career readiness	Fall		MC		
	Preliminary SAT/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT)	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	High school	College readiness	Fall	Paper-pencil	MC		
	Advanced Placement (AP) examinations	Varies	High school	Proficiency on course standards, college readiness	Spring			N	
Georgia	Georgia Milestones Assessment System End-of-grade assessments	English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, social studies	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended CR, extended writing response	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Georgia Milestones Assessment System EOC assessments	9th grade Literature and Composition, American Literature and Composition, Algebra I, Geometry, Coordinate Algebra, Analytic Geometry, Physical Science, Biology, U.S. History, Economics/Business/ Free Enterprise	Middle and high school	Proficiency on course standards	Spring (see Notes)	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended CR, extended writing response	Y	Administration will begin in Winter 2015 for Algebra I and Geometry.
	Georgia Alternate Assessment (GAA)	ELA, mathematics	K, 3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Two collection periods during year	Portfolio of student work		Y	
	GAA	Science, social studies	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Two collection periods during year	Portfolio of student work		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Georgia Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (GKIDS)	ELA, mathematics, social studies (optional), science (optional), approaches to learning, personal and social development, motor skills (optional)	K	School readiness	Yearlong			Y	School decides when to administer the assessment, which tasks to use, and how frequently to assess students.
Guam	ACT Aspire	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based and/or Paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	Guam Standards Based Assessments	ELA, mathematics	Grades not tested by the ACT Aspire	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Guam Standards Based Assessments	Social studies, science	1–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11–12	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Hawaii	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended response, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Hawaii State Assessment (HSA)	Science	4, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	Hawaii State Alternate Assessments (HSA-Alt)	Reading, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, performance tasks	Y	
	HSA-Alt	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, performance tasks	Y	Field test to occur Fall 2015 and operational test to occur Spring 2016.
	Hawaiian Language HSA (Field Test)	ELA, mathematics	3–4	Proficiency on state standards	Spring				Field test of the Hawaiian Language HSA in reading and math occurred in immersion schools in Spring 2015. Students who took this test did not take the Smarter Balanced assessment.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	EOC examinations	Algebra I and II (optional), Biology I (required), U.S. History (optional)	High school	Proficiency on course standards	Spring (Fall for block schedule schools; Summer administration available)	Computer-based	MC, CR	Y	
	ACT Aspire	English, mathematics, reading, science	8–10	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC	See Notes.	Required for grade 8.
	ACT Plus Writing	English, mathematics, reading, science, writing	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, CR for writing portion	Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	Alternate version administered to students in grades 1–12.
Idaho	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT)	Science	5, 7	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	MC	Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	ISAT-Alt	Science	5, 7, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Fall–Spring (or October–February)	Portfolio		Y	
	EOC examinations	Biology, chemistry	10–12	Proficiency on course standards	Spring	Computer-based	MC	Y	
	Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA)—ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	K test is paper-pencil.
	Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI)	Reading	K–3	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring (for K–2 only)				
	SAT	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	11	College readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC, CR	Y	ACCUPLACER is available to a select group of students.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	United States Citizenship Test	Civics and state government	Any time after entering grade 7	High school graduation-readiness	District/school determination			Y	Required beginning with the 2016–2017 school year. The test will be the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services Naturalization Test.
Illinois	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics (including English III and Algebra II/Integrated Math III)	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR	Y	K test is paper-pencil.
	ACT Plus Writing	English, mathematics, reading, science, writing	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, CR for writing portion	N	The Illinois State Board of Education pays for the administration of the test, but district decides whether to administer. All grade 11 students in participating districts are expected to participate.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC	N	The Illinois State Board of Education pays for the administration of the test, but district decides whether to administer. All grade 11 students in participating districts are expected to participate.
Indiana	Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	MC, gridded-response, TEI	Y	
	ISTEP+ EOC Assessments (ECAs)	Algebra I, English 10	Algebra I course grade; 10	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer			Y	After the 2015–2016 school year, the ISTEP+ Grade 10 Mathematics and English Language Arts assessments will replace the ISTEP+ ECAs as graduation requirements.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD)	Reading	K–3	Proficiency on state standards	Spring, Summer (option available for grade 3 only)	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	Grades K–2: oral; Grade 3: MC	Y	IREAD in grades K–2 are used to inform instruction. IREAD-3 (grade 3) is a summative assessment that students must pass in order to move on to the next grade. Students have an opportunity to retest in the summer if they do not pass in the spring.
	Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR)	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	Three testing windows: first window is to administer the placement test, and the last two windows are to assess what has been taught in the fall, winter, and spring.
	ISTAR	Science	4, 6, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	Three testing windows: first window is to administer the placement test, and the last two windows are to assess what has been taught in the fall, winter, and spring.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ISTAR	Social studies	5, 7	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	Three testing windows: first window is to administer the placement test, and the last two windows are to assess what has been taught in the fall, winter, and spring.
	Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR) Kindergarten Readiness (ISTAR-KR)	ELA; mathematics; physical, personal care, and social-emotional skills	Pre-K–K	School readiness	Upon entrance, at exit, and annually on child's birthday	Computer-based	Teacher observation	Y	Data from ISTAR-KR are used in state reporting for pre-kindergarten students receiving special education services.
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	ACCUPLACER	Mathematics, reading, writing	High school	Course readiness	Fall, Spring	Computer-based, adaptive	MC, CR for writing portion	Y	For students who might need remediation at postsecondary institutions or workforce training programs.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Iowa	Iowa Assessments (see Notes)	Reading, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring			Y	Smarter Balanced administered starting in the 2016–17 school year. Only testing window then will be in the spring.
	Iowa Assessments	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring			Y	Beginning in the 2016–17 school year, the only testing window will be in the spring.
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 10–11	Proficiency on state standards	Yearlong, with summative in Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	Iowa Alternate Assessments (IAA)	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Iowa-English Language Development Assessment (I-ELDA)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring			Y	
Kansas	Kansas Assessment Program (KAP)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	First entry by a student in a U.S. school after February 15, 2015: exempted from taking ELA but not mathematics.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	KAP	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	
	KAP	History/government	6, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	
	Multidisciplinary Performance Task (MDPT)	ELA	3–8, 10–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	CR	Y	First entry by a student in a U.S. school after February 15, 2015: exempted from testing.
	Mathematics Performance Task	Mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Performance task	Y	
	ELPA21	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	SR, short CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	First entry by a student in a U.S. school after February 15, 2015: exempted from taking English language arts, but not mathematics
	DLM	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks		

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	KAP Alternate Assessment	History/government	6, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	MC, TEI	Y	First entry by a student in a U.S. school after February 15, 2015: exempted from testing.
	Career Pathways Assessment System (cPASS)		11–12	College and career readiness	Yearlong	Computer-based	MC, TEI		
Kentucky	Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP)	Reading, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, 10–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		MC, extended CR, short answer	Y	
	K-PREP	Writing	5, 6, 8, 10–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	K-PREP Alternate Assessment	English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, 10–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	ACT QualityCore	English 10, Algebra II, Biology, U.S. History	High school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT	English, reading, mathematics, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil or computer-based (pilot)	MC	Y	
	ACT Compass	Reading, mathematics	12	College and career readiness		Computer-based		N	Grade 12 students who do not meet ACT benchmarks in a designated subject must take ACT Compass or KYOTE.
	Kentucky Online Testing (KYOTE)	Reading, writing, mathematics	12	College and career readiness		Computer-based		N	Grade 12 students who do not meet ACT benchmarks in a designated subject must take ACT Compass or KYOTE.
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information		Career readiness		Computer-based or paper-pencil		N	Only for career-enrolled students who have completed three Career and Technical Education courses.
	Kentucky Occupational Skills Standards Assessment (KOSSA)	Broad spectrum, including agriculture, manufacturing, and engineering		College and career readiness		Computer-based		N	Only for career-enrolled students who have completed three Career and Technical Education courses.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB)	Reading, writing, mathematics, civics, U.S. history		Aptitude profile				N	Only for career-enrolled students who have completed three Career and Technical Education courses.
Louisiana	Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP)	English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies (field test)	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based and/or paper-pencil		Y	The social studies assessment was field tested in 2015–16; districts must choose whether to administer in 2015–16 or 2016–17.
	LEAP EOC assessments	English language arts, mathematics, science, social studies	9–12	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	LEAP alternate assessment	English language arts, mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	LEAP alternate assessment	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	English Language Development Assessment (ELDA)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Teaching Strategies GOLD	Early childhood development	Pre-K, K	School readiness		Observation-based		Y	Required for children in publicly funded pre-K and kindergarten programs.
	Developing Skills Checklist (DSC)	language, cognition, physical and social-emotional components	Pre-K, K	School readiness	Fall	Observation-based		Y	Required for children in publicly funded pre-K and kindergarten programs.
	DIBELS NEXT	Literacy	K–3	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Paper-pencil			
	ACT Explore	English, mathematics, reading, science	8	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil		N	
	ACT Plan	English, mathematics, reading, and science	9, 10	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC		
	ACT	English, reading, mathematics, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, and locating information	11	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available, for accommodated testing only			

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Maine	Maine Educational Assessment (MEA)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	New ELA and mathematics assessments for 2015–16 will replace Smarter Balanced.
	MEA SAT	ELA, mathematics	11	Proficiency on state standards, college readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	Will be computer-based in 2017.
	MEA	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment—called Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA)	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio (PAAP)	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Portfolio		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Fall–Spring (November–March)	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	Alternate, paper-pencil version is administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
Maryland	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Maryland School Assessment (MSA)	Science	5, 8, biology	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		MC, CR	Y	
	Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Alt-MSA	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Maryland High School Assessments (HSA)	English 10, Algebra/Data Analysis, Biology, Government	High School	Proficiency on course standards	Spring			Y	To graduate from high school, students must pass each of the HSAs, obtain an approved score on AP or IB tests, pass the Modified HAS, earn a combined approved total across multiple exams, or complete one or more project modules in the content area.
	Modified High School Assessments (Mod-HSA)	English 10, Algebra/Data Analysis, Biology, Government	High School	High school graduation readiness	Determined by LEA	Computer-based or paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Massachusetts	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	In 2014–15, LEAs chose whether to administer PARCC or MCAS. New exam that merges elements of MCAS with PARCC will be administered across the state starting in spring 2017.
	Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)	ELA, mathematics, science	High school	High school graduation readiness	Spring		MC, short answer, CR, writing prompts (ELA)	Y	Students must pass the grade 10 tests in ELA, mathematics, and one of the four high school science and technology/engineering tests as one condition of eligibility for a high school diploma.
	MCAS Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics, science	3–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Criterion-referenced portfolio		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Michigan	Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	Assessment includes both state-developed and Smarter Balanced content.
	M-STEP	Science	4, 7, 11–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	Grade 11–12 M-STEP is part of the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
	M-STEP	Social studies	5, 8, 11–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	Grade 11–12 M-STEP is part of the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
	Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program (MI-Access)	ELA, mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	
	MI-Access	Science	4, 7	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	
	MI-Access	Social studies	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	PSAT	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	9–10	College readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC		
	SAT	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	11, eligible 12	College readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC, CR		Part of the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11, eligible 12	Career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC		Part of the Michigan Merit Exam (MME).
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	Alternate version administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
	Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA)	Mathematics, literacy, language, cognition, social and emotional development, physical and motor development	K	School readiness	Fall	Observation			Test source: Teaching Strategies GOLD.
Minnesota	Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA)	English language arts (ELA)	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available for eligible students		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	MCA	Mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available for eligible students		Y	
	MCA	Science	5, 8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available for eligible students		Y	
	Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) Alternate Assessment	ELA	3–8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		Performance tasks, administered by teacher	Y	
	MTAS	Mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		Performance tasks, administered by teacher	Y	
	MTAS	Science	5, 8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring		Performance tasks, administered by teacher	Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	Alternate version administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities. K test is paper-pencil.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Mississippi	Mississippi Assessment Program (MAP)	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	MAP	Algebra I, English II	High school	Proficiency on EOC standards	Fall, spring				
	Subject Area Testing Program (SATP2)	Algebra I, English II, Biology, U.S. History	High school	High school graduation readiness	Fall, spring			Y	The SATP2 Algebra I and English II will be given to students who need to retest.
	Mississippi Science Test (MST2)	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	K–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF)	Science	3–8, 11–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Subject Area Alternative Assessment (SAAA)	English II, Algebra I, Biology, U.S. History	High school	High school graduation	Fall, Spring			Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT	English, reading, math, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring		MC		
	Mississippi Career Planning Assessment System (MS-CPAS2)			College and career readiness	Fall, Spring				
	Mississippi K–3 Assessment Support System (MKAS2)	Early childhood, reading	K–3	School readiness	Fall, Spring				Consists of three tests: (1) Universal Screener and Diagnostic Assessment; (2) Kindergarten Readiness Assessment; and (3) Grade 3 Reading Summative Assessment.
Missouri	Grade-Level Assessments	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	Grade-Level Assessments	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	EOC assessments	Algebra I and II, English I and II, Geometry, Biology, American History, Government, and Physical Science	High school (or earlier, depending on course grade)	Proficiency on EOC standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	Beginning with the 2014–15 school year, students must complete EOC assessments in Algebra I, English II, biology, and government prior to high school graduation.
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	DLM	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall	Computer-based		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	K test is paper-pencil.
	ACT	English, reading, math, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based or paper-pencil	MC		
	Personal Finance Assessment	Personal Finance	High school	Proficiency on state standards		Computer-based			Required of students who do not take a stand-alone personal finance course.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Montana	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT)	Science	4, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	CRT Alternate Assessment (CRT-Alt)	Science	4, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Late Fall	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	ACT Plus Writing	English, mathematics, reading, science, writing	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC, CR	N	
Nebraska	Nebraska State Accountability (NeSA) Assessments	Reading, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	NeSA	Writing	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil			
	NeSA	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring				
	NeSA Alternate Assessments	Reading, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	NeSA Alternate Assessments	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	English Language Development Assessment (ELDA)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
Nevada	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Criterion-Referenced Tests (CRT)	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	High School Science Exam	Science	10	High school graduation, EOC	Spring			Y	Administered until an EOC assessment in science is implemented in 2017.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	High School EOC Exams	English I and II, Mathematics I and II	High school	Proficiency on course standards				Y	Class of 2019 will be the first class of students required to receive a passing score on the EOCs to graduate.
	ACT	English, reading, math, science	11	College and career readiness, graduation readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC	Y	Required for graduation eligibility.
	Nevada Alternate Assessment (NAA)	ELA, mathematics, science	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Observation		Y	
	NAA	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Observation		Y	
	Career and Technical Education (CTE) assessments		10–12	Career readiness	Spring			Y	
	English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA21)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Computer-based	SR, short CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
New Hampshire	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP)	Science	4, 8	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	NECAP	Writing	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	SAT	ELA, mathematics, science	11	Proficiency on state standards, college readiness			MC, CR		
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards		Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	New Hampshire Alternate Learning Progressions Assessment (NH-ALP)	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
New Jersey	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK)	Science	4, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	New Jersey Biology Competency Test (NJBCT)	Biology	High school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA)	Science	4, 8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Portfolio		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
New Mexico	PARCC	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Fall, Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Standards Based Assessment (SBA)	Science	4, 7, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Performance Based Assessment (PBA)	Physical education, visual arts, music	4–8	Proficiency on state standards					
	EOC assessments	ELA, Spanish language arts, foreign languages, mathematics, social studies, physical education, career and technical education, computer and information sciences, performing arts, visual arts, family and consumer science, business, music	High school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring, Summer			Y	
	EOC	Science	8, high school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring, Summer			Y	
	Alternate Assessment High School Graduation (AAHSG) Exam	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	12	High school graduation	Fall, Spring			Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards		Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA)	Science	4, 7, 11–12	Proficiency on state standards		Paper-pencil		Y	
	NMAPA	Social studies	11–12	Proficiency on state standards		Paper-pencil		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	DIBELS Next	Reading	K–3	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
New York	Common Core Tests	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Science Elementary/ Intermediate Tests	Science	4, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA)	ELA, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	New York State Identification Test for English Language Learners (NYSITELL)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Within two weeks of initial enrollment			Y	Diagnostic test.
North Carolina	READY End-of-Grade Tests	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	READY End-of-Grade Tests	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	READY EOC assessments	Math I, Biology, English II	High school (or earlier)	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring			Y	
	NCEXTEND1 alternate assessments	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 10, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	NCEXTEND1 alternate assessments	Science	5, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Beginning-of-Grade 3 English Language Arts/Reading Test	ELA	3	Proficiency on state standards	Fall	Paper-pencil		Y	Diagnostic test.
	Read to Achieve-Grade 3 assessment	ELA	3	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	North Carolina final examinations	ELA, mathematics	High school	Indicator of teacher effectiveness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil		Y	
	North Carolina final examinations	Science	4, 6, 7, high school	Indicator of teacher effectiveness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil		Y	Grade 4 and 5 social studies and science final exams must be administered only in Spring.
	North Carolina final examinations	Social studies	4–high school	Indicator of teacher effectiveness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil		Y	Grade 4 and 5 social studies and science final exams must be administered only in Spring.
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	K test is paper-pencil.
	WIDA ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Fall or within 14 days of enrollment	Paper-pencil		Y	
	ACT	English, reading, math, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	MC		
	ACT Aspire Periodic Assessments	English, mathematics, reading, science	8	College and career readiness	Fall		MC		
	ACT Plan	English, mathematics, reading, science	10	College and career readiness	Fall		MC		

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	High school	Career readiness	Fall, Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	MC		
	Credit by Demonstrated Mastery (CDM) Phase 1 Assessments	English, mathematics, science	6–8, 9–12	Awarding course credit	Summer, Fall, Winter	Computer-based, paper-pencil			Used by LEAs to award course credit without requiring student to complete classroom instruction.
	College and Career Readiness Alternate Assessment		11	College and career readiness	Fall for grade 10, Spring for grade 11		MC, CR		
North Dakota	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	North Dakota State Assessment (NDSA)	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	North Dakota Alternate Assessment (NDAA)	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall	Computer-based		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	ACT	English, reading, mathematics, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC		
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	MC		
Ohio	Ohio's State Tests	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	Ohio's State Tests	Science	5, 8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based			
	Ohio's State Tests	Social Studies	4, 6, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based			
	Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD)	ELA, mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	AASCD	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards				Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	AASCD	Social studies	4, 6	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	Ohio Graduation Test (OGT)	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	High school	High school graduation readiness			MC, CR	Y	Class of 2017 will be the last to take the OGT.
	Diagnostic assessments	Reading	K–3	School readiness	Fall			Y	
	Diagnostic assessments	Writing	1–3	School readiness	Fall			Y	
	Diagnostic assessments	Mathematics	1–2	School readiness	Fall			Y	
	Kindergarten Readiness Assessment	Social skills, mathematics, science, social studies, language and literacy, physical well-being and motor development	K	School readiness	Fall		Observation, MC, performance tasks	Y	
	Ohio English Language Proficiency Assessment (OELPA)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening, comprehension	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	SR, short CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	Part of ELPA21 field test.
Oklahoma	Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests (OCCT)	Reading, mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	OCCT	Writing, science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	OCCT	Social studies	5, 7–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP)	Science	5, 8, HS biology	Proficiency on state standards, EOC		Portfolio		Y	
	OAAP	Social studies	5, 7, 8, HS U.S. History	Proficiency on state standards, EOC		Portfolio			
	OCCT End-of-Instruction	Algebra I and II, Biology I, English II and III, Geometry I, U.S. History	High school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring			Y	
	Oklahoma Modified Alternate Assessment Program (OMAAP)	Algebra I, Biology I, English II, U.S. History	High school	Proficiency on course standards	Fall, Spring			Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Oregon	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Winter, Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS)	Science, social studies	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Winter, Spring	Computer-based-Adaptive	SR, CR	Y	Social studies is optional.
	OAKS Extended	ELA, mathematics, science	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Winter, Spring	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	ELPA21	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	SR, short CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Logramos Spanish Literacy Assessment	Spanish	3–5	Spanish fluency	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	For Spanish-speaking students.
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania System School Assessment (PSSA)	English language arts, mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	PSSA	Science	4, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Keystone Exams	Algebra I, biology, literature	Course grade	Proficiency on course standards	Winter, Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil		Y	Exams serve as high school graduation requirements for students beginning with the class of 2017.
	Classroom Diagnostic Tools	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	3–12	Readiness indicator		Computer-based (adaptive)		N	Available for use in schools and classrooms throughout the school year on a voluntary basis to guide instruction and remediation.
	Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment (PASA)	Reading, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Administered by teacher to individual students		Y	
	PASA	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Administered by teacher to individual students		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
Puerto Rico	Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico	Mathematics, English, Spanish	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards				Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Pruebas Puertorriqueñas de Aprovechamiento Académico	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	Pruebas Puertorriqueñas Evaluación Alterna	Mathematics, English, Spanish	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	Pruebas Puertorriqueñas Evaluación Alterna	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
Republic of the Marshall Islands									
Republic of Palau	Palau Achievement Test	English, Palauan studies, science, mathematics, social studies	4, 6, 8, 10, 12	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
	Stanford Achievement Test	Reading, mathematics	1–12	Comparative measure		Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	Quarterly Assessment Tests	Mathematics, science, English, Palauan studies, social studies	1–8	Proficiency on state standards				Y	
Rhode Island	PARCC	English language arts/literacy	3–10	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	PARCC	Mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP)	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC)	Reading, writing, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	Rhode Island Alternate Assessment	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Three times throughout year	Portfolio		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)	Reading accuracy, fluency, comprehension	K–2	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	Kindergarten Entry Assessment and Teaching Strategies GOLD Progress Checkpoints Assessments		Pre-K–K	School readiness		Observation	Observation rubrics		Rhode Island is in the process of developing a Kindergarten Entry Assessment.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
South Carolina	South Carolina Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (SCPASS)	Science, social studies	4–8	Proficiency on state standards	TBD			Y	
	Summative Assessments [name to be determined]	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11 (grades 9, 10 if funds are available)	Proficiency on state standards	TBD			Y	
	EOC Examination Program (EOCEP)	Algebra I/Mathematics for the Technologies II, English I, U.S. History and the Constitution, Biology I/Applied Biology II	Course grade	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring				
	EOC [name to be determined]	Geometry, English II	High school	Proficiency on state standards	TBD				These assessments will be administered in Spring 2016, if required for federal accountability.
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	SC-Alt	Science, social studies	4–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil			
	Pre-kindergarten/Kindergarten Assessment (Pals, MyIGDIs, or GOLD)		K (4 years old)	School readiness	Fall, Spring			Y	Districts may choose one assessment from the list.
	Pre-kindergarten/Kindergarten Assessment (DRA-2nd Edition Plus)		K (5 years old)	School readiness	Fall, Spring			Y	
	Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) and Iowa Assessment (IA)		2	Gifted and talented indicator	Fall				
	Performance Task Assessments			Gifted and talented indicator	Spring				
South Dakota	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	South Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (Dakota STEP)	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC)	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	DSTEP-A	Science	5, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Portfolio	Rating forms based on student work samples	Y	
	Stanford 10 Abbreviated	Reading, mathematics	2, 4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR	Y	For home-schooled students and students who receive alternative instruction.
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-Apt)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	1–12	English language proficiency screener		Paper-pencil		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	EOC examinations and Course Equivalency assessments	Algebra I and II, Geometry, Biology, Physical Science, Physics, World History, U.S. History, Chemistry, Spanish I, Government, Geography	Course grade	Proficiency on state standards				N	Available in both state-provided and district-created forms. District must submit exam information for SD DOE approval.
	ACT	English, reading, mathematics, science	11–12	College and career readiness		Computer-based, paper-pencil	MC	N	
	South Dakota Benchmark Assessment	Reading, mathematics	3–8, 11	Progress in achieving state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, TEI	N	
	National Career Readiness Certificate (WorkKeys assessments)	Applied mathematics, locating information, reading for information	11–12	Career readiness		Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR	N	
	Accuplacer	Reading, writing, mathematics	11–12	Course readiness		Computer-based	SR	N	
Tennessee	Tennessee Ready (TNReady)	English language arts (including writing), mathematics	3–11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, performance task	Y	
	Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP)	Social studies	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR,	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	TCAP	Science	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	EOC examinations	English I–III, Algebra I–II, Biology I, Chemistry, U.S. History	Course grade	Proficiency on state standards	Summer	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	TCAP-Alt Portfolio Assessment	Reading/language arts, mathematics, science	3–8, 9–12	Proficiency on state standards		Portfolio		Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	ACT Explore	English, mathematics, reading, science	8	College and career readiness	Fall	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	ACT PLAN	English, mathematics, reading, science	10	College and career readiness	Fall	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	ACT/SAT	English, reading, mathematics, science, writing	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	Constructed Response Assessment (CRA)	Mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter	Computer-based	CR	N	
	SAT10	Reading, mathematics	K–2	Performance relative to peers	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR	N	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Texas	State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR)	Reading, mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring, Summer	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	STAAR	Writing	4, 7	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR, performance based		
	STAAR	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	STAAR	Social studies	8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	STAAR EOC	English I and II, Algebra I, Biology, U.S. History	Course grade	Proficiency on state standards	Winter, Summer	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	STAAR EOC	English III, Algebra II	Course grade	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR	N	Will be available to districts in Spring 2016 as optional assessments.
	STAAR Alternate	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	STARR Alternate 2	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Winter	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	STAAR L	Mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR	Y	Linguistic accommodation for ELLs.
	Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	Texas Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (TAKS)	ELA, mathematics, science, social studies	9–11	Graduation readiness	Fall, Winter, Summer	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
Utah	Student Assessment of Growth and Excellence (SAGE)	English language arts (ELA)—Includes Online Writing Assessment	3–11	Proficiency on state standards	Winter, Spring, Summer	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	SAGE	Mathematics	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Winter, Spring, Summer	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	SAGE	Science	4–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Winter, Spring, Summer	Computer-based	SR	Y	
	DIBELS	Reading	1–3	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Winter, Spring	Paper-pencil	Performance based	Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Utah Alternate Assessment	Science	4–12	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Winter	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
	WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-Apt)	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency		Paper-pencil		Y	
	ACT EXPLORE	English, mathematics, reading, science	8 or 9	College and career readiness	Fall	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	ACT Plan	English, mathematics, reading, science	10	College and career readiness	Fall	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	ACT	English, reading, mathematics, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR	Y	
	Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB)	Reading, writing, mathematics, civics, U.S. history	11	Aptitude profile					
U.S. Virgin Islands	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Virgin Islands Territorial Assessment of Learning (VITAL)	Science	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	This will be replaced with NGSS-aligned test by 2017.
	National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR	Y	
	VITAL Alternate	Science	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Portfolio	Evidence of student work	Y	
	Learning Accomplishment Profile, Third Edition (LAP-3)	Developmental items	Pre-K	School readiness		Observation, Criterion-referenced			
	Language Assessment Scales (LAS) Links	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil			
Vermont	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP)	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR, CR, short-answer	Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Fall	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Vermont Alternate Assessment Portfolio (VTAAP)	Science	4, 8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Portfolio	Evidence of student work	Y	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Winter	Computer-based, with paper-pencil version available (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	
Virginia	Standards of Learning (SOL)	Reading, writing, mathematics, history/social studies, science	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring, Summer	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	Virginia Modified Achievement Standards Test (VMAST)	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards		Computer-based	SR, TEI	Y	
	Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program (VSEP)	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Fall, Spring	Portfolio	Evidence of student work	Y	
	Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP)	Reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies	3–8, high school	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Portfolio	Evidence of student work	Y	
	Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA)	Reading	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Portfolio	Evidence of student work	Y	For limited English proficient (LEP) students.

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
Washington	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Measurements of Student Progress	Science	5, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	EOC examinations	Math (Algebra I, Geometry, Integrated Math I and II), Biology	Math: Course grade; Biology: 10	Proficiency on course standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	Second-Grade Fluency and Accuracy Assessment	Reading	2	Proficiency on state standards					
	Washington—Access to Instruction and Measurement (WA-AIM)	ELA, math, science for students with significant cognitive challenges	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	1:1 (proctors complete forms), paper-pencil		Y	
	WaKIDS Teaching Strategies GOLD	Whole-child: social–emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, mathematics	K	School Readiness	Fall	Observation	Observation rubrics	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA)	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Fall (Placement), Spring (Annual)	1:1 (proctors complete forms), paper-pencil	Performance-based	Y	
	English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21)	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Computer-based	Performance-based	Y	
	OSPI-Developed Assessments	Social studies, the arts, health and fitness, educational technology							
West Virginia	Smarter Balanced	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on CCSS	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	West Virginia General Summative Assessment: Science	Science	4, 6, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	SR, CR, extended CR, TEI, performance tasks	Y	
	Alternate Performance Task Assessment (APTA)	Reading/language arts, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	Performance tasks	Y	
	APTA	Science	4, 6, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	Performance tasks	Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	WESTELL	Reading, writing, listening, speaking	K–12	English language proficiency	Spring	Performance-based	Performance tasks	Y	
	HEAP Health Assessment	Health	6, 8, high school	Proficiency on state standards		Computer-based	SR, short answer, extended CR, performance tasks	Y	
	FitnessGram Physical Fitness Assessment	Health	4–8, high school	Student fitness		Performance-based	Performance tasks	Y	
	Early Learning Scale	Developmental items	Pre-K	School readiness		Observational, performance-based	Evidence of student work, teacher observation and reflection	Y	
	Teaching Strategies GOLD	Developmental items		School readiness					
	ACT EXPLORE	English, mathematics, reading, science	8	College and career readiness		Paper-pencil			
	ACT PLAN	English, mathematics, reading, science	10	College and career readiness		Paper-pencil	CR		

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, locating information, reading for information	12	Career readiness		Computer-based			
	Global 21 Career/Technical Education (CTE) Performance Assessment		9–12	College and career readiness					
	Preliminary SAT/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT)	Reading, writing and language, mathematics	9–11	College readiness		Paper-pencil	SR, CR	N	
	ACT and SAT	English, reading, mathematics, science, writing	High school	College and career readiness		Paper-pencil	SR, CR	N	
	COMPASS	Reading, mathematics	12	College and career readiness				N	
	Advanced Placement examinations			Proficiency on course standards				N	
	Golden Horseshoe	History	8	Proficiency on state standards				N	
	Online District Benchmark Interim Assessment (ODBIA)	All subjects	3–11	Proficiency on state standards				N	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	Online Technology Assessment	Technology	8	Proficiency on state standards				N	
	Acuity, interim, and formative assessments			Proficiency on state standards				N	
	Creative Curriculum.net		Pre-K					N	
	DIBELS	Literacy		Proficiency on state standards				N	
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Forward Exam	English language arts (ELA), mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	Wisconsin Forward Exam	Science	4, 8, 10	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	ACCESS	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Fall, Winter, Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	Performance-based	Y	
	ACT Aspire Early High School	English, reading, math, science, writing	9, 10	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based		Y	
	ACT Plus Writing	Reading, math, English, science, writing	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, locating information, reading for information	11	Career readiness	Spring	Paper-pencil		Y	
	Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment	ELA, mathematics	3–8, 11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	DLM	Science	4, 8–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Computer-based	Embedded tasks	Y	
	Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS)	Literacy	K–2	School readiness					Screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring
Wyoming	Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS)	Reading, writing, mathematics	3–8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC	Y	
	PAWS	Science	4, 8	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Paper-pencil	MC	Y	
	WY-Alternate (WY-ALT)	English language arts, mathematics	3–8, 9–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring	Individually administered student performance assessment		Y	
	WY-ALT	Science	4, 8, 9–11	Proficiency on state standards	Spring			Y	

State	Assessment	Content Area or Course	Grade(s)	Outcome Description	Testing Period	Type or Delivery Mode	Item Types[1]	Required Y/N	Notes
	ACT ASPIRE	English, math, reading, science	9, 10	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based, paper-pencil	SR, CR	Y	
	ACT Plus Writing	English, math, reading, writing, science	11	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-based	MC, CR for writing portion	Y	
	COMPASS	Reading, mathematics	12	College and career readiness	Spring	Computer-adaptive		N	
	ACT WorkKeys	Applied mathematics, reading for information, locating information	11–12	Career readiness	Spring	Computer-based		N	
	ACCESS for ELLs	Reading, writing, speaking, listening	K–12	English language proficiency	Winter	Computer-based, paper-pencil (note that K test is paper-pencil)	SR, CR, performance based, interactive items	Y	