#### Table III

#### Reporting Practices of Testing Programs

The methods of reporting minimum competency test results also reflect the diversity of testing practices in the states. Seventeen states report using pass/fail data, 13 use raw scores, 15 use percent correct. Among states that report derived scores, 9 use IRT scale scores, 3 use percentiles, and 2 states report standard scores. Most states report a mix of these types of scores, and within a given state that mix may vary depending on the subjects being tested.

Reports of test results are distributed to teachers and students in 25 states, principals in 25, superintendents in 25, state education agency curriculum personnel in 22, state boards of education in 22, media and public through state education agency reports in 20, legislatures in 21, and the public on request in 20 states. In general, the reports to students and teachers are individual score reports, while the reports made available to the other parties named are summary reports.

The common use of minimum competency test information for remedial purposes suggests that most tests yield information on specific objectives within the tests, and a number of states yield information on specific objectives within the tests, and a number of states explicitly point to the fact that pass/fail requirements were set for each objective within the tests. The trend, however, appears to be away from criterion-referenced standards for each objective toward pass/fail standards based on overall IRT scale score, with added diagnostic information for specific objectives.

### Minimum Competency Table 111 Reporting Practices of Testing Programs

									sults M					
	урея	<u>of</u> 1	COL	utior			<u>3=1</u>	<u>ivi</u>	al Sc		Group	erf	performance	
State	Raw scores		rass/ fail	equivalent	Derived SCOTES	Students, teachers	Principals	superin=   tendents	SEA curriculum personnel	State Board of Education	Media t public (SEA report)	Legi		Notes/ changes
Alabama	,6,9	N	11	N	N	у.	у*	Y*	y*	y*	Y*	у*		• Did not Indlcate L f
	, . , .			-		,		-	,	,	•	-		IS or GS .
Alaska - No prope	r													
Arizona	N	N	aw	Rule	N	tile	Rule	Rule	N	N	N	N	N	• Parents-Law; did not
						Law								indicate if IS or GS.
Arkansas	Ву	N	ext	N	Y	у	y*	Y*	Y*	у*	Y*		у*	• Did not Lndicate Lf
	Obj.		ear											IS or GS.
California	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	N	N
Colorodo - No data														
	Y	Y	Υ	N	D. R. P	у.	у.	۰,	у*	у+	Y*	у,	у.	* Did not indicate if
														IS or GS.
Deliware	N	N	Y*	N	И	•*	•*	**	•*	•*	**	•*	,*	<ul> <li>Has been gathered twice not regul red; number i&gt; f studerks at taini nq minimum compete ncles requirement available to SEA.</li> </ul>
														•* Every LEA has 3 different pollcy.
District Of Colu						у*	y*			у*			M.	
District OI Colu	mbia r	N	Y	N	CRT obj. mastered Each com petency must be passed.		y	Υ*	N	y	N	N	N	•Dld not indicate Lf IS or GS .
	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	y.	(*	,{*	у*	γ <b>•</b>		у.	•Dld not indicate if
														IS or GS.
Sorgia	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y*	У	¿*	у.	у*	Υ*	у*	у*	* Dld not In{llcate if IS or GS. Open records law in Georgia.
SOURCE: Data C	ompil	ed fo	1 or th	e Off	ice of Te	echno	  lo~ .	Asses	sment :	y Nort	hwest	Reqic	nal Ed	ucational Laboratory, 1985.

### 

						I		R	esults	Made A	vailabl	e to	•	
	уре.	of	for	<u>itio</u>	Reported		S=1	ivi	Sc	:es, G	Group	<u>Perior</u> mace	permance	
State	Raw	Percent correct	Pass/	Grade level equivalent	Derived scores	Students, teachers	Principals	Superin-		State Board of Education	Media & public (SEA renort)		al	Notes/ changee
Hiwiaa	Y	Y	N	N	γ	Y*		γ*	у*	N	N		N	•Did not Lndicate
Idaho	N	Y	Y	и	N	Y*	Y*	Y*		Y*	Υ*	у*	у*	IS or GS.  •Dld not ~ndlcate IS or GS.
Illlnols- Not app	 licab 	 le												
Indiana - No prog	r\$													
lowa - No program														
K,III>.i>	Y	Y	N	N	Y	γ*	Υ*	Y*	у*	Y*	Υ*	у*		Did not nd cate KS or GS
·//· i k;,	Y	Y	N	и	)'	Y <b>*</b>	Y*	<b>(*</b>		Y*	Y*	Υ*	Υ*	Did not nd cate Is or GS
	,ì	t	Y	и	N	IS	GS	ss	GS	ദട	SS	, ;s		None
Maine - No program	ı													
Maryland	γ	Y	N	N	γ	Y*	Y*	Y*	у.	Υ*	Y*	у*		• Did not indicate IS or GS.
Massachusetts	N	Υ	N	N	N	*	*	•	•	*	•	•	•	* These are an LEA however, Leas re SEA: 1) standard: and 2) percentage students that do meet standard,
Michigan - No progra	a.m													
Minnesota - No pr	ogram													
Mississippi	Y	Υ	•	N	Y	Y*	y*	<b>₹*</b>	у*	Y*	γ*	у,	Υ*	Did not indicate is or GS.
'essouri	N	"11	ľ	И	N	Y*	Y*	r*	у*	γ•	γ*	у.	Υ*	Did not indicate IS or GS.
										·		,		•

### $\begin{array}{cccc} Minimum & Competency \\ & & Table & \mbox{III} \\ \mbox{Reporting} & \mbox{\bf Practices} & \mbox{\bf of} & \mbox{\bf Testing} & \mbox{\bf Program} \end{array}$

							I		R	esults	Made A	vailabl	e to	:	1
		Тур€	<u>f</u>	<u>f</u> or	tion	Reported		_ <u>I</u> s	<u>ivi</u>	al Sc	es, G	Group	erf	mance	
Stat <b>e</b>		Rav	correct	_	equivalent	Derived scores		_	Superin-	SEA curriculum Dersonnel	State Board of Education	Media & public (SEA report)	Legislature		Notes/ changes
Montana -	No progr	am 													
Nebraska		NA	łΑ	NA	NA	NA		GS	GS	N	N	N	N		None
Nevada		N	1	N	N	: High school only	у*	у*	Y*	Y*	У	Y*	Y*	у*	Until Spring 1985 percent correct on number of items right.  Did not indicate if IS or GS.
New Hampshi	ire - No	prog													
Ndw Jersey		N		N	N	N Other scale	Is	GS	GS	GS	GS	G\$	GS	GS	None
New Mexico		N		Y	N	У	Is	GS	GS	GS	GS	GS	GS	GS	None
· · York		Y		Y	N	N	GS	GS	GS	GS	GS	GS	GS	Gs	
North Car		·	•	Y	N	N	Y	Y •*	Y**	Y***	Y	/***	(**1	y***	.Adjusted raw score to a common scale. .* On sub-tests. .** Did not IS or
Ohio	oca - No	NA NA	A	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	AN	NA	NA	NA	N.A.	NA	Results Of tests are not provided to the state (including pass/fail rates on an annual basis. SEA evaluates 1/5 of all dirstricts each year for accreditation (All districts every 5 years.) Part of evaluation is to check to see that mimum standards of competency are in compliance. This evaluation includes examining test results. program is too new for any useful data from accreditation reviews.

## Minimum Competency Table 111 Reporting Practices of Testing Programs

	Types	s of	Inf	e <b>rt</b> ]10	Repot		_	R Liv	esults	Made es,	Avail		to:	-
				Grade level equivalent	Derived scores	Students,	, ,	Superin-	SEA curriculum	State Board of	Media & public	Legislature	Public (On request)	Notes/ changes
Oklahoma - No pro Oregon	gram			ЗА	N A	NA	NA	N/	NA	NA	NA	N#	NA	State does not co
Pennsylvania			Y	и	N		у*	Å*	у*	Υ*	Y*	Y#	у*	Test not used again it is administered •Did not Indicate IS or GS.
RhodeIsland -No p	    rograi 	n												
South Carolina	N		Y	N	flag objective on which student needs wo		у*	Y*	у*	Y*	Y*	Y*	у*	•Did not indicate Is or GS.
North Dakota-No	ı progi	ram												
и о	I t .	railable ;	inter	view										
t	Y	N	γ 9th Graded Test	N	N	IS	GS	GS	GS	GS	N .	GS	GS	The state does not publish a state-wide report. Information provided to district school and district he data must be resented at an offi school board meeting These meetings are p News media make a ha attending as many 10 board meetings as po and thereby forming om "state-wide" rep,
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	٧A	NA	NA	NA	IA	NA	IA
Vermont	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	ΝA	NA	NA	NA	iA	NA	1A
	Y	\{	Y	N	Y	Is	Gs	;s	GS	GS	G <b>S</b>	;s	N	

# Minimum Competency Table III Reporting Practices of Testing Programs

	Results Made Available to:													
	Types	of I	nform	ation	Reported	<u> </u>	IS=I			es, C				
State	Raw	Percent correct	Pass/ fail	Grade level equivalent	Derived scores	Students, teachers	Principals	Superin-	SEA curriculum	State Board of Education	media t public (SEA report)	Legislature	Public (On request)	Notes/ changes
Washington - Nopro	gram						<u> </u>							
West Virginia -No	progi	am y	et in	plac	e; see Ta	ble v	VIII							
Wisconsin - Notava	I nilab	l Le fo	r Ini	ervi	∌W•									
Wyoming - Nostate	data;	district	Let	requi	red to as	sess.								
								l						