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# Introduction

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide information necessary to appropriately use school and district level data files on state assessment results from ED*Facts*. It contains information that is crucial to take into consideration prior to conducting any analyses on the data.

## ED*Facts* Background

ED*Facts* is a Department of Education (ED) initiative to govern, acquire, validate, and use high-quality elementary and secondary performance data in education planning, policymaking, and management decision making to improve outcomes for students. ED*Facts* centralizes data provided by the state education agencies (SEAs) at the SEA, local education agency (LEA), and school levels, and provides the Department with the ability to easily analyze and report the data. Since its inception in 2004, this initiative has reduced reporting burden for SEAs and local data producers, and has streamlined elementary and secondary data collection, analysis, and reporting functions at the federal, state, and local levels.

It is imperative for users to understand that this file reflects data as reported by state education agencies to ED*Facts*. ED has conducted various data quality checks, resulting in communication with states to verify the data or, in some cases, the resubmission of the entire file. Data anomalies, however, may still be present within the file. If you have any comments or suggestions about this document or the data files, we would like to hear from you. See the Frequently Asked Questions section for information about submitting a question or comment. All data in ED*Facts* are organized into data groups and reported to ED by SEAs using defined file specifications. The data on student achievement and participation in reading/language arts and mathematics are organized into the following four data groups:

Table 1. ED*Facts* Achievement and Participation File Specifications and Data Groups

| **File Specification** | **Data Group** | **Data Group Name** | **Data Group Definition** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FS175 | DG583 | Academic Achievement in Mathematics | The unduplicated number of students who completed the state assessment in mathematics for whom a proficiency level was assigned. |
| FS178 | DG584 | Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts | The unduplicated number of students who completed the state assessment in reading/language arts for whom a proficiency level was assigned. |
| FS185 | DG588 | Assessment Participation in Mathematics | The unduplicated number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment in mathematics. |
| FS188 | DG589 | Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts | The unduplicated number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment in reading/language arts. |

In the academic achievement data (Mathematics FS175/ DG583 and Reading/Language Arts FS178/ DG584), states provide the count of students taking each type of assessment and scoring in each performance level by subject, grade, and full academic year status. In the assessment participation data (Mathematics FS185/ DG588 and Reading/Language Arts FS188/ DG589), states provide the count of students who were enrolled during the state assessment testing window, by whether the students participated or did not participate in the state assessment by subject, grade, and full academic year status. Both achievement and participation data are reported in the following subgroups, as required by law:

* Major Racial and Ethnic Groups
* Sex
* Disability Status
* LEP Status
* Economically Disadvantaged Status
* Migrant Status
* Homeless Enrolled Status

Beginning in the SY 2011-2012 reporting year, data are reported to ED*Facts* by assessment administered, as well as, by the individual performance levels established by each state that are applicable to each assessment type.

Please visit [www.ed.gov/edfacts](http://www.ed.gov/edfacts) to access the file specifications.

## Education Levels Reported

States submit data at three education levels: state, LEA (includes school districts), and school. Each LEA is assigned a 7-digit ID by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) called the NCES LEA Identification Number. The first two digits is a unique state ID called the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) state code and the last 5 digits are unique within that state for the LEA. Each school is also assigned a unique ID by NCES. The school IDs are 12 digits. The first 7 digits is the NCES LEA Identification Number for the LEA that the school belongs to and the remaining 5 digits are unique to that school within the LEA but the 5 digits may not be unique within the state.

## Date of the Data

The files contain data that are current as of April 12, 2017. April 12, 2017 was the deadline for the final data submission period of the SY 2015-16 Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Appendix A includes a table showing the date of the last LEA and school level submissions for each state at the April 12, 2017 date.

## Privacy Protections Used

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) is a Federal law that protects the privacy of student education records. FERPA requires that when data are released on groups of students, certain steps are taken to ensure someone cannot ascertain a student’s individual identity (i.e. the data do not disclose individual characteristics of a student). This may be possible, for example, if the number of students listed in an individual cell in the data table is small enough that certain characteristics of an individual student can be revealed. In order to protect students’ privacy, the Department applied a combination of disclosure avoidance techniques, including suppressing data for very small groups of students, and a modest “blurring” (described below) of the data reported for all other students. Together, these steps protect the information of all students by preventing someone from determining with any reasonable certainty how a specific student performed on the assessments.

The process by which the privacy protections were applied to the Public Use file is described below.

Step One: Protection of Data for Small Groups

Because it is often easy to identify specific individuals when data are presented for small numbers of students, the Department has suppressed all cells with 1-5 students. These suppressions are identified by ‘PS’.

Step Two: Blurring of Data for Medium-sized Groups

To further protect the privacy of students, and to prevent any data suppressed in Step One from being recalculated by subtracting other reported groups data from the reported totals, the Department has reported the percent proficient and percent participation for all medium-sized groups as a range (e.g., <20% or 70-74%).

The magnitude of the reported ranges is determined by the size of the group whose data are being reported. For example, cells with the fewest students (6-15) are reported with the widest ranges (e.g., <50% or ≥50%). As the number of students reported increases, the magnitude of the range decreases, until there are more than 300 students in a cell, at which point the percent proficient and percent participation are reported as a whole number. The ranges used for varying sized groups are presented below in Table 2 and an illustration of the privacy protection is displayed in Table 3.

Table . Ranges Used for Reporting Percent Proficient and Percent Participation

| **Number of Students Reported in the Cell** | **Ranges Used for Reporting the Percent Proficient and Percent Participation for that Group** |
| --- | --- |
| 6-15 | <50%, ≥50% |
| 16-30 | ≤20%, 21-39%, 40-59%, 60-79% ≥80% |
| 31-60 | ≤10%, 11-19%, 20-29%, 30-39%, 40-49%, 50-59%, 60-69%, 70-79%, 80-89%, ≥90% |
| 61-300 | ≤5%, 6-9%, 10-14%, 15-19%, 20-24%, 24-29%, 30-34%, 35-39%, 40-44%, 45-49%, 50-54%, 55-59%, 60-64%, 65-69%, 70-74%, 75-79%, 80-84%, 85-89%, 90-94%, ≥95% |
| More than 300 | ≤1%, 2%, 3%, . . . , 98%, ≥99% |

Identification of specific individuals within the “All Students, All Grades” category is especially difficult. Therefore, the percent proficient and percent participation for that group is reported as a whole number whenever there are more than 200 students, rather than 300 students.

However, ED has determined that this results in an increased risk of disclosure in districts with only two schools where one school has a very small student population (n≤ 6) and the other school has a student population between 200 and 300 students. In order to mitigate disclosure risks, ED has implemented an additional privacy protection routine that removes whole number reporting for “All Students” in the larger school within these districts. As a result the reported percent proficient and percent participation for the larger school, which has between 200 and 300 students, will not be a whole number percentage. Instead it will be presented as a 5 percent point range (i.e., 50-54% instead of 52%).

For rates that are privacy protected, some of the privacy protections use the symbols: ≥, ≤, <, >. In the public files, these symbols are translated to:

* Greater than or equal to = ≥ = GE
* Less than or equal to = ≤ = LE
* Greater than = > = GT
* Less than = < = LT
* Data suppressed to protect student privacy = PS

For example, if a graduation rate in the data file that shows “GE50” means that the rate for that particular subgroup is “greater than or equal to 50%.” See table below for additional explanation of the way privacy protection for various student counts are applied.

Table . Illustration of Privacy Protections

|  | **3th Grade** | **3th Grade** | **4th Grade** | **4th Grade** | **5th Grade** | **5th Grade** | **All Grades** | **All Grades** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number Students** | **Percent Proficient** | **Number Students** | **Percent Proficient** | **Number Students** | **Percent Proficient** | **Number Students** | **Percent Proficient** |
| American Indian | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Asian | . | . | . | . | 1 | PS  (100%) | 1 | PS  (100%) |
| Black | 78 | 75-79%  (79%) | 100 | 75-79%  (76%) | 101 | 85-89%  (89%) | 279 | 80-84%  (82%) |
| Hispanic | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| White | 5 | PS  (80%) | 8 | ≥50%  (100%) | 6 | ≥50%  (83%) | 19 | ≥80%  (89%) |
| Two or More Races | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| All  Students | 83 | 80-84%  (80%) | 108 | 75-79%  (78%) | 108 | 85-89%  (89%) | 299 | 82%  (82%) |

Notes: “PS”indicates that the percent proficient has been suppressed to protect student privacy.Parenthesized numbers in italics represent the actual percent proficient of the subgroup and are included solely for illustration purposes and are not reported in the data release.

# Description of the Data

## Academic Achievement Data

States are required to report achievement data on state assessments to ED under Title I, Part A of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA). Student performance on state assessments is measured by assessing students against state content standards. Students are assessed annually in third through eighth grade and at least once in high school. The data are aggregated for all students and by the various subgroups. Data are typically presented as “the percent of students proficient or above on the state assessment,” with “proficient or above” defined as the number of students achieving at the “proficient” or “advanced” levels, as defined by each SEA.

SEAs are required to complete an assessment metadata survey annually via E*MAPS* to define these proficient levels as well as other assessment metadata. The survey collects and stores information necessary to interpret the information received in academic achievement and assessment participation files. States provide the following information through their E*MAPS* Assessment Metadata Survey:

* Information on which circumstances students with disabilities may not take assessments, including whether states allow for medical exemptions for all students.
* Information on which assessment types, by grade and performance level, states implement to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA and at which performance level students are proficient.
* Information on whether state assessments changed between the current school year and prior school year.

The information provided through the E*MAPS* Assessment Metadata Survey must align exactly with the data provided through in the Academic Achievement in Mathematics and Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in order to accurately interpret the data and calculate the percentage of students considered proficient.

For reporting purposes, states provide the counts of students by academic subject, by assessment type, by grade level, and by performance level for all students and the various subgroups. See Table 5 below for a list and description of the assessment types reported in Academic Achievement in Mathematics and Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts.

Table . Assessment Types and Definitions

| **Assessment Type** | **Definition of Assessment** |
| --- | --- |
| Regular assessments based on grade-level achievement standards without accommodations (REGASSWOACC) | An assessment designed to measure the student’s knowledge and skills in a particular subject matter based on academic achievement standards appropriate to the student’s grade level. See ESEA, Section 111(b)(3). |
| Regular assessments based on grade-level achievement standards with accommodations (REGASSWACC) | An assessment designed to measure the student’s knowledge and skills in a particular subject matter based on academic achievement standards appropriate to the student’s grade level. See ESEA, Section 1111(b)(3). |
| Alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards (ALTASSGRDLVL) | A way to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities based on the same grade-level achievement standards measured by the State’s regular assessments. Such assessments are available to students who the IEP team determines cannot participate in all or part of the State assessments under paragraph (a)(1) of 34 CFR §200.6, even with appropriate accommodations. These assessments must yield results for the grade in which the student is enrolled in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and, beginning in SY 2007-08, science, except as provided in 34 CFR §200.6(a)(2)(ii)(B). |
| Alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards (ALTASSMODACH) | A way to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities who access the general grade-level curriculum, but whose disabilities have precluded them from achieving grade-level proficiency and who (as determined by the IEP team) are not expected to achieve grade-level proficiency within the year covered by the IEP. See 34 CFR §200.1(e). |
| Alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) | A way to measure the academic achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. These assessments may yield results that measure the achievement standards that the State has defined under 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §200.1(d). |

The total number of students across all performance levels across all assessment types equals the total number of students who completed the state assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned. This is the denominator in our calculation of percent proficient and is represented in the “numvalid” fields of the data files.

The numerator is comprised of the number of students assigned to performance levels designated by the state to be at or above grade-level proficiency across all assessment types.

The reporting period is the testing window defined by the state. For most states the testing window represents a period in the spring of each school year. A few states utilize a testing window in the fall.

## Assessment Participation Data

In addition to achievement, states are required to report assessment participation data to ED under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Participation data are reported on third through eighth grade and at least once in high school, and the data are disaggregated by various subgroups. Data are typically presented as the “percent of students who participated in the state assessment.”

For reporting purposes, states provide the counts of students by academic subject, by grade level, and by participation status for all students and the various subgroups. See Table 6 for a list of the participation statuses reported in File Specifications 185 and 188.

Table . Participation Statuses and Definitions

| **Participation Status** | **Definition of Participation Status** |
| --- | --- |
| Participated – Regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards without accommodations (REGPARTWOACC) | An assessment designed to measure the student’s knowledge and skills in a particular subject matter based on academic achievement standards appropriate to the student’s grade level. See ESEA, Section 111(b)(3). |
| Participated – Regular assessments based on grade-level achievement standards with accommodations (REGPARTWACC) | An assessment designed to measure the student’s knowledge and skills in a particular subject matter based on academic achievement standards appropriate to the student’s grade level. See ESEA, Section 1111(b)(3). |
| Participated – Alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards (ALTPARTGRADELVL) | A way to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities based on the same grade-level achievement standards measured by the State’s regular assessments. Such assessments are available to students who the IEP team determines cannot participate in all or part of the State assessments under paragraph (a)(1) of 34 CFR §200.6, even with appropriate accommodations. These assessments must yield results for the grade in which the student is enrolled in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and, beginning in SY 2007-08, science, except as provided in 34 CFR §200.6(a)(2)(ii)(B). |
| Participated – Alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards (ALTPARTMODACH) | A way to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities who access the general grade-level curriculum, but whose disabilities have precluded them from achieving grade-level proficiency and who (as determined by the IEP team) are not expected to achieve grade-level proficiency within the year covered by the IEP. See 34 CFR §200.1(e). |
| Participated – Alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards (ALTPARTALTACH) | A way to measure the academic achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. These assessments may yield results that measure the achievement standards that the State has defined under 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §200.1(d). |
| Participated – English language proficiency assessment (PARTELP) | May be taken LEP students who have been in the U.S. less than 12 months in lieu of the reading/language arts assessment.  Note: This status is only for the reading/language arts assessment and only when the state allows LEP students who have been in the U.S. less than 12 months to take an English language proficiency assessment in lieu of the reading/language arts assessment. |
| Medical exemption (MEDEXEMPT) | Each state determines what constitutes a significant medical emergency. On March 29, 2004, the Department announced a policy that students who are unable to participate in the state assessment during the testing and make-up windows because of a significant medical emergency will not count against the school’s participation rate. A May 19, 2004, “Dear Colleague” letter provided additional guidance acknowledging that there may be circumstances beyond an LEA's control when a student cannot be assessed at any time during the testing window due to a significant medical emergency (e.g., a student is hospitalized due to an accident). In these cases, the school or LEA should not be penalized for that student's absence due to the documented significant medical emergency. Therefore, when determining the percentage of students taking an assessment, states do not have to include a student with a significant medical emergency in the participation rate calculation. |
| Did not participate (NPART) |  |

The total number of students across all participation statuses (excluding medical exemption) equals the total number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment. This is the denominator in our calculation of percent participation.

The numerator is comprised of the number of students who participated in an assessment and is represented in the “numpart” fields of the data files.

The reporting period is the testing window defined by the state. For most states the testing window represents a period in the spring of each school year. A few states utilize a testing window in the fall.

# File Structure

## Variable Naming Convention

Variable names within the file are organized using the abbreviations listed below in the following structure:

[SUBGROUP]\_[SUBJECT][GRADE][METRIC]\_SCHOOL YEAR

**[SUBGROUP]:** Data are presented in the file for each of the subgroups in the following format (please see Appendix D - Major Racial and Ethnic Groups and Special Populations Subgroups for more information on ‘major racial and ethnic groups’):

Table . Subgroups Abbreviations

| **Abbreviation** | **Meaning** |
| --- | --- |
| ALL | All students in the school |
| MAM | American Indian/Alaska Native students |
| MAS | Asian/Pacific Islander students |
| MHI | Hispanic students |
| MBL | Black students |
| MWH | White students |
| MTR | Two or More Races |
| CWD | Children with disabilities (IDEA) |
| ECD | Economically disadvantaged students |
| LEP | Limited English proficient students |
| F | Female students |
| M | Male students |
| HOM | Homeless enrolled students |
| MIG | Migrant students |

**[SUBJECT]:** Data within each file are specific to only one subject. Across all available files there are two possible subjects:

| **Abbreviation** | **Meaning** |
| --- | --- |
| MTH | Mathematics |
| RLA | Reading/Language Arts |

**[GRADE]:** Data are presented in the file for each of the following grades:

Table . Grade Level Abbreviations

| **Abbreviation** | **Meaning** |
| --- | --- |
| 00 | Results aggregated across all grades |
| 03 | Grade 3 |
| 04 | Grade 4 |
| 05 | Grade 5 |
| 06 | Grade 6 |
| 07 | Grade 7 |
| 08 | Grade 8 |
| HS | Grade(s) assessed in high school |

**[METRIC]:** All data are aggregated by subgroup and grade level. For each combination of subgroup and grade level within the file there are two metrics presented in the assessment achievement files:

Table . Achievement Variable Abbreviations

| **Abbreviation** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| numvalid | The number of students who completed the state assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| pctprof | The percentage of students scoring at or above the state’s proficiency level on the assessment |

For each combination of subgroup and grade level within the file there are two metrics presented in the assessment participation files:

Table . Participation Variable Abbreviations

| **Abbreviation** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| numpart | The number of students who participated in a state assessment |
| pctpart | The percentage of students who participated in a state assessment |

For example:

Table . Examples of Variable Names

| **Variable name** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| ALL\_MTH00numvalid\_1213 | The number of all students who completed a state assessment in mathematics and for whom a proficiency level was assigned across all grades in SY 2012-2013 |
| MHI\_RLA08pctprof\_1213 | The percent of Hispanic students scoring at or above proficient on the reading/language arts assessment in the eighth grade in SY 2012-2013 |
| ALL\_MTH00numpart\_1213 | The number of all students participating in the mathematics assessment, across all grades in SY 2012-2013 |
| MHI\_RLA08pctpart\_1213 | The percent of Hispanic students who participated in a reading/language arts assessment in the eighth grade in SY 2012-2013 |

## File Layout

The table layout for the school and district data is identical, with the exception that the district level table does not contain a school name or school NCES ID (NCESSCH). Section 3.1 Variable Naming Convention provides the breakdown of the variable names.

The ## in the tables below indicates grade level: 00 (All Students), 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, HS.

### Academic Achievement Files

Number of variables for each file:

* School – 231
* District – 229

Note: The subject in the variable name will display “MTH” in the mathematics files and “RLA” in the Reading/Language Arts files and the SY will display the school year as “1516” for SY 2015-16 files.

Table . Table Layout for Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts Achievement Files

| **Variable Name** | **Type** | **Length** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STNAM | Character | 250 | State Name |
| FIPST[[1]](#footnote-1) | Character | 2 | The two-digit American National Standards Institute (ANSI) code for state |
| LEAID[[2]](#footnote-2) | Character | 7 | District NCES ID |
| LEANM | Character | 60 | District Name |
| NCESSCH | Character | 12 | School NCES ID (Not in District file) |
| SCHNAM | Character | 250 | School Name (Not in District file) |
| DATE\_CUR | Character | 9 | Date of data snapshot (“Data current as of” date) |
| ALL\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Total number of students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| ALL\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of students in the school that scored at or above proficient |
| MAM\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Native American students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MAM\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Native American students that scored at or above proficient |
| MAS\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Asian/Pacific Islander students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MAS\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander students that scored at or above proficient |
| MBL\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Black students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MBL\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Black students that scored at or above proficient |
| MHI\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Hispanic students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MHI\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Hispanic students that scored at or above proficient |
| MTR\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of students with Two or More Races that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MTR\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of students with Two or More Races that scored at or above proficient |
| MWH\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of White students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MWH\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of White students that scored at or above proficient |
| F\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of female students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| F\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of female students that scored at or above proficient |
| M\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of male students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| M\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of male students that scored at or above proficient |
| CWD\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of children with disabilities that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| CWD\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of children with disabilities that scored at or above proficient |
| ECD\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of economically disadvantaged students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| ECD\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of economically disadvantaged students that scored at or above proficient |
| LEP\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of limited English proficient students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| LEP\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of limited English proficient students that scored at or above proficient |
| HOM\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of homeless students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| HOM\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of homeless students that scored at or above proficient |
| MIG\_[SUBJECT]##numvalid\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of migrant students that completed an assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned |
| MIG\_[SUBJECT]##pctprof\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of migrant students that scored at or above proficient |

### Assessment Participation Files

Number of variables in each file:

* School - 231
* District - 228

Note: The subject in the variable name will display “MTH” in the mathematics files and “RLA” in the Reading/Language Arts files and the SY will display the school year as “1516” for SY 2015-16 files.

Table . Table Layout for Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts Participation Files

| **Variable Name** | **Type** | **Length** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STNAM | Character | 250 | State Name |
| FIPST | Character | 2 | The two-digit American National Standards Institute (ANSI) code for state |
| LEAID | Character | 7 | District NCES ID |
| LEANM | Character | 60 | District Name |
| NCESSCH | Character | 12 | School NCES ID (Not in District file) |
| SCHNAM | Character | 250 | School Name (Not in District file) |
| DATE\_CUR | Character | 9 | Date of data snapshot (“Data current as of” date) |
| ALL\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Total number of students who participated in an assessment |
| ALL\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of students in the school who participated in an assessment |
| MAM\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Native American students who participated in an assessment |
| MAM\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Native American students who participated in an assessment |
| MAS\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Asian/Pacific Islander students who participated in an assessment |
| MAS\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander students who participated in an assessment |
| MBL\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Black students who participated in an assessment |
| MBL\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Black students who participated in an assessment |
| MHI\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of Hispanic students who participated in an assessment |
| MHI\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of Hispanic students who participated in an assessment |
| MTR\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of students with Two or More Races who participated in an assessment |
| MTR\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of students with Two or More Races who participated in an assessment |
| MWH\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of White students who participated in an assessment |
| MWH\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of White students who participated in an assessment |
| F\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of female students who participated in an assessment |
| F\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of female students who participated in an assessment |
| M\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of male students who participated in an assessment |
| M\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of male students who participated in an assessment |
| CWD\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in an assessment |
| CWD\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in an assessment |
| ECD\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of economically disadvantaged students who participated in an assessment |
| ECD\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of economically disadvantaged students who participated in an assessment |
| LEP\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of limited English proficient students who participated in an assessment |
| LEP\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of limited English proficient students who participated in an assessment |
| HOM\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of homeless enrolled students who participated in an assessment |
| HOM\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of homeless enrolled students who participated in an assessment |
| MIG\_[SUBJECT]##numpart\_[SY] | Number | 8 | Number of migrant students who participated in an assessment |
| MIG\_[SUBJECT]##pctpart\_[SY] | Character | 8 | Percentage of migrant students who participated in an assessment |

# Guidance for Using the Data – Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

1. ***Are state assessments comparable?***

State assessments are designed by each state to measure the content the state has determined appropriate for that grade and subject. As a result, both the content on the tests and achievement standards students must meet to be considered “proficient” vary widely across states. Specific proficiency rates for schools in different states should not be considered comparable. Uses of the data to compare achievement across states could be done utilizing a school’s relation to their state mean or to a state target, but should be done with caution. For more information, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has released a series of studies exploring state assessment comparability utilizing the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

NCES studies on NAEP and state assessments can be accessed online here: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/studies/statemapping/>

1. ***Are these data comparable from year to year?***

Many states changed their standards and assessments at some point in the process of measuring their students, so it is often not possible to create a trend line that looks at changes in achievement across years, since a change could reflect a change in one or more of several aspects of the state’s assessment system. For example, states may change their academic standards, state-wide assessment, or the cut-points for creating proficiency levels. This could result in drastic increases or decreases in percent proficient from year to year.

For a list of states which reported they made changes to their state assessments between SY2014-15 and SY2015-16, see Appendix C - State Assessment Changes from Prior School Year.

1. ***Why are the major racial and ethnic groups reported differently by states?***

Under the ESEA, a state education agency (SEA) has the flexibility to determine the major racial and ethnic groups it will use for reporting on the data included in its assessment and accountability system. The major racial and ethnic groups that an SEA uses are approved through its Accountability Workbook (the most recent copy of each state’s workbook can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html>). As a result, there is some variation in how SEAs report data by race and ethnicity. To create the data file, the major racial ethnic groups were cross-walked into six standard racial and ethnic groups. See Appendix D for the crosswalk.

1. ***Why doesn’t the summation of the major racial and ethnic groups equal the “ALL” student count?***

Due to flexibilities with states’ implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, there may be instances where not all possible groupings of racial and ethnic identification are reported as individual major racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, some information may be missing and these counts by major racial and ethnic group will not include every student; however any students not included within an individual major racial and ethnic group would be included in the “ALL” student count.

1. ***Why doesn’t the summation of the sexes equal the “ALL” student count?***

In almost all cases, summing the male and female counts will equal the “ALL” student count. However, there may be instances where this is not the case. This could be due to missing information on an individual student’s test record or an issue with the creation of the aggregate count reported to ED*Facts*.

1. ***Why are migrant data consistently missing for some states over the school years?***

Only states that apply for and receive a Migrant Education Program grant under Title I, Part C are required to provide data to ED on migrant students. The following states did *not* receive a Migrant Education Program grant and were therefore not required to submit data on migrant students:

* Connecticut
* District of Columbia
* Puerto Rico
* Rhode Island
* Virgin Islands
* West Virginia

To review the list of states that received a MEP grant, please visit: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/mep/awards.html>.

1. ***Are there any known limitations within the data?***

ED conducts various data quality checks on an annual basis, resulting in communication with states to verify the data or a resubmission of the entire file. These checks focus upon the presence or absence of categories within all submitted levels of the data, alignment of the school and district data with certified state-level data, and missing or questionable data on individual schools participating in key federal programs. Anomalies identified during the data quality review process are noted in Appendix B - Data Notes.

Other limitations (by affected state)

**New York** – Data for the New York City School District (NCES LEAID ‘3620580’) has been submitted as a supervisory union with 33 subordinate school districts. Each record within this file includes information about the local education agency (LEA) to which the school belongs. The schools included in this file are reported as they were submitted to ED*Facts,* with associations for all New York City being to these subordinate school districts. All but one of the subordinate school districts have the name “New York City Geographic District ##” where ## is a number between 1 and 32. If you are interested in aggregating the submitted school level data to the level of the New York City School District, use the names and LEA IDs in the Table 16 to identify the proper records within the data file.

Table . New York City School District’s Subordinate School Districts

| **Subordinate District Name** | **LEA ID** |
| --- | --- |
| New York City Geographic District #1 | 3600076 |
| New York City Geographic District #2 | 3600077 |
| New York City Geographic District #3 | 3600078 |
| New York City Geographic District #4 | 3600079 |
| New York City Geographic District #5 | 3600081 |
| New York City Geographic District #6 | 3600083 |
| New York City Geographic District #7 | 3600084 |
| New York City Geographic District #8 | 3600085 |
| New York City Geographic District #9 | 3600086 |
| New York City Geographic District #10 | 3600087 |
| New York City Geographic District #11 | 3600088 |
| New York City Geographic District #12 | 3600090 |
| New York City Geographic District #13 | 3600091 |
| New York City Geographic District #14 | 3600119 |
| New York City Geographic District #15 | 3600092 |
| New York City Geographic District #16 | 3600094 |
| New York City Geographic District #17 | 3600095 |
| New York City Geographic District #18 | 3600096 |
| New York City Geographic District #19 | 3600120 |
| New York City Geographic District #20 | 3600151 |
| New York City Geographic District #21 | 3600152 |
| New York City Geographic District #22 | 3600153 |
| New York City Geographic District #23 | 3600121 |
| New York City Geographic District #24 | 3600098 |
| New York City Geographic District #25 | 3600122 |
| New York City Geographic District #26 | 3600099 |
| New York City Geographic District #27 | 3600123 |
| New York City Geographic District #28 | 3600100 |
| New York City Geographic District #29 | 3600101 |
| New York City Geographic District #30 | 3600102 |
| New York City Geographic District #31 | 3600103 |
| New York City Geographic District #32 | 3600097 |
| NYC Special Schools District 75 | 3600135 |

1. ***Should these data align with data reported on State websites and report cards?***

Not necessarily. States may update their websites on different schedules than they use to report to ED. States may also build their websites and online report cards to utilize only the results for students who were present for the full academic year, and therefore were included within school and district accountability determinations. The data in these files includes information on all students who received a valid score on the state assessment, regardless of their ‘full academic year status.’ Additionally, ED uses a method to protect the privacy of individuals represented within the data that could be different than the method used by an individual state. For more discussion of how privacy protections affect the presentation of data within the Public Use file, see Section 1.5 Privacy Protection FAQs.

1. ***Should these data align with other data published by ED?***

Not necessarily. State-level data are finalized in each State’s Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), and also published on ED Data Express and in the ESEA Report to Congress. Data published in these locations are point-in-time data, and they reflect the official data for a particular school year. If states resubmit school or district level data after they finalize their CSPR, then school and/or district level data may not align when it is rolled-up to the state level.

1. ***Were proficiency rates reported by the SEAs within the files submitted to EDFacts?***

No. Data are reported to ED*Facts* by the individual performance levels established by the state. Each state identifies its performance levels as being below, at or above state definitions of grade level proficiency. Those proficiency mappings are reported to ED separately from the ED*Facts* data files. For example, State A may submit counts of students scoring in Level 1, Level 2, Level 3 and Level 4. State A also submits information regarding which of those levels are considered by the state to be at or above grade level proficiency. The submitted proficiency mappings are then used to convert the data reported to ED*Facts* by performance level into the percent proficient metric included within these files. The metric for number of valid scores within the file represents the aggregation of reported student counts across all performance levels. Tables showing the proficiency levels reported for each grade level and assessment type within each state are available from the [ED*Facts* website](https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/data-files/index.html).

1. ***When are state assessments typically administered?***

States generally administer their statewide assessments during the spring. There are a small number of states that administer their assessments in the fall. Students who test in the fall are assessed on academic content from the previous school year. See state websites for detailed information about the timing of statewide assessments.

1. ***Why are valid combinations of grades and student groups missing for some LEAs and schools?***

The file specifications provide states with guidance on when to report a zero versus leave the record out of the file. At the SEA level, states are required to report zero counts by every disaggregation required in academic achievement (Mathematics FS175 and Reading/Language Arts DG584) and assessment participation (Mathematics FS185 and Reading/Language Arts FS188). For example, if a state does not have any Grade 3 migrant students, the state is required to report a zero for that record in their SEA level files. At the LEA and School level, states are not required to report zero counts. Valid combinations for the state that are not included in the LEA or school level files will be assumed to be zeros.

If a state does not administer a certain assessment type the state is instructed not to report zero counts for those records. Similarly, if a state does not use all major racial and ethnic group permitted values, the state should not report zero counts for those permitted values. Reporting zero counts will be considered data quality issues.

1. ***Is there a unique identifier that can be used to combine/merge these data with other federal data sets?***

All rows of data include the NCES assigned school ID (variable name: NCESSCH). This 12-digit identifier is used within the Common Core of Data and other regular data releases from NCES. It can be used to merge these data with other ED data publications, or with state data publications. Anyone wishing to merge these data with data in files published by other agencies that do not utilize the NCES assigned school code may first need to match each NCES assigned school ID with a state assigned ID. The Common Core of Data (<http://nces.ed.gov/ccd>) includes both NCES and state assigned ID numbers. It could be used to associate each of these records with a state assigned ID number.

1. ***What if I notice something unusual in the data?***

Data concerns would need to be corrected by individual states through a resubmission of data files to ED*Facts*. However, rather than emailing states directly, if you notice something unusual in the data or something that you don’t understand, send an e-mail to [EDEN\_SS@ed.gov](mailto:EDEN_SS@ed.gov). To assist us in responding to the concern, please format your e-mail as follows:

The subject line of the e-mail should be:

EDFacts Public Assessment Files

The following information needs to be included preferably in this order and with the captions:

* School Year – indicate which school year(s) have the issue(s)
* Academic subject – indicate whether the issue is with the data on mathematics or reading/language arts or both
* Assessment file – Academic Achievement in Mathematics (FS175/DG583), Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts (FS175/DG584), Assessment Participation in Mathematics (FS185/DG588), and/or Assessment Participation in Reading/Language Arts (FS188/DG589)
* States – indicate which state(s) have the issue
* Description – describe the issue (what did you see, what were you expecting to see)

# Appendix A - Last Submission Date by State

The tables below contain the last date that an SEA submitted files containing academic achievement and assessment participation data for SY 2015-16. All data in the public files are current as of 4/12/2017. Therefore, any data submitted after this date are not included in the Achievement or Participation files.

Table A-1. Date of Last Submission of SY 2015-16 Achievement Data by State

| **State** | **LEA Level Mathematics (C175)** | **LEA Level Reading/LA (C178)** | **School Level Mathematics (C175)** | **School Level Reading/LA (C178)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALABAMA | 4/12/2017 | 4/12/2017 | 4/12/2017 | 4/12/2017 |
| ARIZONA | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 |
| ARKANSAS | 12/8/2016 | 12/3/2016 | 12/8/2016 | 12/3/2016 |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | 3/2/2017 | 3/2/2017 | 3/2/2017 | 3/2/2017 |
| CALIFORNIA | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 |
| COLORADO | 12/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 |
| CONNECTICUT | 4/10/2017 | 4/11/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/11/2017 |
| DELAWARE | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 |
| FLORIDA | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 |
| GEORGIA | 12/8/2016 | 12/8/2016 | 12/8/2016 | 12/8/2016 |
| HAWAII | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 |
| IDAHO | 3/24/2017 | 3/24/2017 | 3/24/2017 | 3/24/2017 |
| ILLINOIS | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 |
| INDIANA | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 |
| IOWA | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 | 11/16/2016 | 11/16/2016 |
| KANSAS | 3/6/2017 | 3/2/2017 | 3/6/2017 | 3/2/2017 |
| KENTUCKY | 10/31/2016 | 10/31/2016 | 10/31/2016 | 10/31/2016 |
| LOUISIANA | 4/11/2017 | 2/14/2017 | 4/11/2017 | 2/14/2017 |
| MAINE | 12/12/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 12/14/2016 |
| MARYLAND | 3/7/2017 | 3/7/2017 | 3/7/2017 | 3/8/2017 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| MICHIGAN | 3/24/2017 | 3/24/2017 | 3/24/2017 | 3/24/2017 |
| MINNESOTA | 9/22/2016 | 9/22/2016 | 9/22/2016 | 9/22/2016 |
| MISSISSIPPI | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 |
| MISSOURI | 4/10/2017 | 11/17/2016 | 4/10/2017 | 11/17/2016 |
| MONTANA | 3/6/2017 | 3/6/2017 | 3/6/2017 | 3/6/2017 |
| NEBRASKA | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 |
| NEVADA | 4/5/2017 | 4/5/2017 | 4/5/2017 | 4/5/2017 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 |
| NEW JERSEY | 12/14/2016 | 2/2/2017 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 |
| NEW MEXICO | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 |
| NEW YORK | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 10/24/2016 | 10/24/2016 | 10/24/2016 | 10/24/2016 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| OHIO | 4/7/2017 | 4/7/2017 | 4/7/2017 | 4/7/2017 |
| OKLAHOMA | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| OREGON | 11/29/2016 | 11/29/2016 | 11/29/2016 | 11/29/2016 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | 12/11/2016 | 12/11/2016 | 12/11/2016 | 12/11/2016 |
| PUERTO RICO | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 |
| RHODE ISLAND | 11/7/2016 | 5/31/2017 | 11/7/2016 | 4/10/2017 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 1/25/2017 | 1/12/2017 | 1/25/2017 | 1/12/2017 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | 12/11/2016 | 12/11/2016 | 12/11/2016 | 12/11/2016 |
| TENNESSEE | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 |
| TEXAS | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 |
| UTAH\* | 5/17/2017 | 5/17/2017 | 5/17/2017 | 5/17/2017 |
| VERMONT | 2/23/2017 | 2/23/2017 | 2/23/2017 | 2/23/2017 |
| VIRGIN ISLANDS | 4/4/2017 | 4/4/2017 | 4/4/2017 | 4/4/2017 |
| VIRGINIA | 11/29/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 11/29/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| WASHINGTON | 3/9/2017 | 3/9/2017 | 3/9/2017 | 3/9/2017 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | 12/6/2016 | 12/7/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/19/2016 |
| WISCONSIN | 12/1/2016 | 12/2/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/2/2016 |
| WYOMING | 12/6/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 11/30/2016 |

\* data not included in public files because data submitted after 4/12/2017 due date

Table A-2. Date of Last Submission of SY 2015-16 Participation Data by State

| **State** | **LEA Level Mathematics (C185)** | **LEA Level Reading/LA (C188)** | **School Level Mathematics (C185)** | **School Level Reading/LA (C188)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALABAMA | 12/14/2016 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 4/12/2017 |
| ARIZONA | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 |
| ARKANSAS | 12/8/2016 | 2/27/2017 | 2/27/2017 | 12/8/2016 |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | 3/2/2017 | 3/2/2017 | 3/2/2017 | 3/2/2017 |
| CALIFORNIA | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 | 2/28/2017 |
| COLORADO | 12/12/2016 | 12/13/2016 | 12/13/2016 | 12/9/2016 |
| CONNECTICUT | 3/1/2017 | 4/11/2017 | 4/11/2017 | 4/10/2017 |
| DELAWARE | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 | 2/24/2017 |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 |
| FLORIDA | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 |
| GEORGIA | 12/8/2016 | 12/8/2016 | 12/8/2016 | 12/8/2016 |
| HAWAII | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 |
| IDAHO | 3/24/2017 | 3/27/2017 | 3/27/2017 | 3/24/2017 |
| ILLINOIS | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 |
| INDIANA | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 |
| IOWA | 11/15/2016 | 11/16/2016 | 11/16/2016 | 11/16/2016 |
| KANSAS | 3/7/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/6/2017 |
| KENTUCKY | 10/31/2016 | 10/31/2016 | 10/31/2016 | 10/31/2016 |
| LOUISIANA\* | 4/11/2017 | 4/13/2017 | 4/13/2017 | 4/11/2017 |
| MAINE | 12/14/2016 | 12/9/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 |
| MARYLAND | 3/7/2017 | 3/7/2017 | 3/7/2017 | 3/7/2017 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | 2/21/2017 | 12/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| MICHIGAN | 12/2/2016 | 12/2/2016 | 12/2/2016 | 3/24/2017 |
| MINNESOTA | 9/22/2016 | 9/22/2016 | 9/22/2016 | 9/22/2016 |
| MISSISSIPPI | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 |
| MISSOURI | 4/10/2017 | 11/17/2016 | 11/17/2016 | 4/10/2017 |
| MONTANA | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/6/2017 |
| NEBRASKA | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 |
| NEVADA | 4/11/2017 | 4/11/2017 | 4/11/2017 | 4/5/2017 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 | 11/15/2016 |
| NEW JERSEY | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 | 12/14/2016 |
| NEW MEXICO | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 | 3/1/2017 |
| NEW YORK | 12/15/2016 | 12/15/2016 | 12/15/2016 | 2/24/2017 |
| NORTH CAROLINA | 10/25/2016 | 10/24/2016 | 10/24/2016 | 10/24/2016 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | 12/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 | 12/9/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| OHIO | 4/7/2017 | 4/7/2017 | 4/7/2017 | 4/7/2017 |
| OKLAHOMA | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| OREGON | 9/26/2016 | 9/26/2016 | 9/26/2016 | 11/29/2016 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | 2/27/2017 | 2/27/2017 | 2/27/2017 | 12/11/2016 |
| PUERTO RICO | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 |
| RHODE ISLAND | 11/9/2016 | 4/10/2017 | 4/10/2017 | 11/7/2016 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | 1/25/2017 | 1/12/2017 | 1/12/2017 | 1/25/2017 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | 12/13/2016 | 12/13/2016 | 12/13/2016 | 12/11/2016 |
| TENNESSEE | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 12/12/2016 |
| TEXAS | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 | 12/6/2016 |
| UTAH\* | 5/18/2017 | 5/18/2017 | 5/18/2017 | 5/17/2017 |
| VERMONT | 2/27/2017 | 2/27/2017 | 2/27/2017 | 2/23/2017 |
| VIRGIN ISLANDS | 4/4/2017 | 4/4/2017 | 4/4/2017 | 4/4/2017 |
| VIRGINIA | 11/29/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 12/1/2016 | 11/29/2016 |
| WASHINGTON | 3/9/2017 | 3/9/2017 | 3/9/2017 | 3/9/2017 |
| WEST VIRGINIA\* | 12/9/2016 | 12/12/2016 | 4/19/2017 | 12/14/2016 |
| WISCONSIN | 12/13/2016 | 12/13/2016 | 12/13/2016 | 12/1/2016 |
| WYOMING | 12/6/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 11/30/2016 | 12/6/2016 |

\* data not included in public files because data submitted after 4/12/2017 due date

# 

# Appendix B - Data Notes

The second and third columns in the table below list identified data anomalies that may impact the usability of the data. Absence of comments indicates that either no known data anomalies exist or that any data anomalies identified were not significant enough to impact the usability of the data. Applicable state comments are also included to assist with the interpretation of the data. Please note that states are responsible for the accuracy of the comments they submit to ED to accompany their data submission.

**Table B-1. Data Notes for Mathematics**

| **State** | **Achievement (C175)** | **Participation (C185)** | **State Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALABAMA | **Across File Comparison:** The LEA and School numbers of ECODIS students who took an assessment and received a valid score (C175) are significantly smaller than the LEA and School numbers of students who participated in an assessment (C185) for all grades. Across all grades, the discrepancy is 38,964 students (18%) at the LEA level. For each grade at the LEA level, the discrepancies range from 587 to 5,845 students (17-22%). Similar discrepancies exist at the School level. | **SEA to LEA/SCH Comparison:** The C185 total number of ECODIS students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment at the SEA level is approximately 39,929 students (19%) smaller than was reported at the LEA level. A similar discrepancy exists between the SEA and School levels. This discrepancy occurs for ECODIS students across all assessment types and grades. |  |
| ALABAMA | **Year to Year comparison:** The C175 number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number for two subgroups: MM and MIG. The discrepancy is 7,443 students (64%) for MM students and 221 students (24%) for MIG students. | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists for the C185 total number of MM and MIG students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. | *“…The discrepancies noted were a result of several factors. First and foremost, more students with a Race/Ethnicity of MM tested in Math in the 2015-2016 school year (based on a year-to-year count of records with a valid Math score). Additionally, in 2014-2015, if a test record could not be matched to an enrollment record, and the test record did not have a valid Race/Ethnicity code, it was designated as Two or More Races. For 2015-2016, this rule was changed to designate these types of test records as White. For the MIG subgroup, more students who received a valid Math score were reported as Migrant in 2015-2016 than in 2014-2015. For the MIG subgroup, more students who received a valid Reading score were reported as Migrant in 2015-2016 than in 2014-2015.* |
| ALABAMA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a REGASSWACC assessment (regular assessment with accommodations) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 5,029 students (25%). For Grades 3-7 and HS, the discrepancies range from 357 to 1,848 students (13-159. Even larger discrepancies exist in the C178 and C188 files. | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy REGPARTWACC exists for the C185 total number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. | *“…In the 2014-2015 assessment data received from the vendor, fewer students were reported with accommodations than in the 2015-2016 data.”* |
| ALASKA | No data reported at SEA, LEA, or School levels. | No data reported at SEA, LEA, or School levels. | *“Data for these files do not exist due to the cancellation of state assessments*.” |
| ARIZONA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of HOMELESS students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The difference 2,188 students (22%). | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C185 number of HOMELESS students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment in SY 2014-15 is also 1,264 students (12%) greater than the number reported in SY 2015-16. | *“It appears that reporting of students with homeless condition by our school districts was adversely affected by a transition to a new student data system that we had in the 2015-16 school year.”* |
| ARKANSAS | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 14,966 students (5.5%). |  | *“…One reason this 14-15 is lower than 2015-16 was the change in high school math for alternate assessment. Students taking an alternate assessment in high school use to take it in grade 9, with the change to NCSC/MSAA the grade assessed was moved to grade 11. This aligns math with RLA which is also assessed at grade 11. Many of the students in grade 11 during the 2014-15 school year had previously taken the alternate assessment in grade 9; therefore, the number of students taking the math assessment in grade 11 was lower than previous years and in 2015-16.”* |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in High School who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in High School who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. |  |
| COLORADO | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 32,674 students (7%). | **Year to Year Comparison:** A discrepancy of 57,999 students (11%) exists for the C185 total number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. | *“Colorado submitted English language arts and mathematics testing data for students in grades 3-10 in SY2014-15; however, only data for a single grade of high school were submitted in SY2015-16. The absence of a second grade in high school in the SY2015-16 submission accounts for the significant year-to-year discrepancies.”*  *State explanation for changes to high school assessment reporting:*  *“…State legislation stipulated that the 10th grade assessment be changed from PARCC/CMAS to the PSAT, beginning in 2015-16.  The PSAT does not come with proficiency cut-points, and CDE has not yet developed them. . . . Although some 10th grade students with disabilities took Colorado’s alternate DLM, we did not report those data because we were not reporting the 10th grade general assessment, and were of the opinion that the reporting should be aligned.”* |
| CONNECTICUT | **SEA to SCH Comparison**: The C175 total number of students who took an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) and received a valid score at the SEA level is approximately 1,083 students (27%) greater than was reported at the SCH level. Similar discrepancies exist for the following subgroups: MB, MHL, MW, MALE, FEMALE, and CWD. The discrepancies range from 230 to 1,083 students (24-29%). | Similar **SEA to SCH Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C185 number of students who participated in an assessment. |  |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 5,635 students (83%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists for the C185 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. |  |
| FLORIDA | **Partial Data:** No C175 data reported for students who took an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. |  |  |
| FLORIDA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists between the SY 2014-15 C185 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment and the SY 2015-16 number. | *“Florida stopped collecting accommodation information on our test documents and in our testing systems in 2014-15 for ELA and Mathematics and only required that schools record and maintain the accommodations information at the local level.*  *It was realized during the 2015-16 school year that the accommodations information was required for federal reporting purposes. However, at that time it was too late to make changes to the documents/systems and collect all accommodations data for the spring 2016 testing.*  *For 2015-16 reporting we were able to generate data for certain accommodations through our computer based testing system (text-to-speech, masking, paper-based tests) and certain paper based accommodations (LP, Braille, One-Item-per-Page).*  *The discrepancy between 2014-15 vs 2015-16 is because in 2014-15 we reported certain paper accommodations and in 2015-16 we were able to add certain computer based accommodations.*  *The numbers for the 2016-17 year will again be different. In 2016-17 we will begin collecting information on all accommodations on paper and computer based assessments*  *Grade 3 Mathematics and Grade 4 Reading assessments have fewer accommodations reported as they were paper based assessments only in 2015-16.”* |
| GEORGIA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number for the following subgroups: MA, MB, MHL, MM, MALE, LEP, HOM, FEMALE, ECODIS, and CWD. The total discrepancy from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16 is 15,054 students (a 13% difference). For subgroups, the discrepancies range from 319 to 12,687 students (11-17% differences).  **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of grade 9 and 12 students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 4,441 students (27%) for grade 9 and 2,066 (119%) for grade 12. | Similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C185 number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“For the FY15 creation of the C175 file, the Algebra End-of Course assessment was the only assessment used. However, for the FY16 creation of the C175, the Algebra and the Analytic Geometry End-of-Course assessments were used which increased the number of students reported for C175 and C185.”* |
| HAWAII | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations and received a valid score (REGASSWACC) in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 385 students (102%). |  | *“Accommodation data dependent on data provided by the SBA Assessment file. SY 2014-15 was first year the SBA Assessment was used. A larger amount of accommodations were input into SBA for Reading compared to Math. Cleaner accommodation data was provided from SBA for SY 2015-16.”* |
| IDAHO | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. This is a discrepancy of 2,296 students (156%). Additionally, the C175 number of students who took an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. This is a discrepancy of 210 students (13%). | Similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C185 number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“The increase in the number of students participated in ALTASSALTACH and REGASSWACC is due to us clarifying eligibility requirements with the school districts. More students participated in the correct test, and this is reflected in the decrease in the number of students in NPART.*  *This year's number is roughly 10% of the overall population. Approximately 10% of our students are on an IEP… students on an IEP are eligible for ALTASSALTACH and REGASSWACC”* |
| ILLINOIS | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. This is a discrepancy of 39,056 students (23%). | Similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C185 number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. |  |
| INDIANA | **Partial data:** No C175 data submitted for the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. | **Partial data:** No C185 data submitted for the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTPARTALTACH) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. | *“The data reported for ISTAR, Indiana’s alternate assessment, reflects the anticipated results from ISTAR for 2015-16 and are consistent with Indiana’s pattern of data collection. The data for 2015-16 cannot be reported as cut scores for the new assessment were not able to be achieved for this school year. Indiana’s Alternate Assessment took place, students were tested, but students were not graded and no proficiency levels were assigned. These students are included in the number of students enrolled but not in the number of students participating.”* |
| MAINE | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 4,243 students (5%). Additionally, the number of HS students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is 4,180 students (50%) smaller than in SY 2015-16. |  | *"Maine had challenges in 2014/15 because we used SmarterBalanced for hr HS assessment instead of the SAT and this caused a much larger amount of families selecting to opt out in 2014/15. When we went back to the SAT in 2015/16, the counts returned to normal."* |
| MICHIGAN | **Year to Year Comparison**: The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 6,276 students (65%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists for the C185 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from year to year. | *“Michigan moved from about 80% online to about 95% online at the same time and these two testing modes are very different. The … determination of with/without accommodations is much cleaner since it now has to be identified by the proctor rather than the student. Also, the on-line test experience allows some students to test without accommodations that may have required an accommodation in the past.”* |
| MONTANA | **Partial Data:** No C175 data reported for GRADE 11 students who took a regular assessment without accommodations (REGASSWOACC) at the SEA, LEA, or SCH levels. | **Partial Data:** No C185 data submitted at the SEA, LEA, or School levels for Grade 11 students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC), though data were submitted for this grade across several subgroups at the LEA and SCH levels in C175. | *“Montana has not yet identified performance levels for the ACT assessment. We plan to do so as soon as possible. We have reported the 11th grade students taking the ACT as participants, but no proficiency level data is available.”* |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 1,510 students (414%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists from the prior year for the C185 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“The number of students who took the REGASSWACC from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 increased . . . in M and RLA for an accommodation with scribe writing. Since 2015-2016 was the second year that students took the Smarter Balance assessment, the increase in scribe-writing is likely due to the schools being more prepared.”* |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | **Partial Data:** No C175 data reported at the LEA or School levels for Grade 11 students who took the regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC). | **Partial Data:** No C185 data reported at the LEA or School levels for Grade 11 students who took the regular assessment with accommodations (REGPARTWACC). |  |
| NEW JERSEY | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 70,807 students (9%). Additionally, the number of HS students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is 44,014 students (24%) smaller than in the SY 2015-16 number. |  | *“Differences in participation count are related to two separate issues: 1) Comparing 2015-16 to 2014-15 more students participated in the second year of testing, and the results of students who took assessments in the fall scheduling block are factored into calculations. 2) Comparing 2015-16 to 2013-14 and earlier, the current assessments are not comparable, previously one grade was assessed at the HS level and currently two additional grades are assessed.”* |
| NEW MEXICO | **Across File comparison**: The SEA, LEA, and School numbers of GRADE HS students who took an assessment and received valid score (C175) are significantly smaller than the SEA, LEA, and School numbers of students who participated in an assessment (C185) for all subgroups. The discrepancy is 9,082 students (13%) at all levels. |  |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number for the HOM, LEP, and MHL subgroups. The discrepancy is 3,699 students (12%) for the MHL subgroup; 4,186 students (18%) for the LEP subgroup; and 629 students (12%) for the HOM subgroup. Similar discrepancies exist for the C185 HOM, LEP, and MHL students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C185 number of HIGH SCHOOL students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 7,862 students (16%). A similar discrepancy exists for the C175 number of HIGH SCHOOL students who took an assessment and received a valid score from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16 (4,279 students; 9.4%). | For Achievement data:  *“Although all students are required to take the high school tests in math, reading/language arts, and science, they are not required to take them in the same grade or the same year. This can lead to differences in the number of high school test takers from year to year and between subjects. This can also explain the subgroup discrepancies in the high school assessment.*  *The changes in grades 3-8 could be reflective of changing from ACT Aspire to SC READY. Students traditionally do slightly worse during the first administration of a new assessment.*  *Any changes related to Economically Disadvantaged students could also be due to a change in identification methodology.*  *For LEP students: our student information system was modified in 15-16, enabling it to better capture which students are those "who exited LEP status prior to the testing window within the past two years" (per 2.4.7 of file specification 179). This led to a change in our data processing…”*  For Participation data:  *"…SC revised its calculation methodology for the enrollment rates with its high school EOCEP assessment during 15-16. Thus, the number of enrolled students who were eligible to test is higher in 15-16."* |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C175 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 1,326 students (31%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists from the prior year for the C185 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“SY14-15 was the first year SD submitted Smarter Balance accommodations data. SD had the opportunity to monitor the data closer. . . . SD is still improving this data, and will continue to monitor for progress.”* |
| TENNESSEE | **Partial Data:** No C175 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students who took both regular assessments with and without accommodations (REGASSWOACC, REGASSWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. ED has documented that the state suspended achievement testing for mathematics and reading/language arts in grades 3-8 in SY2015-16. | **Partial Data:** No C185 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students who took both regular assessments with and without accommodations (REGPARTWOACC, REGPARTWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. ED has documented that the state suspended achievement testing for mathematics and reading/language arts in grades 3-8 in SY2015-16. |  |
| TENNESSEE | **Partial Data:** No C175 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students at the SEA, LEA, and School levels for the following subgroups: MIG, LEP, and ECODIS. | **Partial Data:** No C185 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students at the SEA, LEA, and School levels for the following subgroups: MIG, LEP, and ECODIS. |  |
| TENNESSEE | **Partial Data:** No C175 data reported for MIG and HOM students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels | **Partial Data:** No C185 data reported for MIG and HOM students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGPARTWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels |  |
| UTAH | **Partial Data:** No data reported for Migrant students in C175 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels. | **Partial Data:** No data reported for Migrant students in C185 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels. |  |
| VERMONT | **Partial Data:** No data reported in C175 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels for the regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC). | **Partial Data:** No data reported in C185 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels for the regular assessment with accommodations (REGPARTWACC). |  |
| WEST VIRGINIA | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in all grades who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in all grades who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. |  |

**Table B-2. Data Notes for Reading/Language Arts**

| **STATE** | **ACHIEVEMENT (C178)** | **PARTICIPATION (C188)** | **STATE COMMENTS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALABAMA | **Year to Year comparison**: The C178 number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number for the MM and MIG subgroups. The discrepancy is 7,301 students (63%) for the MM subgroup and 242 students (26%) for the MIG subgroup. Additionally, the C178 number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number for the MHL and ECODIS subgroups. The discrepancy is 3,404 students (15%) for the MHL subgroup and 37,962 students (18%) for the ECODIS subgroup. | Similar SEA to LEA/SCH Comparison discrepancies exist for the C178 number of ECODIS students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment as exist for the C188 file. | *“…The discrepancies noted were a result of several factors. First and foremost, more students with a Race/Ethnicity of MM tested in Reading in the 2015-2016 school year (based on a year-to-year count of records with a valid Science score). Additionally, in 2014-2015, if a test record could not be matched to an enrollment record, and the test record did not have a valid Race/Ethnicity code, it was designated as Two or More Races. For 2015-2016, this rule was changed to designate these types of test records as White. For the MIG subgroup, more students who received a valid Reading score were reported as Migrant in 2015-2016 than in 2014-2015.* *For the MHL subgroup, beginning with the 2015-2016 school year, a business rule was changed to improve the accuracy of the race/ethnicities being reported. In 2014-2015, the reported race/ethnicity was pulled from the test records provided by the vendor. . . . For the ECODIS subgroup, based on how AL Dept of Ed currently reports poverty, if a school is participating in CEP, the whole school is reported as poverty. If additional schools participated in CEP in 2015-2016 that were not in CEP in 2014-2015, their students were reported as poverty for the latest school year, whereas only Free/Reduced students would have been reported the previous year.”* |
| ALASKA | No data reported at SEA, LEA, or School levels. | No data reported at SEA, LEA, or School levels. | *“Data for these files do not exist due to the cancellation of state assessments*.” |
| ARIZONA | There is a similar C175 **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy for C178 HOMELESS students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. *See data note in Mathematics table above.* | There is a similar C185 **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy for C188 HOMELESS students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. *See data note in Mathematics table above.* | *“It appears that reporting of students with homeless condition by our school districts was adversely affected by a transition to a new student data system that we had in the 2015-16 school year.”* |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in High School who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in High School who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. |  |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | **Partial Data:** No C178 data submitted for the regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) assessment type for all grades and subgroups at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. | **Partial Data:** No C188 data submitted for the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTPARTALTACH) participation status for all grades and subgroups at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. |  |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION |  | **Partial Data:** No C188 data submitted for Grade 11 at the LEA and School levels. Data for this grade were reported at the SEA level. |  |
| COLORADO | There is a similar C175 **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy for C178 students who took an assessment and received a valid score from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16 (33,753 students; 8%). *See data note in Mathematics table above.* | There is a similar C185 **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy for C188 students who took an assessment and received a valid score from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16 (57,221 students; 11%). *See data note in Mathematics table above.* | *“Colorado submitted English language arts and mathematics testing data for students in grades 3-10 in SY2014-15; however, only data for a single grade of high school were submitted in SY2015-16. The absence of a second grade in high school in the SY2015-16 submission accounts for the significant year-to-year discrepancies.”*  *State explanation for changes to high school assessment reporting:*  *“…State legislation stipulated that the 10th grade assessment be changed from PARCC/CMAS to the PSAT, beginning in 2015-16.  The PSAT does not come with proficiency cut-points, and CDE has not yet developed them… Although some 10th grade students with disabilities took Colorado’s alternate DLM, we did not report those data because we were not reporting the 10th grade general assessment, and were of the opinion that the reporting should be aligned.”* |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | **Year to Year comparison**: The C178 total number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 2,654 students (41%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists for the C188 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. |  |
| FLORIDA | **Partial Data:** No C178 data reported for students who took an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. |  |  |
| FLORIDA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C178 total number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 64,644 students (10901%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists between the SY 2014-15 C188 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment and the SY 2015-16 number. | *“Florida stopped collecting accommodation information on our test documents and in our testing systems in 2014-15 for ELA and Mathematics and only required that schools record and maintain the accommodations information at the local level.*  *It was realized during the 2015-16 school year that the accommodations information was required for federal reporting purposes. However, at that time it was too late to make changes to the documents/systems and collect all accommodations data for the spring 2016 testing.*  *For 2015-16 reporting we were able to generate data for certain accommodations through our computer based testing system (text-to-speech, masking, paper-based tests) and certain paper based accommodations (LP, Braille, One-Item-per-Page).*  *The discrepancy between 2014-15 vs 2015-16 is because in 2014-15 we reported certain paper accommodations and in 2015-16 we were able to add certain computer based accommodations.*  *The numbers for the 2016-17 year will again be different. In 2016-17 we will begin collecting information on all accommodations on paper and computer based assessments*  *Grade 3 Mathematics and Grade 4 Reading assessments have fewer accommodations reported as they were paper based assessments only in 2015-16.”* |
| GEORGIA | **Year to Year comparison:** The C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number for GRADES 3-8, 11, and 12. The total discrepancy from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16 is 17,173 students (a 16% difference). For each grade, the discrepancies range from 250 to 3,068 students (12-34% differences). | Similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C188 number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“This increase is a combination of both the increase in enrollment…” and the increased demands of assessment and instruction. As more students are struggling with the new assessment, additional supports are needed to support learning and demonstration in assessment.”* |
| HAWAII | **Year to Year comparison:** The C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations and received a valid score (REGASSWACC) in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 1,722 students (75%). |  | *“Accommodation data dependent on data provided by the SBA Assessment file. SY 2014-15 was first year the SBA Assessment was used. A larger amount of accommodations were input into SBA for Reading compared to Math. Cleaner accommodation data was provided from SBA for SY 2015-16.”* |
| IDAHO | **Year to Year comparison:** The C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. This is a discrepancy of 9,582 students (1960%). Additionally, the C178 number of students who took an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. This is a discrepancy of 218 students (14%). | Similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C188 number of students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“The increase in the number of students participated in ALTASSALTACH and REGASSWACC is due to us clarifying eligibility requirements with the school districts. More students participated in the correct test, and this is reflected in the decrease in the number of students in NPART.*  *This year's number is roughly 10% of the overall population. Approximately 10% of our students are on an IEP. … students on an IEP are eligible for ALTASSALTACH and REGASSWACC…”* |
| INDIANA | **Partial data:** No C178 data submitted for the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTASSALTACH) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. | **Partial data:** No C188 data submitted for the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (ALTPARTALTACH) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. | *“The data reported for ISTAR, Indiana’s alternate assessment, reflects the anticipated results from ISTAR for 2015-16 and are consistent with Indiana’s pattern of data collection. The data for 2015-16 cannot be reported as cut scores for the new assessment were not able to be achieved for this school year. Indiana’s Alternate Assessment took place, students were tested, but students were not graded and no proficiency levels were assigned. These students are included in the number of students enrolled but not in the number of students participating.”* |
| INDIANA | **Year to Year comparison:** The C178 total number of LEP students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The difference is 6,487 students (24%) for the LEP subgroup. | Similar **Year to Year comparison** discrepancies exist for the C188 LEP students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“Due to changes in Indiana’s Assessment and Accountability systems, including new testing vendors, the data collection methods of identifying special student population test results has changed significantly between 2014-15 and 2015-16. Specifically, new English Learner assessments have modified the identification of ELL students. The state also used a new process to identify assessments of Special Education students, which accounts for higher counts than previous years.”* |
| MICHIGAN | **Year to Year Comparison**: Similar to the discrepancy noted for C175 in the Mathematics table above, the C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 2,632 students (10%). | A similar discrepancy exists for the C188 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from year to year. | *“Michigan moved from about 80% online to about 95% online at the same time and these two testing modes are very different. The …determination of with/without accommodations is much cleaner since it now has to be identified by the proctor rather than the student. Also, the on-line test experience allows some students to test without accommodations that may have required an accommodation in the past.’* |
| MONTANA | **Partial Data:** No C178 data reported for GRADE 11 students who took a regular assessment without accommodations (REGASSWOACC) at the SEA, LEA, or SCH levels. | **Partial Data:** No C188 data reported for GRADE 11 students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) at the SEA, LEA, or School levels. Data was submitted for this grade and assessment type at the LEA and School levels in C178. | *“Montana has not yet identified performance levels for the ACT assessment. We plan to do so as soon as possible. We have reported the 11th grade students taking the ACT as participants, but no proficiency level data is available.”* |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 1,827 students (33%). | A similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists from the prior year for the C188 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“The number of students who took the REGASSWACC from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 increased . . . in M and RLA for an accommodation with scribe writing. Since 2015-2016 was the second year that students took the Smarter Balance assessment, the increase in scribe-writing is likely due to the schools being more prepared.”* |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | **Partial Data:** No C178 data reported at the LEA or School levels for Grade 11 students who took the regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC). | **Partial Data:** No C188 data reported at the LEA or School levels for Grade 11 students who took the regular assessment with accommodations (REGPARTWACC). |  |
| NEW JERSEY | **Year to Year comparison:** The C178 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 69,599 students (9%). Additionally, the number of HS students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is 43,506 students (20%) smaller than in the SY 2015-16 number. |  | *“Differences in participation count are related to two separate issues: 1) Comparing 2015-16 to 2014-15 more students participated in the second year of testing, and the results of students who took assessments in the fall scheduling block are factored into calculations. 2) Comparing 2015-16 to 2013-14 and earlier, the current assessments are not comparable, previously one grade was assessed at the HS level and currently two additional grades are assessed.”* |
| NEW MEXICO | **Across File comparison**: The SEA, LEA, and School numbers of GRADE HS students who took an assessment and received valid score (C178) are significantly smaller than the SEA, LEA, and School numbers of students who participated in an assessment (C188). The discrepancy is 5,875 students (9%) at all levels. |  |  |
| NEW YORK | **Year to Year comparison**: The C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 20,161 students (17%). | A similar Year **to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists for the C188 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C178 total number of students who took an assessment and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly smaller than the SY 2015-16 number for the HOM, LEP, MHL, and MM subgroups. The discrepancy is 706 students (13%) for the HOM subgroup; 4,436 students (19%) for the LEP subgroup; 3,966 students (13%) for the MHL subgroup; and 1,304 students (10%) for the MM subgroup. | Similar **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancies exist for the C188 HOM, LEP, MHL, and MM students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“Although all students are required to take the high school tests in math, reading/language arts, and science, they are not required to take them in the same grade or the same year. This can lead to differences in the number of high school test takers from year to year and between subjects. This can also explain the subgroup discrepancies in the high school assessment.*  *The changes in grades 3-8 could be reflective of changing from ACT Aspire to SC READY. Students traditionally do slightly worse during the first administration of a new assessment.*  *Any changes related to Economically Disadvantaged students could also be due to a change in identification methodology.*  *For LEP students: our student information system was modified in 15-16, enabling it to better capture which students are those "who exited LEP status prior to the testing window within the past two years" (per 2.4.7 of file specification 179). This led to a change in our data processing…””* |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | **Year to Year Comparison:** The C178 number of students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) and received a valid score in SY 2014-15 is significantly greater than the SY 2015-16 number. The discrepancy is 1,971 students (51%). | The same **Year to Year Comparison** discrepancy exists from the prior year for the C188 total number of REGPARTWACC students who were enrolled at the time of the assessment. | *“SY14-15 was the first year SD submitted Smarter Balance accommodations data. SY15-16…” SD had the opportunity to monitor the data closer. The SY 2015-2016 data is correct. SD is still improving this data, and will continue to monitor for progress.”* |
| TENNESSEE | **Partial Data:** No C178 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students who took both regular assessments with and without accommodations (REGASSWOACC, REGASSWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. ED has documented that the state suspended achievement testing for mathematics and reading/language arts in grades 3-8 in SY2015-16. | **Partial Data:** No C188 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students who took both regular assessments with and without accommodations (REGPARTWOACC, REGPARTWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels. ED has documented that the state suspended achievement testing for mathematics and reading/language arts in grades 3-8 in SY2015-16. |  |
| TENNESSEE | **Partial Data:** No C178 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students at the SEA, LEA, and School levels for the following subgroups: MIG, LEP, and ECODIS. | **Partial Data:** No C188 data reported for GRADE 3-8 students at the SEA, LEA, and School levels for the following subgroups: MIG, LEP, and ECODIS. |  |
| TENNESSEE | **Partial Data:** No C178 data reported for MIG and HOM students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels | **Partial Data:** No C188 data reported for MIG and HOM students who took a regular assessment with accommodations (REGPARTWACC) at the SEA, LEA, and School levels |  |
| UTAH | **Partial Data:** No data reported for Migrant students in C178 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels. | **Partial Data:** No data reported for Migrant students in C188 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels. |  |
| VERMONT | **Partial Data:** No data reported in C178 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels for the regular assessment with accommodations (REGASSWACC). | **Partial Data:** No data reported in C188 at the SEA, LEA, or School levels for the regular assessment with accommodations (REGPARTWACC). |  |
| WEST VIRGINIA | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in all grades who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. | Based on data quality reviews of SEA, LEA, and School level data, ED strongly urges caution in the use and interpretation of Achievement and Participation data for Students with Disabilities (CWD) in all grades who took regular assessments with or without accommodations. For more information, please see the Office of Special Programs (OSEP) IDEA Section 618 SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Documentation here: <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html>. |  |
| WEST VIRGINIA |  | No School level data reported for C188. |  |

# Appendix C - State Assessment Changes from Prior School Year

The table below contains information on changes in state assessments from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16. If a row has a “yes” in the comment column, the comment will be found in table C-2.

Table C-1. State Assessment Changes in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

| **State** | **Subject/ Assessment Type/ Grade Range** | **Assessment Change from Prior Year?** | **Did Change Affect Comparability?** | **Changed cut scores** | **Changed proficiency standards** | **Significantly changed assessment items** | **Used entirely new assessment** | **Realigned assessment to new content standards** | **Other** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ALABAMA | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| ALABAMA | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALABAMA | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| ARKANSAS | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARKANSAS | Math ALT HS | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARKANSAS | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| ARKANSAS | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| ARKANSAS | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARKANSAS | Read ALT HS | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARKANSAS | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| ARKANSAS | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Math ALT HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X | X | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X |  | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X |  | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X |  | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Read ALT HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X |  | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X |  | Yes |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X | X |  | Yes |
| CALIFORNIA | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
| CALIFORNIA | Math ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
| CALIFORNIA | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
| CONNECTICUT | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| CONNECTICUT | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONNECTICUT | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| CONNECTICUT | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| DELAWARE | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| DELAWARE | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DELAWARE | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| FLORIDA | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| FLORIDA | Math ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| FLORIDA | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| INDIANA | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| INDIANA | Math ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| INDIANA | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MAINE | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MAINE | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| MAINE | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAINE | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MAINE | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| MARYLAND | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| MARYLAND | Math ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes. |
| MARYLAND | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MARYLAND | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| MARYLAND | Read ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MARYLAND | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MICHIGAN | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| MICHIGAN | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MICHIGAN | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| MISSISSIPPI | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| MISSISSIPPI | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| MISSISSIPPI | Read ALT HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| MISSISSIPPI | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| MISSISSIPPI | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| MISSOURI | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| MISSOURI | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| MONTANA | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| MONTANA | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTANA | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| NEVADA | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X |  |  |  |  | Yes |
| NEVADA | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEVADA | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X |  |  |  |  | Yes |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  | Yes |
| NEW MEXICO | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW MEXICO | Math ALT HS | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW MEXICO | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW YORK | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW YORK | Math ALT HS | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NEW YORK | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OHIO | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| OHIO | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| OHIO | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OHIO | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| OHIO | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X | X |  | X |  |  |  |
| PUERTO RICO | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUERTO RICO | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUERTO RICO | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUERTO RICO | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUERTO RICO | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | Read ALT HS | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |
| TENNESSEE | Math ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| TENNESSEE | Math ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |
| TENNESSEE | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| TENNESSEE | Math REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| TENNESSEE | Read ALT 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| TENNESSEE | Read ALT HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| TENNESSEE | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| TENNESSEE | Read REG HS | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| WISCONSIN | Math REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |
| WISCONSIN | Read REG 3-8 | Yes | Yes |  |  |  | X |  |  | Yes |

The table below contains the comments made by states regarding their assessment changes.

Table C-2. State Assessment Changes in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts - Comments

| **STATE** | **Subject/ Assessment Type/ Grade Range** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ALABAMA | Math REG HS | Although ACT Plan and ACT Aspire both provide college and career readiness benchmarks for the ACT, they are not the same test. |
| ALABAMA | Read REG HS | Although ACT Plan and ACT Aspire both provide college and career readiness benchmarks for the ACT and ACT WorkKeys, they are different tests. In addition, Alabama changed from ACT Plan English to ACT Aspire Reading. |
| ARKANSAS | Math REG 3-8 | Went from PARCC to ACT Aspire. |
| ARKANSAS | Math REG HS | From PARCC to ACT Aspire. |
| ARKANSAS | Read REG 3-8 and HS | Changed from PARCC to ACT Aspire. |
| BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION | All | With BIE's use of statewide assessments from 23 states and 2 tribal assessment waivers (Navajo, Miccosukee), numerous changes are made to the assessments that BIE has no control over. |
| INDIANA | Math Read ALT 3-8 | The data reported for ISTAR, Indiana™'s alternate assessment, reflects the anticipated results from ISTAR for 2015-16 and are consistent with Indiana™s pattern of data collection. The data for 2015-16 cannot be reported as cut scores for the new assessment were not able to be achieved for this school year. Indiana™s Alternate Assessment took place, students were tested, but students were not graded and no proficiency levels were assigned. These students are included in the number of students enrolled but not in the number of students participating. |
| MAINE | Math Read REG 3-8 | Our content standards did not change, and we attempted to keep our achievement levels at the same level of rigor. However, it was a completely different assessment of the content standards…. |
| MARYLAND | Math ALT HS | Per PSC and ED, the regular and modified high school assessments were grouped into two levels - proficient and not proficient. |
| MARYLAND | Math REG HS | Per PSC and ED, the high school assessments were grouped into two levels - proficient and not proficient - so that both the Maryland HSA and PARCC could be reported. The majority of students were on the HSA track but some were on the PARCC track. |
| MARYLAND | Read ALT HS | Per PSC and ED, the regular and modified high school assessments were grouped into two levels - proficient and not proficient. |
| MARYLAND | Read REG HS | Per PSC and ED, the high school assessments were grouped into two levels - proficient and not proficient - so that both the Maryland HSA and PARCC could be reported. The majority of students were on the HSA track but some were on the PARCC track. |
| MICHIGAN | Math REG HS | The MME (Michigan Merit Exam) mathematics test is the SAT mathematics test. |
| MICHIGAN | Read REG HS | The MME (Michigan Merit Exam) Reading/Language Arts assessment is the SAT Evidence-based Reading and Writing assessment |
| MISSOURI | Math REG 3-8 | Missouri had to leave SMARTER Balanced, we used our vendor's College and Carrer Ready bank of items |
| MISSOURI | Read REG 3-8 | Missouri [did not use] SMARTER Balanced items, Missouri used College and Ready items from our vendor's item bank |
| MONTANA | Math REG HS | Proficiency levels not yet defined. Process will be initiated to define these as soon as possible. |
| MONTANA | Read REG HS | Proficiency levels not yet defined. Process will be initiated as soon as possible. |
| NEVADA | Math and Read REG HS | Nevada School Board of Education did not adopt proficiency cuts on the 14-15 EOC but did on the 15-16 EOC. |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | Math REG HS | NH implement the College Board SAT (replaced SBAC Gr. 11) |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | Read REG HS | NH implemented the College Board SAT (Replaced SBAC Gr. 11) |
| TENNESSEE | Math REG 3-8 | The 3-8 assessment was redesigned to align with new state standards. The design expected a two-part administration with part 1 in February covering approx. 20% of the standards and including constructed response items. The items and blueprint were designed for online assessment. Based upon a problem with the online platform, TN transitioned to a paper pencil backup of the form with the new standards. The part 1 administration was delayed and tested in early March. Additional issues with the inability of the test vendor to deliver the paper versions of part 2 to school districts resulted in termination of the contract on 4/22 and TN … [canceled] testing for grades 3-8 in all content areas. Had the new assessments been administered, we would have completed standard setting in July. |
| TENNESSEE | Math REG HS | The secondary assessments were redesigned to align with new state standards. The design included a two-part administration with part 1 in February covered approximately 20% of the standards with constructed response items. The items and blueprint were designed for online assessment. Based upon a problem with the online platform, TN transitioned to a paper pencil backup of the form with the new standards. The part 1 administration was delayed and tested in early March. Additional issues with the inability of the test vendor to deliver the 3-8 paper versions of part 2 to school districts resulted in termination of the contract on 4/22. Although the Secondary assessments were administered, there were significant delays in data review, scoring and reviewing due to a vendor transition for these services. In addition, TN added assessments in Geometry and Integrated Math I/II/III. All Math assessments were based upon new academic standards in TN. Standard setting was conducted in August, 2016. |
| TENNESSEE | Read REG 3-8 | The 3-8 assessment was redesigned to align with new state standards. The design expected a two-part administration with part 1 in February that consisted of a written essay. The items and blueprint were designed for online assessment. Based upon a problem with the online platform, TN transitioned to a paper pencil backup of the form with the new standards. The part 1 administration was delayed and tested in early March. Additional issues with the inability of the test vendor to deliver the paper versions of part 2 to school districts resulted in termination of the contract on 4/22 and TN … [canceled] testing for grades 3-8 in all content areas. Had the new assessments been administered, we would have completed standard setting in July. |
| TENNESSEE | Read REG HS | The secondary assessments were redesigned to align with new state standards. The design included a two-part administration with part 1 in February consisting of essay items. The items and blueprint were designed for online assessment. Based upon a problem with the online platform, TN transitioned to a paper pencil backup of the form with the new standards. The part 1 administration was delayed and tested in early March. Additional issues with the inability of the test vendor to deliver the 3-8 paper versions of part 2 to school districts resulted in termination of the contract on 4/22. Although the Secondary assessments were administered, there were significant delays in data review, scoring and reviewing due to a vendor transition for these services. Standard setting was conducted in August. |
| WISCONSIN | Math and Read REG 3-8 | Since this is a new assessment, this also came up with new cut scores and performance expectations. |

# Appendix D - Major Racial and Ethnic Groups and Special Populations Subgroups

The table explains how the major racial and ethnic groups used in the file specifications are converted into the six race ethnic categories used in these files.

Table D-1. Major Racial and Ethnic Groups

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Race Ethnicity used in this file** | | **Major Racial and Ethnic Groups used in reporting to ED*Facts*** | |
| **Abbreviation** | **Description** | **Abbreviation used in files submitted by SEAs** | **Description of abbreviation from file specification** |
| MAS | Asian/Pacific Islander | MA | Asian |
| MAP | Asian / Pacific Islander |
| MF | Filipino |
| MNP | Nat Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander |
| MAM | American Indian or Alaska Native | MAN | American Indian / Alaska Native or Native American |
| MHI | Hispanic / Latino | MHL | Hispanic / Latino |
| MHN | Hispanic (not Puerto Rican) |
| MPR | Puerto Rican |
| MBL | Black or African American | MB | Black (Not Hispanic) or African American |
| MWH | White | MW | White (Not Hispanic) or Caucasian |
| MTR | Two or more races | MM | Multicultural or Multiethnic or Multiracial |

# 

The table below explains how the special populations subgroup used in the file specifications are abbreviated in the data files.

Table D-2. Special Populations Subgroups

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Special Population Subgroup used in this file** | | **Special Population Subgroup used in reporting to ED*Facts*** | |
| **Abbreviation** | **Description** | **Abbreviation used in files submitted by SEAs** | **Description of abbreviation from file specification** |
| CWD | Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA) | WDIS | Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA) |
| ECD | Economically Disadvantaged Students | ECODIS | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| HOM | Homeless Enrolled | HOMELSENRL | Homeless Enrolled |
| LEP | Limited English proficient (LEP) | LEP | Limited English proficient (LEP) |
| MIG | Migrant Students | MS | Migrant Students |
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1. The state codes were previously Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) codes. The variable name uses the previous reference of FIPS. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Districts are a type of local education agency (LEA). The variable name uses the more generic term of LEA. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)