Lessons Learned and the Road Ahead for the American Diploma Project Assessment Consortium
CCSSO Student Assessment Conference
June 20, 2010
Welcome and Introductions

- Tracy Halka—Associate Director, ADP Assessment Consortium, Achieve
- Stan Heffner—Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Ohio Department of Education
- Wesley Yuu—Senior Associate for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, Hawaii P-20 Partnerships for Education
- Cathy White—Account Manager, National Services, Pearson
Agenda

Lessons Learned
- Forces Shaping the American Diploma Project & the ADP Assessment Consortium
- Ohio’s role as the lead state
- New Jersey’s use of the ADP Algebra I End-of-Course Exam as a graduation requirement
- Hawaii’s use of the ADP Algebra II End-of-Course Exam in their higher education placement strategy and state system
- Pearson’s role as assessment vendor and partner in reform

The Road Ahead
- Where do we go from here?
Forces Shaping the American Diploma Project and the Assessment Consortium

• Achieve was created by the nation’s governors and business leaders in 1996 following the first National Education Summit.

• Achieve is a bipartisan, non-profit organization that helps states raise academic standards, improve assessments, and strengthen accountability to prepare all young people for postsecondary education, work, and citizenship.

• Achieve currently is working with 35 states through the American Diploma Project (ADP) Network to design and implement policies that aim to close the “expectations gap.”
American Diploma Project

• The American Diploma Project was created to ensure all graduates leave high school ready for college and careers.
• Early research by ADP sought to identify “must-have” knowledge and skills graduates will need to be successful in college and the workplace.
• Found a convergence between the skills that high school graduates need to be successful in college and those they need to be successful in a job that supports a family and offers career advancement.
• Developed ADP benchmarks that include the core content and skills in mathematics and English all students should have when they graduate high school.
Key Findings

- In mathematics, graduates need strong computation skills, ability to solve challenging problems, reasoning skills, geometry, data analysis, statistics, and advanced algebra.
- Essentially, they need the content and skills *typically taught* in courses such as Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry, or equivalent, as well as data analysis and statistics.
- In English, graduates need strong reading, writing and oral communication skills equal to four years of grade-level coursework, as well as research and logical reasoning skills.
ADP Policy Agenda: Close the Expectations Gap

- Align high school standards with college and career expectations.
- Require all students to take curriculum aligned with standards.
- Include “college-ready” tests, aligned with state standards, in high school assessment system.
- Hold high schools accountable for graduating students college- and career-ready, and hold postsecondary institutions accountable for student success.
35 ADP States Working Toward Alignment
ADP Assessment Consortium

In summer 2006, nine states issued RFP for the development of an Algebra II exam:

- Arkansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island

- Ohio acted as “lead state” in unprecedented multi-state procurement arrangement

- Pearson awarded contract in 2007 with addition of Algebra I in 2008

- Since the consortium began, six additional states have joined:
  - Arizona, Florida, Hawaii, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Washington
Purposes of the Common Exam

• The ADP Algebra I and II exams are designed to serve 3 goals:
  - To improve high school curriculum and instruction and to help ensure rigor and consistency for the sake of equity
  - To provide a common measure of student performance within and across states over time
  - To serve as an indicator of readiness for more advanced course work, specifically:
    • The Algebra II exam is designed to assess readiness for first-year college credit-bearing courses, but not intended as a replacement for existing college placement tests. It is designed to reduce the number of tests students take.
Exam Content Standards and Design

- States worked together to agree on test content and design specifications
  - Involved high school teachers and two- and four-year higher education mathematics faculty
- The resulting ADP Algebra II End-of-Course Exam Standards are generally aligned with ADP mathematics benchmarks, which represent knowledge students should have to be prepared for postsecondary success
- Performance levels are common across states
  - Consortium cross-state report published annually
State Leadership in Building and Sustaining An Effective Consortium
Consortium Structure

ADP Assessment Consortium States
Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Washington
Coordination and Direction Team

• Includes assessment directors or other high-ranking policy-making officials from each member state

• Responsible for overseeing the production and implementation of the Algebra I & II program

• Ensures sensitivity to legislation and policies of the states during deliberations and decision making
Decision Making

- Process of consensus, collaboration, and compromise
- Each member state has one voice and one vote
- Discussion of issues often give and take
- For legal matters, decisions must be unanimous
- Excellent preparation for common assessment consortia of states
New State Members

- Membership is open for any state wanting to be part of the consortium
- New members must agree to terms stated in the contract, but may add language
- Membership includes participation in all:
  - CDT meetings; and
  - Item development and review meetings
Why States Join

- **Interstate and Intrastate Comparison**—valuable information within and among states
- **Financial Efficiency**—multi-state consortium reduces duplication of assessment development costs
- **Proactive Policymaking**—state-led consortia decisions respect state needs while meeting national goals
More Reasons Why States Join

• ADP benchmark for Algebra II for all students is central to high school reform
• Hold schools accountable for delivering true Algebra II-level coursework
• Higher education buy-in
• The “grand” experiment—demonstrates how states can reach agreement on a blueprint and a test
• More efficient use of diminishing staff and dollars
Ohio’s Role as Lead State

• Appoint a procurement officer
• Conduct procurement
• Provide guidance to the CDT
• Administer the contract
Ohio: Challenges of Consortium

- **Common Assessment**
  - What can be the role of Algebra I and II exams?

- **Future Funding**
  - States have gone from riches to rags

- **Disturbing Results**
  - What are high schools defining as Algebra II?

- **Achieving Acceptance**
  - Colleges: use as a placement exam?
  - Careers: use in determining readiness?

- **Item Types**
  - Should they match common assessments?
Ohio: Benefits of Consortium

• Cost sharing
  - Item development
  - Processing

• Battle for common ground
  - Comparisons within and across states

• Information sharing
  - Best practices and alternate approaches

• Advantage in Race-to-the-Top application
New Jersey’s Use of the Algebra I Exam as a Graduation Requirement
Phasing in of Algebra I Assessment as Graduation Requirement in New Jersey

Due to current assessment requirements and the “due notice” that is required to be given to districts, the Algebra I assessment as a graduation requirement will be phased in using four groups. NJ does not require, or recommend, that students receive Algebra I instruction in a specific grade.
Phasing in of Algebra I Assessment as Graduation Requirement in New Jersey

- Group #1- Current 10th, 11th, and 12th graders will not be responsible for a passing score on the Algebra I assessment. If they complete an Algebra I course in school year 2011/12 or later, they sit for the assessment, but are only responsible for a passing score on the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA), the state’s 11th grade compensatory assessment.

- Group #2- Current 9th graders will be responsible for a passing score on both the HSPA and the Algebra I assessment if they complete an Algebra I course in school year 2011/12 or later.

- Group #3- Current 8th graders will be responsible for a passing score on the Algebra I assessment only. If they completed Algebra I in 2010/11, they will need to be “district certified” that they are proficient in Algebra I (having sat for full scale pilot in May 2010). The HSPA disappears after 2012.

- Group #4- Current 7th and lower grades will need a passing score on the Algebra I assessment.
Concerns from NJ (state department and field educators) in moving from a state-specific assessment to a consortium assessment

NJ Department of Education conducted 15 sessions with teachers/supervisors throughout the state called “Algebra I Assessment Expectations Clarification”. Teachers are supportive of requiring Algebra I content for all students and seem in favor of the move to end-of-course assessment, but have concerns.
Concerns from NJ (state department and field educators) in moving from a state-specific assessment to a consortium assessment

- All current NJ state assessment programs include state supplied formula sheets—Algebra I does not.
- Low scores from 2009/10 pilot.
- “Rigor” and depth of Achieve Algebra I Benchmarks— typical comment: “This is Algebra II content.”
- Timing- “approximately 60 minutes” and “untimed,” the ability to implement this, and the impact on standardized testing.
- Lack of Test Coordinator Training and face-to-face contact.
- Meshing of accommodation codes, demographic codes, collection of student data, score reporting, and testing procedures with standard NJ procedures.
Hawaii’s Use of Algebra II in Higher Education Placement Strategy
Not enough students performing well in UH pipeline to higher level math courses

Notes: Courses selected are those with enrollment >500 for xx semesters (Fall 2005 to Spring 2008). Data combines enrollment across UH campuses and terms. “Success” is defined as a student earning a grade of A, B, or C in the course.
Too many students fall out of the remedial/developmental pipeline in UH system

Note: The Achieving the Dream cohort includes entering (includes transfers), full and part time, degree seeking students.
What is the next course for students who graduate from high school with Algebra II or higher?

**DOE Courses**

- Algebra II
- Trig/PreCalc
- Math 100
- Math 111/112
- Statistics
- College Algebra
- Pre-Calc: Elem Fncts
- Calculus for Bus/SoSc
- Pre-Calc: Trig/AGeom
Algebra II (and the EOC exam) is the leverage for transforming DOE and IHE

- Algebra II is no longer just for accelerated students... all students should have access to career- and college-prep mathematics...
- ...and more “highly qualified” and effective Algebra II instructors will be needed.
- The Algebra II exam standardizes what is expected out of the Algebra II course across the state...
- ...and provides quality assurance for IHEs...
- ...and informs readiness for certain college-level courses (i.e., used for college placement).
Work with the ADP led to the DOE committing to increase the number of students completing rigorous mathematics in high school

- Revising secondary math benchmarks to align with ADP & EOC benchmarks

- Revised BOE Policy 4540 to redefine the requirements for the BOE Recognition Diploma, effective for the class of 2013 (4 credits of math and meet standards on Algebra II exam)

- Set a goal of 50% of graduates in 2013 earning the BOE Recognition Diploma...and 80% by 2018
Incentives for earning the rigorous BOE Recognition Diploma raise stakes for students

- **Scholarships** (DOE grads to UH)
- **College admissions** for students earning BOE Recognition Diploma with Honors: Chaminade University, Hawaii Pacific University, UH-Hilo, UH-West Oahu, and UH-Manoa (with minimum SAT/ACT scores)
- **Carpenters’ or drywall apprenticeship program** math test waiver
- **UH - placement into math courses**
Algebra II Exam: A Brief History in Hawaii DOE

- Since 2008, Hawaii teachers and specialists participated in test development
- HiDOE administered exam in Spr. 2008, 2009 and 2010
- Data from first three serves a baseline for schools
Algebra II Exam: A Brief History in UH System

- Since 2008, UH faculty participated in test development and validity studies conducted by Pearson
- 2008-2009: Series of three Mathematics Summits
- October 2009 (Mathematics Summit #3): placement agreements established by UH faculty
Performance on the Algebra II Exam will determine placement into UH mathematics courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVEL</th>
<th>COURSE PLACEMENT (for students on a degree path requiring advanced mathematics)</th>
<th>COURSE PLACEMENT (for students on a degree path requiring general education credit in mathematics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WELL PREPARED</td>
<td>Pre-Calculus: Trigonometry / Analytic Geometry</td>
<td>Survey of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED</td>
<td>Pre-Calculus: Elementary Functions</td>
<td>Tech math courses (Math 50, 60 series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMALLY PREPARED</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>Applied Calculus (UH-Hilo only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEDS MORE PREPARATION</td>
<td>Student will need to take math placement exam at receiving campus.</td>
<td>Mathematics for Elem. Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demanding cut scores resulted in low performance...but there is hope

- **Hawaii**: 3988
- **Baldwin HS**: 870
- **NATL CONSORTIUM**: 31185
- **McKinley HS**: 232552
- **Castle HS**: 274033

Legend:
- Purple: Well Prepared
- Green: Prepared
- Red: Needs Preparation

ADP Algebra II End-of-Course Exam administered Spring 2009
Hawaii’s Next Steps

- Complete upgrades to high school math standards based on Common Core
- Complete vertical (DOE-UH) and horizontal alignment (across UH system)
- Develop/purchase Algebra II modules as part of a statewide curriculum
- Provide statewide professional development
- Assure that pre-service teachers are appropriately trained
- Communicate to teachers and students that the Algebra II exam now matters
- Conduct studies to validate that placement via the Algebra II exam is just as successful as other placement exam
- Watch as college-going rates and degree-completion rates go up! (we hope!)
Website:
http://p20hawaii.org/
The Role of the Assessment Vendor as Partner in Reform
The Role of the Assessment Vendor as Partner in Reform

In close collaboration with the States and Achieve:

- Balance state-level needs within context of broader Consortium objectives
- Design and implement validity research to support standard-setting and program goals
- Facilitate communications with key stakeholders including teachers, students, parents, policymakers and public
- Learn to be more flexible in response to evolving state and national education policies and practices
Strong Commitment to Research

- Achieve, the Consortium States, and Pearson share this commitment
- Guided by Research Alliance comprised of leading national experts from higher education, mathematics, psychometrics, and education policy
- Unprecedented approach to standard-setting utilized validity research focused on Algebra II use for college readiness
Approach to Algebra II Standard Setting

- Given the multiple purposes of the exam, in November 2007 the Research Alliance recommended various validity studies prior to standard setting
- Standard setting was conducted after the spring 2009 administration
- Benefits of this approach
  - Time for additional studies
  - Time for additional instruction
  - Time for a full implementation of the ADP Algebra II Exam
Algebra II Standard Setting

Standard setting—July 22-24, 2009

- Standard setting is typically done by content experts using item-level data to determine the correct mix of items that constitute basic, proficient, or advanced performance levels.

- For the ADP Algebra II Exam, the performance levels must also describe a student’s preparedness to succeed in a first-year credit-bearing college mathematics course.

- Pearson implemented the “Modified Briefing Book” standard setting method.

- This approach was chosen to consider the validity research evidence and emphasize the relationship between scores on the exam and performance in postsecondary education, rather than item-level data.

- 27 panelists from all 15 ADP Consortium States—Department of education mathematics/assessment staff and higher education representatives from 2- and 4-year colleges.
Algebra II Validity Research Studies

- Three main types of studies in Briefing Book:
  - Concurrent studies—how does student performance on the Algebra II exam compare with other exams given in the high school to college transition?
  - Cross-sectional studies—what is the relationship between college students’ performance on the exam and their course grades?
  - Judgment studies—what kind of performance on the exam do college faculty expect?
- Achieve also conducted a number of content alignment studies with the Algebra II exam
Other Research to Inform Algebra II Standard Setting

Standard setting was informed by other research conducted by Achieve.

- Analysis of Algebra II standards across numerous states
- “Aligned expectations” - study of admissions and placement tests
- International perspective
- Analysis of college syllabi from judgment study participants
Algebra I Standard Setting

Conducted July 20-21, 2009

- Item Mapping Method
- 19 Panelists from 8 ADP Consortium States
- 4 Performance Levels
  - Below Basic
  - Basic
  - Proficient
  - Advanced
Results from 2009
The Majority of Graduates Would Have Taken Harder Courses, Particularly in Mathematics

Knowing what you know today about the expectations of college/work ... Would have taken more challenging courses in at least one area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>College students</th>
<th>Students who did not go to college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2009 Administration: Performance on the Algebra I Exam

#### TABLE 7: ALGEBRA I: PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL, BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Students Tested</th>
<th>Advanced (850–575)</th>
<th>Proficient (574–450)</th>
<th>Basic (449–387)</th>
<th>Below Basic (386–300)</th>
<th>Average Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>33,446</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>28,470</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Minnesota participated in the Algebra I administration but too few students took the exam to report scores.
# Spring 2009 Administration: Performance on the Algebra II Exam

## Table 8: Algebra II: Percent of Students in Each Performance Level, by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>102,936</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>6,291</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>45,443</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>8,063</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achieve 2009 Annual Cross-State Report

- Findings: Similar across states and subjects
  - Students' performance was low across all states for both exams
  - Performance is low across all content standards in both exams, in all states
  - Constructed response items were a particular challenge for students
  - Students who take Algebra I and II in earlier grades perform better on the exams

## Spring 2008, 2009 & 2010 Algebra Administrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of State</th>
<th>Spring 2008 (# of students tested)</th>
<th>Spring 2009 (# of students tested)</th>
<th>Spring 2010 (# of students registered)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>22,101</td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>29,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida (joined 2009)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>5,157</td>
<td>6,291</td>
<td>8,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>45,443</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>Alg I: 520</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Alg I: 9</td>
<td>Alg I: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alg II: 1,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9,813</td>
<td>Alg I: 28,470</td>
<td>Alg I: 126,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alg II: 8,063</td>
<td>Alg II: 2,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>2,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>33,611</td>
<td>Alg I: 2,031</td>
<td>Alg I: 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alg II: 2,416</td>
<td>Alg II: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>Alg I: 2,416</td>
<td>Alg I: 2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alg II: 369</td>
<td>Alg II: 1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (Algebra II only)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
<td>did not administer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of students:</strong></td>
<td><strong>88,344</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alg I: 33,427</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alg I: 129,438</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alg II: 103,936</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alg II: 46,014</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s New in 2010
2010 Research Plan

• Cognitive Labs
  - Purpose: To learn more about how students are approaching items and the mathematics on the Algebra I and II exams—Are the types and content familiar to students?
  - Participants: 18 Algebra I students from 3 New Jersey schools and 18 Algebra II students from 3 Arkansas schools
  - 90 minute sessions conducted in May and June 2010
  - Results of the study will be available in August 2010
2010 Research Plan

- Teacher Content Evaluation Study
  - Purpose:
    - To better understand the gaps between curriculum and instruction within and across states, and what is covered on the ADP Algebra exams.
    - To understand which of the ADP standards and benchmarks teachers are covering in their classrooms and what might be causing students to perform poorly on the exam.
  - Online survey conducted May 3-28
  - Participants: Teachers from Arkansas, Hawaii, Kentucky, New Jersey, Ohio, and Rhode Island
  - Results of the study will be available in August 2010
Rapid Reporting Implemented in Spring 2010

- School Roster posted 16 days after receipt of a complete school (no aggregated data)
- Student Score Reports, School Roster (including aggregated data), School/District/State Level Summary Reports, and Data Files posted 16 days after receipt of a complete state
The Road Ahead
How to contact us

Tracy Halka: thalka@achieve.org
Stan Heffner: stan.heffner@ode.state.oh.us
Wesley Yuu: wyuu@hawaii.edu
Sandra Alberti: sandra.alberti@doe.state.nj.us
Cathy White: cathy.white@pearson.com