# National Summary** 



## Standards and Assessments

Table 1: State Progress toward Development of Accountability System, 2001-02

| State | Core Content Standards | State Student <br> Assessment*  | Achievement evels | Years of Consistent Data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | M, S, E, SSt | Alabama High School Graduation Exam | 2 | - |
| Alaska | M, E/LA, H | California Achievement Test | 4 | - |
| Arizona | M, S, LA, SSt | Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards | 4 | - |
| Arkansas | M, S, LA, H/SSt | Arkansas Benchmark Exam | 4 | - |
| California | M, S, E, SSt | California Standards Tests | 5 | 2 |
| Colorado | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Student Assessment Program | 4 | 6 |
| Connecticut | M, S, E/LA, SSt | CMT/CAPT | 4 | 3 |
| Delaware | M, S, E, SSt | Delaware Student Testing Program | 5 | 4 |
| District of Columbia | M, S, E, SSt | Stanford 9 | 4 | - |
| Florida | M, S, LA, SSt | Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test | 5 | - |
| Georgia | M, S, E/LA, SSt (1999) | Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests | 3 | 3 |
|  |  | Georgia High School Graduation Tests | 3 | - |
| Hawaii | M, S, LA, SSt | Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II | 4 | - |
| Idaho | M, S, LA, SSt | ITBS and TAP | 4 | - |
| Illinois | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Illinois Standards Achievement Test | 4 | 4 |
| Indiana | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus | 2 | - |
| lowa | M, S, R (Local Decision) | Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, lowa Test of Ed. Dev. | 3 | 2 |
| Kansas | M, S, LA, SSt (Kansas Assessment) | Kansas Math/Reading Assessment | 5 | 3 |
| Kentucky | M, S, SSt | Kentucky Core Content Test | 4 | 4 |
| Louisiana | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Louisiana Educational Assessment Program | 5 | - |
| Maine | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Maine Educational Assessment | 4 | 4 |
| Maryland | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Md. School Performance Assessment Program | 3 | 7 |
| Massachusetts | M, S, E, H/SSt | Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System | 4 | 3 |
| Michigan | M, S, E/LA, SSt | MEAP Essential Skills | 3R, 4M and high school | - |
| Minnesota | M, S, LA, SSt | Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment | 4 | 5 |
| Mississippi | M, S, LA, SSt | Mississippi Curriculum Test, Subject Area Test | 4 | - |
| Missouri | M, S, LA, SSt | Missouri Assessment Program | 5 | 5 |
| Montana | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Iowa Tests of Basic Skills | 4 | 2 |
| Nebraska | M, S, E/LA, SSt, Reading/Writing | Multiple Assessment Tools | 2 | - |
| Nevada | M, S, E/LA, SSt | Nevada Criterion-Referenced Exam | 4 | - |
|  |  | High School Proficiency Exam | 2 | - |


| State | Core Content |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Standards |  |$\quad$| State |
| :---: |
| Assessment* |

*More information on assessments can be found in state profiles beginning on page 12.

Core Content Standards
Source: Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education 2002, CCSSO, 2003. Results from the 2002 CCSSO Policies and Practices Survey.
As of spring 2002, Title I requirements for developing content standards for Reading or English Language Arts and Mathematics have been met by 49 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

State Assessment; Student Achievement Levels
Source: State assessment results submitted in the Consolidated Report, Section B, 2001-02, and follow-up by CCSSO with the State Education Accountability Reports and Indicator Reports: Status of Reports across the States, 2003
Years of Consistent Data
Source: State assessment results submitted in the Consolidated Report, Section B, 2001-02, and follow-up by CCSSO. Note: Years of consistent data indicates at least one subject and grade in the state provides a trend. See state profiles beginning on page 12 for more details.

## Student Achievement by Category

Table 2: Availability of Student Achievement Results by Disaggregated Category, * 2001-02

| State | Elementary Grade | Middle Grade | High School Grade | All Students | Title I |  | Migratory | Disabled | Race/ Ethnicity | Gender |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | - | - | 11 | $X$ | - | $X \quad X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Alaska | 3 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $X \quad X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Arizona | 3 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | X | - $\quad x$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Arkansas | 4 | 8 | R:11/M:9-12 | $X$ | - | $x \quad x$ | X | X | X | X |
| California | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $x \quad x$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Colorado | R:4/M:5 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $x \quad x$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| Connecticut | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $X \quad X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Delaware | 3 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $X \quad x$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Dist. of Columbia | 3-6 | 7-8 | 9-11 | $x$ | $X$ | $X \quad x$ | X | $X$ | X | $x$ |
| Florida | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $x$ | $x \quad x$ | $x$ | $X$ | X | X |
| Georgia | 4 | 8 | 11 | $X$ | X | X | $X$ | X | X | $X$ |
| Hawaii | 3 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | X | $x \quad x$ | $x$ | $X$ | X | X |
| Idaho | 4 | 8 | 10 | X | X | X | X | X | X | $x$ |
| Illinois | 3 | 8 | 11 | X | X | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | X |
| Indiana | 3 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | X | $X \quad X$ | - | $X$ | X | $X$ |
| lowa | 4 | 8 | 11 | X | - | $x \quad x$ | X | $X$ | X | $X$ |
| Kansas | R:5/M:4 | R:8/M:7 | R:11/M:10 | X | X | $X \quad X$ | X | X | $x$ | $X$ |
| Kentucky | R:4/M:5 | R:7/M:8 | R:10/M:11 | X | X | $x \quad x$ | X | X | X | X |
| Louisiana | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | - | $X \quad X$ | - | $X$ | $X$ | X |
| Maine | 4 | 8 | 11 | $X$ | X | - $\quad x$ | X | X | $x$ | X |
| Maryland | 3 | 8 | - | X | X | $X \quad X$ | X | $X$ | X | X |
| Massachusetts | 4 | R:7/M:8 | 10 | X | - | X | - | X | X | X |
| Michigan | 4 | R:7/M:8 | 11 | X | - | - - | - | - | X | $X$ |
| Minnesota | 3 | - | - | X | - | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | X |
| Mississippi | 4 | 8 | $\mathrm{R}: 9-12$ | X | - | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | $X$ |
| Missouri | 3 | R:7/M:8 | R:11/M:10 | X | X | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | X |
| Montana | 4 | 8 | 11 | $X$ | - | $X \quad X$ | X | $X$ | X | X |
| Nebraska | 4 | 8 | 11 | X | - | - $X$ | - | X | - | - |
| Nevada | 3 | - | 11 | X | - | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | $X$ |
| New Hampshire | 3 | 6 | 10 | X | X | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | X |
| New Jersey | 4 | 8 | 11 | $X$ | $X$ | $X \quad X$ | X | $X$ | - | - |
| New Mexico | - | - | - | X | X | - $\quad x$ | - | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| New York | 4 | 8 | HS | X | X | $X \quad X$ | X | X | X | X |


| State | Elementary Grade | Middle Grade | High School Grade | All <br> Students | Title I | Economically Disadvantaged P | Limited English Proficient | Migratory | Disabled | Race/ <br> Ethnicity | Gender |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Carolina | 4 | 8 | 9 | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | X | X | $X$ |
| North Dakota | 4 | 8 | 12 | $X$ | X | X | X | $X$ | X | X | X |
| Ohio | 4 | 6 | - | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | X | X | X |
| Oklahoma | 5 | 8 | R:10 | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | X |
| Oregon | 3 | 8 | 10 | X | $X$ | - | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | X |
| Pennsylvania | 5 | 8 | 11 | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| Puerto Rico | 3, 6, 9,11 |  |  | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| Rhode Island | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | - | $X$ | X | X |
| South Carolina | 4 | 8 | - | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | X |
| South Dakota | 4 | 8 | 11 | $x$ | $X$ | X | $x$ | X | $X$ | $x$ | $x$ |
| Tennessee | 3-8 |  | - | $x$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ |
| Texas | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | X | X | X | X | $X$ | X |
| Utah | R:4/M:3 | 7 | 11 | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | X | $X$ |
| Vermont | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| Virginia | 3 | 8 | - | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ | $X$ | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ | $x$ |
| Washington | 4 | 7 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| West Virginia | - | - | - | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | X | X | $X$ |
| Wisconsin | 4 | 8 | 10 | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | $X$ | X | $X$ | $X$ |
| Wyoming | 4 | 8 | 11 | X | $X$ | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Nation | 49 | 47 | 44 | 52 | 42 | 44 | 51 | 45 | 51 | 50 | 50 |

## (50 states, D.C., P.R.)

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated Performance Report, Section B, 2001-02, and State Student Assessment Programs Annual Survey 2002, CCSSO.
*Note: X indicates the indicator is available; - indicates it is not
R:\#/M:\# indicates results were disaggregated for \# grade reading or mathematics only. Reading: R, Mathematics: M
Results published in this table may not represent data reported in the individual state profiles that follow. Differences are due to the fact that although states may have collected achievement data by subgroup, they did not necessarily report the disaggregated data to the U.S. Department of Education in their Consolidated Performance Report as this information was not required for the 2001-02 school year.

## Summary of Student Performance 2001-02

Table 3: Summary by State of Students at Proficient Level or Higher, by State Definition

|  | Elementary* <br> Reading <br> State | - | - | Middle School* <br> Reading | Math |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^0]*Please see each state's profile for the grade and definition of proficient represented in the table.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Due to a change in tests, Alabama's elementary and middle school assessment results were not reported by proficiency levels in 2001-02.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ State did not report elementary or middle school percent proficient in the all students category.

| State | Elementary* |  | Middle School* |  | State Term for Proficient* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |  |
| New Jersey | 79\% | 68\% | 74\% | 58\% | Proficient |
| New Mexico ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | - | - | - | - |  |
| New York | 61\% | 67\% | 44\% | 47\% | Level 3 |
| North Carolina | 77\% | 89\% | 85\% | 83\% | Level III |
| North Dakota | 74\% | 57\% | 67\% | 42\% | Proficient |
| Ohio | 66\% | 62\% | 56\% | 59\% | Proficient |
| Oklahoma | 63\% | 63\% | 70\% | 64\% | Satisfactory |
| Oregon | 85\% | 77\% | 64\% | 58\% | Meets Standard |
| Pennsylvania | 57\% | 53\% | 58\% | 52\% | Proficient |
| Puerto Rico ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 41\% | 61\% | - | - | Proficient |
| Rhode Island ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  | Achieved Standard |
| South Carolina | 34\% | 36\% | 27\% | 19\% | Proficient |
| South Dakota | 62\% | 64\% | 68\% | 33\% | Proficient |
| Tennessee ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | - | - | - | - | Proficient |
| Texas | 91\% | 94\% | 94\% | 93\% | Proficient |
| Utah | 80\% | 74\% | 78\% | 40\% | Near Mastery |
| Vermont ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  |  |  | Achieved Standard |
| Virginia | 71\% | 80\% | 70\% | 70\% | Pass/Proficient |
| Washington | 66\% | 52\% | 44\% | 30\% | Meets Standards |
| West Virginia ${ }^{\dagger}$ | - | - | - | - |  |
| Wisconsin | 79\% | 69\% | 74\% | 44\% | Proficient |
| Wyoming | 44\% | 43\% | 38\% | 33\% | Proficient |

${ }^{\text {c }}$ Puerto Rico combines scores for grades 3, 6, 9, 11 for Reading Language Arts and for Mathematics.
${ }^{d}$ Rhode Island Achieved Standard: Grade 4 Reading: Analysis \& Interpretation: 60\%, Basic Understanding: 74\%, Writing Effectiveness: 59\%, Writing Conventions: 59\%; Mathematical Concepts: 40\%, Mathematical Problem Solving: 28\%, Mathematical Skills: 66\%; Grade 8 English Language Arts: Analysis \& Interpretation: $26 \%$, Basic Understanding: $50 \%$, Writing Effectiveness: $55 \%$, Writing Conventions: $45 \%$; Mathematical Concepts: $23 \%$, Mathematical Problem Solving: 27\%, Mathematical Skills: 51\%.
${ }^{e}$ Vermont Achieved Standard: Grade 4 English \& Language Arts: Reading Analysis \& Interpretation: 67\%, Reading Basic Understanding: 80\%; Mathematical Concepts: $45 \%$, Mathematical Problem Solving: $33 \%$, Mathematical Skills: $71 \%$; Grade 8 English \& Language Arts: Reading Analysis \& Interpretation: $41 \%$, Reading Basic Understanding: 65\%; Mathematical Concepts: 38\%, Mathematical Problem Solving: 42\%, Mathematical Skills: 69\%.
${ }^{\dagger}$ West Virginia reported results in percentile ranks until the first administration of the WESTEST in 2003-04, as per their federal agreement.

## Student Achievement Trends

Table 4: Sample Student Achievement Trends, 1996-2002
Elementary Reading/Language Arts, Middle Grades Mathematics,
Percentage of All Students at or Above Proficient by State Definition


*Please see each state's profile for the definition of proficient represented in the table.
Source: Consolidated Performance Reports, 1995-96 through 2001-02, Section B, Submitted by states to the U.S. Department of Education, with edits by states.

Undoubtedly we have no questions to ask which are unanswerable.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nature, 1836


[^0]:    Key: - indicates the indicator is not available. See applicable footnote for reason.

