

**HB**

**146**

**HFIN**

**FILE**

REPRESENTATIVE  
**TERRY MARTIN**  
VICE-CHAIRMAN  
BUDGET & AUDIT COMMITTEE  
MEMBER  
HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE

# Alaska State Legislature

MAY 15 - JAN 15 258-8169  
716 W. 4TH, SUITE 650  
ANCHORAGE, AK 99504

JAN 15 - MAY 15 465-3783  
STATE CAPITOL  
JUNEAU, AK 99801-1182



April 14, 1997

TO: House Finance Committee

FROM: Rep. Terry Martin *THM*

RE: Amendments to HB 146  
Pupil Competency Testing

The following ideas are currently being drafted into amendment for tomorrow's meeting:

1. Assessment procedures be administered to Elementary School students and Middle or Junior High School Students. Assessments to occur at grades 4, 8 and 11, in preparation for high school graduation competency exam.
2. Consideration be given by school districts as to potential impact on matriculation to next grade level, as well as to graduation from high school.
3. Intervention plans to be developed by school districts to assist students whose assessments reveal they have not mastered skills required by exit criteria, allowing students the opportunity to correct deficiencies and improve their success in public school. Intervention plans must be in place before assessments can be implemented.
4. Alternative standards be developed by school districts to properly assess students with special needs, such as learning or language disabilities.



Rescinded failed  
~~adopted~~ 5/4

0-LS0515\B.1-  
Ford  
4/14/97

#1

AMENDMENT

OFFERED IN THE HOUSE

TO: CSHB 146(HES)

1 Page 1, line 1, following "for":  
2 Insert "elementary and"

3 Page 1, line 5:  
4 Delete "Secondary pupil"  
5 Insert "Pupil"

6 Page 1, line 14, following "under":  
7 Insert "(a) of"

8 Page 2, following line 4:  
9 Insert new subsections to read:

10 (c) In addition to the competency testing required under (a) of this section,  
11 a governing body shall require that pupils be tested for competency in the areas of  
12 reading, English, mathematics, science, and social science in the fourth, eighth, and  
13 11th grades. The department shall determine the form and content of the examination  
14 and shall score completed examinations. A pupil who fails to pass an examination  
15 required under this subsection shall receive remedial instruction in the areas tested.  
16 Remedial instruction must be provided as soon as possible following the disclosure  
17 of the test results to the school district.

18 (d) A district shall  
19 (1) consider each pupil's test results before a pupil passes into the next  
20 grade;  
21 (2) develop intervention plans to assist students who require remedial  
22 instruction; intervention plans must be in place before a pupil is tested as required

- 1 under this section; and
- 2 (3) develop alternative testing standards for pupils with special needs,
- 3 including learning or language disabilities."

# HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(11)

Date Referred to Committee: March 24, 1997

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Date of Committee Action: 4/11/97

The FINANCE Committee considered:

HB 146

HOUSE BILL NO. 146

PUPIL COMPETENCY TESTING

"An Act relating to competency testing requirements for secondary students; and providing for an effective date."

recommends it be replaced with the following committee substitute

CS HB 146 (Fin)

the same title  
 a new title

additional referral to \_\_\_\_\_ Committee  
 attached amendment(s)

ADOPTS: \_\_\_\_\_ Letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S): (Dept)

APPROVES PREVIOUS: (Dept/Date)

fiscal note(s) HFC for DOE

fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

zero fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

zero fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNING WITH RECOMMENDATIONS		DP	DNP	NR	AM
<i>Gene Theriault</i>	Theriault			X	
<i>Mark Hanley</i>	Hanley	X			
<i>Edon Mulder</i>	Mulder	X			
<i>Vic Kohring</i>	Kohring				X
<i>John M. Davies</i>	Davies		X		
<i>Ben Grossenbott</i>	Grossenbott				X
<i>Randy Moses</i>	Moses			X	
<i>Fred Davis</i>	DAVIS			X	

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE

*Gene Theriault* *Mark Hanley*

# FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
1997 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSHB 146 (FIN)

Dept. Affected EDUCATION

BRU: Teaching & Learning Support

Title: An Act relating to competency testing  
requirement for secondary students

Sponsor: House HESS Committee

Requestor: \_\_\_\_\_

Components: Quality Schools

Serial # 2147

**EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)**

OPERATING	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
Personal Services	66.0	66.0	66.0	66.0	66.0	66.0
Travel	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
Contractual	400.0	174.1	174.1	174.1	174.1	174.1
Supplies	4.0	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4
Equipment	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
Land & Structures	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grants, Claims	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>490.0</b>	<b>263.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>266.5</b>	<b>261.5</b>

<b>CAPITAL</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

<b>REVENUE</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

**FUNDING: (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)**

General Fund	490.0	263.5	256.5	256.5	266.5	261.5
Federal Fund	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>490.0</b>	<b>263.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>266.5</b>	<b>261.5</b>

**POSITIONS:**

Full-Time	1	0	0	0	0	0
Part-Time	1	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0	0	0

**ANALYSIS: (ATTACH A SEPARATE PAGE IF NECESSARY)**

see attached analysis

Prepared by:

House Finance Committee

Date: 4/16/97

Rep. Mark Hanley, Co-Chair

Phone: 465-4939

Rep. Gene Therriault, Co-Chair

Phone: 465-4797

# **HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE**

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATE CAPITOL, JUNEAU 99801  
(907) 465-3759



## **SPONSOR STATEMENT**

### **CS HB 146 (HES)**

**"An Act relating to competency testing requirements for secondary students; and providing for an effective date."**

Many of our high school graduates are finishing school and receiving high school diplomas without the skills necessary to survive in the world. This must not continue.

Over twenty states now conduct student competency tests for a standard high school diploma. The students in these states must pass a test with a minimum score before they are allowed to graduate. Three states also have an exit exam for an "Endorsed Diploma." To earn this, the students not only have to pass the test, but must score at a designated level, higher than the minimum required for a regular diploma. Three more states go even further and have a more rigorous test for an "Honors Diploma."

Under the provisions of CS HB 146 (HES), a student is required to pass a competency examination in the areas of reading, English, mathematics, science, Alaska and United States history before receiving a high school diploma. The test would be selected by the department. A pupil who failed this examination and was no longer in attendance would get a certificate of attendance. It would indicate the number of years of attendance, but would also show that the pupil has neither passed a competency examination nor received a diploma. The pupil would have the opportunity to be re-examined, but it would have to take place within three years after the pupil left high school.

It is time for Alaska to take its place among those states working to ensure that their high school graduates have the knowledge they need to succeed in the world.

Adopted

#2

Amendment

by Mulder

To: CSHB 146 (HES)

Page 1, line 7, following "mathematics":

Insert ". "

Delete (through line 8): "science, Alaska history and United States history."

## Fiscal Note

STATE OF ALASKA  
1997 Legislative Session

Bill No. CS HB 146(FIN)

### Updated Analysis (4/16/97)

This legislation will fiscally impact both the local school districts and the state. Districts will have increased costs in making testing available for students, in providing tracking and remedial assistance, in logistics associated with test security and administration. Other projected costs will include redoing district-level diploma format, providing testing for out-of-school students and loss of revenue due to higher dropout rates, which have been experienced in other states.

Anticipating all of the costs of an exit examination is very complex. Alaska has many unique conditions which make it extremely difficult to accurately predict the costs of developing and maintaining the test. Substantial legal challenges have resulted in establishing a standard which Alaska must meet.

The figures in this fiscal note represent the best information the department can extrapolate from other states and expert advice at this time. It has been adjusted for the numbers of students and other specifics, e.g., Alaska travel costs. The department believes that this is the minimum amount necessary to implement the requirements of this legislation. However, it will be necessary to revise future years as more information is made available.

### Personal Services - \$66.0

This will include funding for a new full-time Education Assistant, Range 11, at \$37.0 and a part-time Administrative Clerk 11, Range 8, for ten months at \$29.0. This staffing level is based up the test being developed entirely by a contractor and the assessment budget, including the one existing assessment staff member being maintained.

### Travel - \$10.0

Travel costs are associated with field testing and training sessions around the state. Field testing is an essential element in establishing the technical quality of all test items. Staff will be required to work with the contractor to establish the field test and be present to work with groups to validate items and establish parameters for testing.

### Contractual - \$400.0

CS HB 146(FIN) will require an exit examination in three areas: reading, language arts and mathematics. Based on testimony, the three subject areas comprise two different test content areas (reading and language arts being developed as one test content area). Estimates of the cost of developing exit examinations in other states range from \$150,000 to \$250,000 per content area. This revised fiscal note is built on the average range of \$200,000 for two test content areas. These funds will cover the cost of developing the test, setting standards, developing scoring protocols, layout, scanning of answer sheets, reports and revision of the test through revision and renorming, equating studies, item bank development, or a combination of these. These costs also include any necessary revision and annual maintenance of the test or scoring. It also includes postage, printing, fax and long distance costs.

### Supplies - \$4.0

Supplies include the purchase of testing materials and office supplies.

### Equipment - \$10.0

These funds will be used to purchase the necessary computer equipment, including a scanner, to handle the data associated with the exit examination. Anticipated upgrade and replacement costs are reflected in future year anticipated costs.

# FISCAL NOTE

**STATE OF ALASKA  
1997 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

**BILL NO. CSHB 146 (FIN)**

Revision Date: _____	Dept. Affected: <u>EDUCATION</u>
Title: <u>An act relating to competency testing requirements for secondary students</u>	BRU: <u>Teaching and Learning Support</u>
Sponsor: <u>House HESS Committee</u>	Component: <u>Quality Schools</u>
Requester: <u>House Finance Committee</u>	<b>COMPONENT SERIAL NO. <u>2147</u></b>

**Expenditures/Revenues: (Thousands of Dollars)**

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
PERSONAL SERVICES	66.0	66.0	66.0	66.0	66.0	66.0
TRAVEL	10.0	10.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
CONTRACTUAL	<del>170</del> 472.2	174.1	174.1	174.1	174.1	174.1
SUPPLIES	4.0	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4
EQUIPMENT	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>562.2</b>	<b>263.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>266.5</b>	<b>261.5</b>
<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>CHANGES IN REVENUES</b>						
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)**

1002 Federal Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1003 GF Match	0	0	0	0	0	0
1004 GF	562.2	263.5	256.5	256.5	266.5	261.5
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
Other:						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>562.2</b>	<b>263.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>256.5</b>	<b>266.5</b>	<b>261.5</b>

Estimate of current year (FY97) cost: \$

**POSITIONS:**

FULL-TIME	1					
PART-TIME	1					
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)**

Please see attached analysis

Prepared by: <u>Nancy Buell, Director</u>	Phone: <u>465-8689</u>
Division: <u>Teaching and Learning Support</u>	Date: <u>4/16/97</u>
Approved by Commissioner: <u>Shirley J. Holloway, Ph.D.</u>	Date: <u>4/16/97</u>
Agency: <u>Department of Education</u>	

**PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE**

For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

## Fiscal Note

STATE OF ALASKA  
1997 Legislative Session

Bill No. CS HB 146(FIN)

### Additional Analysis

This will cost all school districts, in addition to the anticipated costs to the state. Districts will have increased costs in making testing available for students, in providing tracking and remedial assistance, in logistics associated with test security and administration, these are a minimum. Other projected costs will include redoing district-level diploma format, providing testing for out-of-school students, and in loss of revenue from the higher drop-out rates which have followed the use of an exit test in other states.

Anticipating all of the costs of an exit examination is very complex, not only because such a test affects the lives of children, but because there have been substantial legal challenges to these tests that have resulted in the standard to which Alaska will be held. It is extremely difficult to get accurate figures on the cost of development and maintenance of this test, because no other state has the unique conditions of Alaska.

The figures in this fiscal note represent the best information the department can extrapolate from other states and expert advice at this time. It has been adjusted for numbers of students and other specifics, e.g., Alaska travel costs. The department believes that this is the **minimum amount necessary** to implement the requirements of the legislation. However, it will be necessary to revise future years as more information is made available.

### Personal Services - \$66.0

This will include funding for a new full-time Education Assistant, Range 11, at \$370 and a part-time Administrative Clerk II, Range 8, for ten months at \$29.0. This staffing level relies on the test being developed entirely by a contractor and on the one existing assessment staff member and assessment budget being maintained.

### Travel - \$10.0

Travel costs are associated with field testing and training sessions around the state. Field testing is an essential element to establish the technical quality of all test items, and the involvement of stakeholder groups is necessary to validate items. Staff will need to work with the contractor to establish the field test, and be present in working with groups to validate items and establish parameters for testing.

### Contractual - \$472.2

CS HB 146(FIN) will require an exit examination in three areas: reading, language arts, and mathematics. Estimates of the cost of developing exit examinations in other states, range from \$150,000 to \$250,000 per content area. These funds will cover the cost of development of the test, standards setting, developing scoring protocols, layout, scanning of answer sheets, reports, and revision of the test itself through revision and renorming, equating studies, item bank development, or a combination of these. These costs also include any necessary revision and annual maintenance of the test or scoring. It also includes postage, printing, fax and long distance costs.

### Supplies - \$4.0

Supplies include the purchase of testing materials and office supplies.

### Equipment - \$10.0

These funds will be used to purchase the necessary computer equipment, including a scanner, to be able to handle the data associated with the exit examination. Anticipated upgrade and replacement costs are reflected in future year anticipated costs.

# FISCAL NOTE

**STATE OF ALASKA**  
**1997 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

**BILL NO. HB146**

Revision Date: 26-Feb-97  
 Title: Secondary Pupil Competency Testing

Dept. Affected: EDUCATION  
 BRU: Teaching and Learning Support  
 Component: Quality Schools

Sponsor: Bunde  
 Requester: (H)HESS

**COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 2147**

Expenditures/Revenues: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03
PERSONAL SERVICES	137.6	139.5	142.4	145.8	148.1	151.2
TRAVEL	25.0	25.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0
CONTRACTUAL	385.6	87.5	88.2	90.1	93.1	94.5
SUPPLIES	4.0	8.4	7.6	8.1	8.4	8.5
EQUIPMENT	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>562.2</b>	<b>265.4</b>	<b>246.2</b>	<b>252.0</b>	<b>267.6</b>	<b>267.2</b>

<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</b>						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

<b>CHANGES IN REVENUES</b>						
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	562.2	265.4	246.2	252.0	267.6	267.2
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
Other:						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>562.2</b>	<b>265.4</b>	<b>246.2</b>	<b>252.0</b>	<b>267.6</b>	<b>267.2</b>

Estimate of current year (FY97) cost: \$

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	2.0					
PART-TIME	1					
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Education Specialist II (Range 21)  
 Education Assistant (Range 12)  
 Administrative Clerk II (Range 10)

See attached for other items

Prepared by: Nancy Buell  
 Division: Teaching and Learning Support  
 Approved by Commissioner: Shirley J. Holloway, Ph.D.  
 Agency: Department of Education

Phone: 465-8689  
 Date: 2/26/97  
 Date: 2/26/97

**PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE**

For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

Analysis to accompany Fiscal Note on HB146

This will cost all school districts, in addition to the anticipated costs to the state. Districts will have increased costs in making testing available for students, in providing tracking and remedial assistance, in logistics associated with test security and administration, at minimum. Other projected costs would include redoing district-level diploma format, providing testing for out-of-school students, and in loss of revenue from the higher drop-out rates which seem to inevitably follow the use of an exit test in other states.

Anticipating all of the costs of an Exit Examination is very complex, not only because such a test affects the lives of children, but because there have been substantial legal challenges to these tests and we know the standard to which it will be held. It is extremely difficult to get accurate figures on the cost of development and maintenance of this test, because no other state has the unique conditions of Alaska. The figures in this fiscal note represent the best information that we can extrapolate from other states at this time. It has been adjusted for numbers of students and other specifics known at this time for Alaska (e.g. travel costs). However, we will need to revise future years as more information is made available and as we have more time to thoroughly research this topic.

**Personnel Services** includes a skeleton staff on one Education Specialist, one Education Assistant and part of a clerical staff member. This is extremely conservative by the standards of other states, all of which have assessment staff far beyond what Alaska has now and would project even with this fiscal note.

**Travel** costs are associated with field testing and training sessions around the state. Field testing is absolutely essential for a high-stakes test, because the state would have to be able to withstand strict scrutiny in the technical quality of all test items, norms and cut scores. All new items would have to be field tested and subjected to review and technical screening. Staff would need to conduct the field test themselves, or supervise carefully any other staff or contractors, because variation in field staff could affect technical merit of the test items, and which is part of the standardization and defensibility of the test.

**Contractual** includes the cost of the test itself, development, standards setting, expertise where technical manipulation of scores is concerned (not included in Personnel costs above), layout, scanning of answer sheets, reports (individual, school, district, state), and revision of the test itself through either a rewrite and renorming, equating study, item bank development, or a combination of these. The field test is perpetual. No state uses a shelf product. No shelf product would ever be secure. There are commercially available copies of other state's tests, which are by definition not secure (e.g. available to the public). Conceivably one could get the test publisher to give one a secure item bank, or develop ones own item bank, with norming and standardization. In any case, after a large start-up cost, there are annual maintenance fees.. This item also includes postage, printing, fax, long distance.

**Equipment** includes purchase of computer and scanner, with anticipated replacement. Without new equipment, we would not be able to outfit the employees working on this with stations which could handle the data associated with this project.

ALABAMA: contract selection made April 1997.

High school exit exam: Contract will be for development and item work only. Includes meetings, planning, all development work including item tryouts and camera ready copy for the state to print the tests. No scoring is included.

An item pool of: 1200 Reading/Language items  
600 Math items  
600 Science items  
600 Social Studies items

All items are multiple choice only. They plan to make 5 or 6 forms from the item pool. The cost will be 2.152 million over 3 1/2 years. It was estimated that Reading, Language and math only would be about 1.3-1.4 million.

LOUISIANA:

Similar to Alabama except that constructed response items are being added. It is estimated that the cost will be about \$800,000 greater than Alabama.

*In both cases above one of the key issues was defensibility of the test and the scores. This requires extra caution and work on the technical aspects of the assessments.*

MISSOURI:

Not exit testing but a three grade program similar to Washington State with TerraNova, our newest achievement test, as the core and additional constructed response, multiple choice items and a writing sample added to the mix. The development costs will be 2.35 million over the three grades.

WASHINGTON:

A three grade program of multiple response formats at grades 4, 7 and 10 leading to a 'Certificate of Mastery' required for a high school diploma. Costs for development, piloting and scoring of the 5 forms to be used were: year 1-1.255 million, year 2-2.293 million and year 3-3.575 million. The increases in years 2 and 3 is due primarily to the larger number of students being tested and scored. Year one included development and pilot of grade 4. Year two was grade 4 with a pilot of grade 7 and year three 4 and 7. Washington has about 65-70,000 students per grade.

NEW MEXICO:

New Mexico has a high school competency exam. The ongoing cost is about \$500,000 year. If I am able to get start up costs before the end of the day I will add them and refax the information.

\*\*addition--includes standard setting and an item development workshop every other year to develop a pool of new multiple choice and constructed response items. 30-40% old items are retained each year with balance being new each year. They test about 30,000 annually. Start up costs would about 15-20% higher for the first year.



late addition 7/14

**ABBREVIATED VITA: W. JAMES POPHAM**  
Professor Emeritus, UCLA Graduate School of Education  
Director, IOX Assessment Associates

W. James Popham has spent the bulk of his educational career in classrooms as a teacher in high schools or colleges. His first teaching assignment, for example, was in a small eastern Oregon high school where he taught junior and senior English, American government, speech, and geography as well as served as yearbook advisor, class sponsor, and unpaid tennis coach. At that time, it appears, small eastern Oregon high schools did not require teachers to be subject-matter specialists.

The bulk of Dr. Popham's teaching career took place in the UCLA Graduate School of Education where, for nearly 30 years, he taught courses in instructional methods for prospective elementary/secondary teachers and courses in educational evaluation and measurement for masters and doctoral candidates. At UCLA he won several distinguished teaching awards. In 1992, he took an early retirement at UCLA upon learning that emeritus professors received free parking.

Because at UCLA he was acutely aware of the perishability of professors who failed to publish, he spent many of his non-teaching hours affixing words to paper. The result: 20 books, 175 journal articles, 50 research reports, and 125 papers presented before research societies. Although not noted in his official vita, while on the UCLA faculty he also authored 1,420 grocery lists.

In 1978, Dr. Popham was elected to the presidency of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). He was also the founding editor of *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, a quarterly journal published by AERA. He has attended each year's AERA meeting since his first in 1958. He is compulsive.

In 1968, Dr. Popham established IOX Assessment Associates, a Los Angeles test-development and evaluation agency that has created statewide student achievement tests for a dozen states. He has personally passed all of those tests, largely because he has had unlimited access to the answer keys.

Dr. Popham's complete 28-page, single-spaced vita is available on request. It is really dull reading.

**House Finance Commi, Legislative Testimony on High**

---

To: House Finance Committee  
From: Testdoctor@aol.com (by way of Nancy Buell  
<nbuell@educ.state.ak.us>)  
Subject: Legislative Testimony on High School Assessment  
Cc:  
Bcc:

Dear Dr. Buell,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to meet with your staff yesterday. I have given some additional thought to the issue of a legislatively mandated high school graduation assessment and would like to offer the following observations.

First, challenges to these assessments in other states have typically involved the disparity between the assessment and the opportunity to learn the contents of those assessments. Hence a defensible assessment must be very narrowly focused -- typically to language arts, social studies, and math. Although other state-wide standards, such as science, are clearly important, the opportunities to meet assessment requirements are limited by wide variations in equipment and teaching ability.

Second, challenges to high stakes assessments have almost always included psychometric issues. As you know, even widely used national tests have significant limitations of validity and reliability when measured with small sample sizes. The principal expert witness in several cases has been James Popham of IOX Associates in Los Angeles. Jim is a former faculty member at UCLA and has consulted widely with state boards and legislatures. If, in the future, the state is faced with litigation on this issue, you may want to insure that he is on your side.

Third, the expense involved in these assessments is formidable. The cost estimates from other states range from \$45 per student (Missouri and Colorado) to more than \$110 per student. The lower end of that range is for a single assessment which includes 1/3 multiple choice, 1/3 short answer, and 1/3 extended response. The high end is for four separate performance assessments in math, science, social studies, and language arts. Even these costs are understated, because they assume a single administration for each student. In fact, a defensible system must include multiple opportunities for success, thus increasing the cost accordingly.

Fourth and finally, I think a persuasive argument can be made that the limited resources available can be effectively focused on establishing a requirement for standards-based performance assessments at the district level. The use of a common framework for assessment (perhaps including inter-district exchanges of evaluators) can minimize cost while maintaining a commitment to consistent application of state standards. At a more fundamental level, the state can exercise

**House Finance Commi, Legislative Testimony on High**

---

significant oversight while preserving local control if it simply monitors the extent to which standards-based performance assessments are used at all for each of the state standards. If the legislature is determined to have a state-wide graduation requirement, then I would encourage policy-makers to focus on the framework for assessment rather than resort to a narrowly focused and inherently low-level test.

I will call attorney Dave Burman in Seattle today and ask for his recommendations for other expert witnesses. If it would be helpful, I would also be available to provide either background briefings or testimony on this matter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Douglas B. Reeves, Ph. D.  
Director, Center for Performance Assessment  
1660 South Albion, Suite 1002  
Denver, CO 80222  
(800) 844-6599 (303) 504 9312  
Fax: (303) 504-9417 E-Mail: testdoctor@aol.com

Possible Implementation Table for Exit Examination

1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2000-02	2000-03
<p>Draft test in Reading, Writing and Mathematics, pilot subsets of items, pilot full test</p> <p>Mandate standards in Reading, Writing and Mathematics Disseminate performance standards in Reading, Writing and Mathematics related to the test</p>	<p>Field test</p> <p>Establish state norms Establish cut-off scores</p> <p>Districts develop remedial system</p> <p>Teacher training</p>	<p>Test 9th graders</p>	<p>Test 9th and 10th graders</p>	<p>Test 9th, 10th and 11th graders</p>	<p>Test 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th graders</p>
<p><b>***DEPARTMENT DOES NOT RECOMMEND A STATE-LEVEL TEST IN SCIENCE AND SOCIAL STUDIES DUE TO THE LACK OF CONSENSUS ON STANDARDS AND CONCERNS BEING CURRENTLY RAISED OVER TECHNICAL QUALITY OF TESTS IN THIS AREA</b></p>		<p>Draft test in Science and Social Studies</p> <p>See above line for tasks related to these tests</p>	<p>See above line for tasks related to these tests</p>	<p>Test 9th graders</p>	<p>Test 9th and 10th graders</p> <p>[Test moves out to test 12th graders by year 2004-05]</p>

To shorten the timeline to implement the exit examination in the year 2001, it would be imperative that there be a fail-safe mechanism to delay the process if technical quality (necessary to withstand legal challenge) cannot be achieved.



# Clearinghouse NOTES

## ASSESSMENT

Education Commission of the States  
707 17th Street, Suite 2700; Denver, CO 80202-3427

303-299-3600 ■ FAX 303-296-8332  
e-mail: [ecs@ecs.org](mailto:ecs@ecs.org); <http://www.ecs.org>

### **States Conducting Student Competency Testing for High School Graduation (Exit Exams)**

**STANDARD DIPLOMA:** Students must pass a test with a minimum score before they're allowed to graduate.

- Alabama
- Arkansas (effective 96-97)
- Arizona (essential skills test score recorded on transcript)
- Florida
- Georgia
- Hawaii
- Indiana (unless principal certifies student has met "Core 40" requirements)
- Louisiana
- Maryland
- Massachusetts (must pass proficiencies, but not a single exit exam)
- Mississippi
- Nevada
- New Jersey
- New Mexico (to graduate with a diploma)
- New York
- North Carolina
- Ohio
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Virginia

**ENDORSED DIPLOMAS:** Students must not only pass an exit test but score at a designated level (higher than the minimum required for regular diploma).

- Michigan (optional test for students wanting this level of diploma)
- New York (more rigorous exam than for regular diploma)
- Tennessee

**HONORS DIPLOMAS:** Students must pass a more rigorous test.

- New York
- Ohio
- Tennessee

**OTHER VARIATIONS:** Minnesota and Pennsylvania are phasing in graduation proficiencies. Minnesota students graduating in the year 2000 must pass tests in reading, math and writing to meet the requirements of the Minnesota Graduation Rule. Pennsylvania students must achieve 52 state academic performance outcomes plus local outcomes (locally developed assessments).

Sources: Council of Chief State School Officers, North Central Regional Education Laboratory, Education Commission of the States

Education Commission of the States Summary of Exit/Minimum Competency Tests, by State as of March 13, 1997 (available by Internet, <http://www.ecs.org/ecs/23fe.htm>)

State	Exit Test Required for High School Graduation
Alabama	Yes
Alaska	No
Arizona	Reading, Writing, Mathematics, but test not developed
Arkansas	Yes
California	Not at state level; local district designs and administers
Colorado	No
Connecticut	No
Delaware	No - Voluntary test available for "meritorious diploma"
Florida	Yes
Georgia	Yes
Hawaii	Yes (note: Hawaii only has one school district--equivalent to district exit test)
Idaho	No
Illinois	Principles of Declaration of Independence, Constitution and proper display of the Flag
Indiana	Class of 1999-2000 will begin
Iowa	No
Kansas	No
Kentucky	No
Louisiana	Yes
Maine	No
Maryland	Yes, Quiz on Citizenship
Massachusetts	Yes
Michigan	Optional
Minnesota	Reading, Writing and Mathematics
Mississippi	Yes
Missouri	No
Montana	No
Nebraska	No
Nevada	Yes
New Hampshire	Option at the district level
New Jersey	Reading, Writing and Mathematics
New Mexico	Yes
New York	Yes
North Carolina	Yes
North Dakota	No
Ohio	Yes
Oklahoma <sup>1</sup>	No
Oregon	No
Pennsylvania	No
Rhode Island	No
South Carolina	No

<sup>1</sup> Appears to be outdated information, because Oklahoma reported to AKDOE staff that they do

South Dakota	No
Tennessee	Yes, but no passing standards - information only
Texas	No, but exit exams set for four high school courses
Utah	No, but optional course exit exams available
Vermont	SBE is to develop, but not done yet
Virginia	Yes
Washington	No, but will require in 2000, apparently in Reading, Writing and Mathematics
West Virginia	No
Wisconsin	No
Wyoming	No
District of Columbia	No

**Are there states that are assessing knowledge of history as part of an exit examination?**

It would appear that at least seven states include some questions on history or citizenship. Maryland and Illinois report specific examinations. Virginia, Ohio, Oklahoma, Louisiana and Georgia report assessing questions on history as part of a section on citizenship, geography and reference skills (topic areas in Social Studies).

Washington, which is just developing its assessments, has decided to delay or omit developing a test of Social Studies due to the expense of developing a test which addresses the state standards.

**Are individual sub-test scores aggregated to determine whether a student passes the overall examination?**

Yes, up to a point. It appears from at least partial state responses to our survey that states require students to pass all subtests. Where subtests are individually scored, see next question. Where there is only one overall score, the subtests are aggregated to produce the score.

**If a student fails one part of a multi-part exit examination, does s/he have to take the entire test over?**

Eight states responded to a survey on this question. All reported that students were only required to retake a sub-test they had failed.

Students in other states are always given multiple opportunities to pass the exam, usually two times each year, for as long as they are in school, and for as long as five years after they are out of school (one state).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

UCLA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Center for the Study of Evaluation  
 National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing  
 UCLA Graduate School of Education & Information Studies  
 10920 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 900  
 (310) 206-1532  
 (310) 825-3883 Fax

February 26, 1997

Ms. Shirley Holloway  
 Commissioner of Education  
 State of Alaska  
 810 W. 10th  
 Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Commissioner Holloway:

I am responding to a request for information about the experience of our research organization, the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) in reviewing the assessment plans of various states.

When confronting the idea of certification of high school performance, most states plan to involve a range of information rather than base their decision on a single measure. The use of an existing standardized test for this purpose, such as the California Achievement Test (5th Edition), raises a number of difficulties. First, the publisher will doubtless say the test is not intended for this purpose. Secondly, as in the Debra P. case, evidence will be required to demonstrate that the students have had an opportunity to learn the material tested. Both of these conditions will immediately raise the likelihood of court case(s). Third, it is our experience that tests of this type, not designed for certification testing, will not bear the pressures placed upon them for this purpose. Specifically, much attention in preparation may be given to the strategy of test taking itself rather than in focusing on the underlying constructs the test is intended to measure. Last, the use of this test over a long period of time raises questions of test security and ultimately of fairness.

While the goal of the legislation may be laudable, there is the reality of the technical quality of available or new measures to meet this goal. In general, certification testing works best when decisions are made in a subject matter area for which there is an agreed upon course of study, such as in the area of law. It is not yet possible to find an omnibus test to measure the full range of competencies undertaken in high school.

Sincerely,

Eva L. Baker  
 Co-Director, CRESST

20 Ryan Ranch Road  
Monterey, CA 93940-5703

**CTB/McGraw-Hill**

A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies



February 26, 1997

Dr. Dennis McCrea  
Administrator, Standards & Assessment  
Alaska State Department of Education  
801 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 200  
Juneau AK 99801

Dear Dr. McCrea:

In response to your questions regarding the use of CTB/McGraw-Hill's CAT/5 Survey assessment as an exit examination for secondary school students:

- 1. This assessment was not developed with this use in mind or as part of the design specification.
- 2. CTB would not support this use of the test: the Survey instrument is too short for a high-stakes test at the individual level.

I hope that this information is helpful to you. Please contact me if you have any further questions. My direct line is 408/393-7568, and my Internet address is [mwebb@ctb.com](mailto:mwebb@ctb.com).

Sincerely yours,

Melvin W. Webb II, Ed.D.  
Senior Product Manager  
NRT Materials, Scoring & Reporting