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Abstract

Test developers are responsible to define how test scores should be interpreted and used. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) directed the Secretary of Education to use results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to confirm the proficiency scores from state developed tests. There are two sets of federal definitions for the term “proficient,” one NAEP and one for NCLB. NAEP’s “At or Above Basic” is the most directly comparable statistic for confirming state proficiency results. NAEP and state proficiency scores, however, should be used (and interpreted) with caution. Achievement level results may provide useful trend information for one group on one test, but the statistical properties of proficiency scores render them ill-suited for trend comparisons. It may well be that there is no defensible, statistical method for using NAEP achievement level results to confirm a state’s proficiency scores. Until the federal law is amended proficiency score analyses it requires should be accompanied, whenever possible, by related analyses based on scale scores or effect size or both.

Introduction

This workshop session revisits a paper the author presented at the 2007 national conference on large-scale assessment entitled “An Explanation for the Large Differences between State and NAEP Proficiency Scores Reported for Reading in 2005” (Stoneberg, 2007a). The content for the beginning and middle of today’s presentation has much in common with that paper, but the ending is remarkably different.
Standards for Educational Testing

The standards for educational and psychological testing – jointly established by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council for Measurement in Education – address the valid use of test scores (Joint Committee on Standards, 1999). Standard 1.2, for example, says “the test developer should set forth clearly how test scores are intended to be interpreted and used.” Standard 1.4 says “if a test is used in a way that has not been validated, it is incumbent on the user to justify the new use, collecting new evidence if necessary.”

The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) sets policy for NAEP while the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) implements it. NAGB and NCES together constitute the “test developer” for NAEP. The state is the “test developer” for the state test, but the state must abide by federal statute and regulation as guided by NCLB program officials in U.S. Department of Education.

A New Use for NAEP

Since its creation in 1969, NAEP has had two major goals: to assess student performance reflecting current educational and assessment practices, and to measure change in student performance reliably over time. To this end, NAEP has given careful attention to the standards for educational and psychological testing as established by the community of professionals engaged in educational research, measurement and evaluation, psychometrics, and statistics.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) created a new use for NAEP by stipulating that “the Secretary shall use information from a variety of sources, including the National Assessment of Educational Progress [...], state evaluations, and other research
studies” to assess or evaluate the Title I program. The apparent motivation for requiring NAEP was to keep the states honest through external confirmation of the results that states reported for their NCLB tests. NAEP would serve this purpose well because all states would participate in NAEP and no state would have any control over the national assessment. Figure 1 illustrates the levels of scores available from the state NCLB test (i.e., student, school, district and state) and NAEP (state and national). The challenge has been to come up with a defendable procedure to compare or match the state-level results from the NCLB test and NAEP.

**Figure 1. Levels of results reported for the NCLB (state) test and NAEP. The challenge is to match state level results from both tests.**

NCLB required a state to develop its assessment so it could report on “two levels of high achievement (proficient and advanced) that determine how well children are mastering the material in the State academic content standards.” NCLB placed focus on
reporting out the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient on the state test. This statistic is known as AYP or Adequate Yearly Progress. It is unfortunate, but the narrow focus on the use of achievement level results in NCLB rendered the use of NAEP achievement level scores to confirm state AYP reports unavoidable. NCLB and NAEP use the same “names” for the various achievement levels (i.e., basic, proficient, and advanced), but the NCLB-mandated state tests and NAEP operate under different definitions for each achievement level name. It is a mistake to assume that proficient is proficient is proficient. NCLB’s state proficient is not the same as NAEP Proficient.

**NCLB Achievement Levels: Interpretation and Use**

The U.S. Department of Education implemented a peer review process to provide federal oversight as states developed their NCLB tests. A peer review team made up of out-of-state persons with expert knowledge and skills in curriculum and assessment visited the program. The team filled out an extensive review checklist while on-site, and issued a report with findings and recommendations. The Title I programs in some states were fined because they did not corrective action sufficient to “pass” peer review on subsequent visits.

The peer review team was required to examine the state’s definitions for the achievement levels. In particular, the team had to pass judgment on the state’s definition of proficient. It had to mark Yes or No on the checklist whether “The ‘proficient’ achievement level represents the attainment of grade-level expectations for that academic content area.” (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

It’s noteworthy here that before NCLB some state testing programs used out-of-level testing for students whose instructional levels were either below or above their grade level. This practice, however, did not survive the peer review process. It was made clear that
NCLB required state tests to measure achievement of grade-level content and to be administered to students at that grade. “On-grade-level, at-grade-level” became the mantra for state tests under NCLB.

While preparing for the reauthorization battle over the No Child Left Behind Act, the U.S. Department of Education published its blueprint for strengthening the law. It said, “We remain committed to ensuring that all students can read and do math at grade level or better by 2014. This is the basic purpose and mission of the No Child Left Behind Act.” (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). Substituting achievement level names specified in NCLB, this might be taken to mean that the intent of the law was to ensure that all students could read and do math at the proficient level or the advanced level. Indeed, the Department’s blueprint made it clear that state “proficient” means “at grade level” and that advanced means “better than grade level.”

**NAEP Achievement Levels: Interpretation and Use**

The National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) has not been silent about the interpretation and use of NAEP achievement level scores. It published achievement level reports to explain its interpretation of achievement level scores. The Board convened an Ad Hoc committee to study how NAEP might be used to confirm state test results, and received reports from the NAEP Validity Studies Panel. It has also published a framework for each assessment that expands upon the policy definitions of Basic, Proficient, and Advanced.

**Achievement Level Reports.** In 2001, as Bush and Kennedy lead the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, NAGB published a series of booklets to inform the public about the interpretation and use of NAEP scores. Text from the reading booklet (identical
language is also found in the booklets for writing, mathematics, science, U.S. history, geography, and civics) reads:

Notice that there is no mention of “at grade level” performance in these achievement goals. In particular, it is important to understand clearly that the Proficient achievement level does not refer to “at grade” performance. Nor is performance at the Proficient level synonymous with “proficiency” in the subject. That is, students who may be considered proficient in a subject, given the common usage of the term, might not satisfy the requirements for performance at the NAEP achievement level. Further, Basic achievement is more than minimal competency. Basic achievement is less than mastery but more than the lowest level of performance on NAEP. Finally, even the best students you know may not meet the requirements for Advanced performance on NAEP. (Loomis & Bourque, 2001).

**Ad Hoc Committee Report.** In 2002, the Board’s Ad Hoc Committee on Confirming Test results issued its report. The committee’s work did not examine (i.e., compare or contrast) the differing interpretations and uses that NCLB and NAEP had stipulated regarding the achievement levels, whether basic, proficient, or advanced. The report, however, did contain several important findings. Three key findings to consider. First, NAEP can be used as evidence to confirm the general trend of state test results in grades 4 and 8 reading and mathematics. Second, confirmation of state AYP results should NOT be conducted on a point-by-point basis. Third, when confirming state AYP results, differences between NAEP and the state testing program must be explored and reported. (Ad Hoc Committee, 2002).

**NAEP Validity Studies Panel.** In 2004, the NAEP Validity Studies Panel issued a report for a statistical analysis that concluded “NAEP’s ‘percent At or Above Basic’ is the most directly comparable statistic for confirming state AYP results.” (Mosquin & Chromy, 2004). When results from NAEP 2005 were released, the percent at or above Basic was given prominence in some reports for the first time ever. The NAEP reports were prepared
by the National Center for Education Statistics and released by the National Assessment Governing Board. This change in reporting practice indicated that both parties accepted the NAEP Validity Studies Panel’s findings as consistent with existing NAEP policy and practice.

**NAEP Frameworks.** NAEP frameworks are not curriculum documents that express what students should be learning in America’s schools. They are a description of what will be tested and how the scores should be interpreted. The framework for each subject expands NAEP’s policy definitions of Basic, Proficient, and Advanced.

The policy definition notes that *Basic* “denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.” Language from the framework for the 2007 reading assessment clarifies “prerequisite knowledge and skills” for Basic at the fourth grade. Fourth-grade students performing at the *Basic* level should demonstrate an understanding of the overall meaning of what they read. When reading text appropriate for fourth graders, they should be able to make relatively obvious connections between the text and their own experiences and extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences. (National Assessment Governing Board, 2006).

Language from the framework for the NAEP 2009 reading assessment clarifies “prerequisite knowledge and skills” for *Proficient*. “Proficient readers,” it says, “will have sizeable meaning vocabularies, including knowledge of many words and terms above grade level.” (National Assessment Governing Board, 2008). This contrasts with NCLB’s “on-grade-level, at-grade-level” yoke.

Clearly, this language from the NAEP reading frameworks indicates that NAEP *Basic* represents an estimate of “grade-level expectations,” and that NAEP *Proficient* demands some above-grade-level knowledge and skills. Once again, NCLB requires a state to define
proficient as meeting grade-level expectations on state content. There can be no doubt that using a state’s NAEP Proficient score to confirm a state’s NCLB proficient score would surely result in mistaken and misleading conclusions. This, however, has been the prime methodology over the last half-decade for NAEP-state proficiency analyses conducted and published by national foundations, institutes, and think tanks.

**NAEP Achievement Levels and “Letter-Grades”**

One way to understand the NAEP achievement levels is to link NAEP’s descriptive language to letter grades (i.e., A, B, etc.) that one would likely see on the report cards of students performing at each NAEP achievement level (Stoneberg, 2007b). Figure 2 compares the language used to describe NAEP achievement level scores and “letter grades” used to describe corresponding classroom performance levels. The language describing NAEP Basic corresponds letter grades ranging from C- to B, which represents meeting grade-level expectations for that particular grade.

**Figure 2. Comparing language used to describe the NAEP achievement levels and “letter grades” used to describe corresponding classroom performance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level</th>
<th>NAEP Achievement Level Descriptors</th>
<th>Letter Grade Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Some of the best students you know</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many words and terms above grade level</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery of challenging content</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficiency in subject (common meaning)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall understanding of grade-appropriate text</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than minimal competency</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>Minimally competent</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2007, NCES published a statistical analysis report finding that "A majority (56 %) of Proficient and above performers on the 1992 NAEP-scaled mathematics assessment maintained an “A” average in mathematics throughout high school. Some 20 percent of “B” students and 5 percent of “C” students reached the proficient or advanced levels." (Scott & Ingles, 2007). Figure 3 presents these results graphically. The interpretation of these results are muddled somewhat because not all students take the same mathematics course in high school. One student may have an A average in two courses (e.g., general math and consumer math, really 8th grade arithmetic a second time and a third time), while another student may have an A average in four rigorous courses including AP Statistics and Math Analysis. The latter will likely reach Proficient on NAEP, while the former probably will not. However, a student with a C average through four rigorous mathematics courses may still reach the NAEP Proficient level. In general, these results leave the impression that NAEP Proficient requires a performance that is higher than just meeting grade-level expectations.

**Figure 3.** The percentage of high school seniors by mathematics GPA who scored “At or Above Proficient” on a 1992 NAEP-scaled mathematics assessment.
Use Achievement Level Scores with Caution

Congress has mandated external evaluations of NAEP, the most recent of which by the National Academy of Sciences (Pellegrino, Jones & Mitchell, 1998). The Academy found that NAEP’s procedure for setting cut-scores was fundamentally flawed because it rested on “informed judgment” rather than a “highly objective process,” and noted that the process had produced some unreasonable results. Even though its report was highly critical of NAEP’s achievement levels, the Academy did recommend their cautious use for drawing attention to changes in student performance over time.

NAEP’s current achievement levels should continue to be used on a developmental basis only. If achievement-level results continue to be reported for future [...] the reports should strongly and clearly emphasize that achievement levels are still under development, and should be interpreted and used with caution. Reports should focus on the change, from one administration of the assessment to the next, in the percentages of students in each of the categories determined by the existing achievement-level cutscores [...] rather than focusing on the percentages in each category in a single year. (Pellegrino, Jones & Mitchell, 1998).

In NCLB, Congress required the Secretary to use NAEP data to evaluate the Title I program, but NCLB also required that NAEP achievement levels be used on a trial basis until the Commissioner of Education Statistics determines that the achievement levels are “reasonable, valid, and informative to the public.” Until that determination is made, the law requires the Commissioner and the National Assessment Governing Board to state clearly the trial status of the achievement levels in all NAEP reports.

The website for the “Nation’s Report Card” notes that, “The Board and NCES believe that the achievement levels are useful for reporting trends in the educational achievement of students in the United States. However, [...] NCES concludes that these achievement levels should continue to be used on a trial basis and should continue to be interpreted and
used with caution.” The Board and NCES also note on the website about the Nations Report Card that a proven alternative to the current process of setting cut-scores has not yet been identified. They invite organizations and individuals with ideas for alternative models for setting cut-scores to present them for consideration.

**How Might a Confirming Analysis Be Done? Then.**

Given the interpretation and status of NAEP achievement levels and the stated purpose of the national assessment, it seemed in 2007 to the author that graphing trend lines plotting state percent at or above proficient and NAEP percent At or Above Basic side-by-side together offered a defendable method for confirming state AYP results. If the trend lines moved in the same direction, it indicated that NAEP confirmed the state results. At least, this was the notion advanced in the author’s paper presented at the CCSSO 37th Annual National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment in Nashville. Quote, complete with graphic (Stoneberg, 2007a):

Figure “A” illustrates how NAEP might be used to confirm state testing results (Carr, 2002). It’s a useful graphic for bringing together the points discussed in this paper. By comparing NAEP’s percent at or above Basic to the state’s percent at or above grade level (i.e., at or above proficient, in NCLB terms), the confirming analysis in Figure “A” recognizes that NAEP’s definition of Proficient is not synonymous with grade-level proficiency in a subject. The different fill colors suggest differences between the two tests, which should be discussed in a narrative accompanying the graph. Moreover, the graph avoids point-by-point comparisons between NAEP and state achievement levels. Rather, it relies on the comparison of proficiency trend lines, a defendable method for using NAEP to confirm state AYP results.
How Might a Confirming Analysis Be Done? Now!

The defendable method for conducting a NAEP-state confirming analysis by comparing their achievement level trends that the author presented at the Large-Scale Assessment Conference in Nashville in June 2007 was essentially rendered *indefensible* in December 2007.

In its 1998 evaluation report, the National Academy of Sciences did recommend that NAEP achievement level results might be used (with caution) to plot a performance trend for a group. Under the blanket of the Academy’s recommendation, it had been assumed generally that proficiency data from NAEP and NCLB tests enjoyed the requisite statistical properties for sound trend comparisons. An unexamined assumption!
A pivotal study by Andrew Ho (University of Iowa) that compared NAEP and state proficiency trend data, however, disputed the assumption. “Trend comparisons require both technical care and substantive consideration. As useful as PAC [percent above cut-score] statistics have been in communicating test results to the public, their properties as trend statistics render them ill-suited for trend comparison” (Ho, 2007).

Dr. Ho presented two sessions at this workshop yesterday related to proficiency standards and defensible methods for making NAEP-state comparisons. Four points from his presentations were particularly noteworthy:

- For NAEP-State comparisons, we need to get past proficiency standards.
- The proficiency metric distorts just about every important large-scale test-driven inference.
- Trend and gap interpretations can be inflated or deflated by cut-score location.
- High-stakes trends, gaps, and gap trends should all be reported on a scale-score or effect-size metric. (Ho, 2009).

The need to change metrics that Ho has advanced seems both credible and desirable. NAEP-state comparisons based on achievement level scores are indeed per se faulty. Unfortunately, the language in NCLB requires the Secretary to use the proficiency metric for NAEP-state comparisons. So until the federal law is changed, any analysis based on the proficient metric that might be required by NCLB should, whenever possible, be associated with and accompanied by a related analysis based on scale-scores or on effect sizes or on both scale scores and effect sizes.
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Standards for educational and psychological testing were updated in 1999 by a joint effort of the

►American Educational Research Association

►American Psychological Association

►National Council on Measurement in Education.
Standards: Valid Use of Test Scores

► Standard 1.2. The test developer should set forth clearly how test scores are intended to be interpreted and used.

► Standard 1.4. If a test is used in a way that has not been validated, it is incumbent on the user to justify the new use, collecting new evidence if necessary.

Since its creation in 1969, NAEP has had two major goals: to assess student performance reflecting current educational and assessment practices, and to measure change in student performance reliably over time.
Public Law 107–110
107th Congress

An Act

To close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.

Jan. 8, 2002
[H.R. 1]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001”.

“PART E—NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF TITLE I

20 USC 6491. “SEC. 1501. EVALUATIONS.

“(a) NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF TITLE I.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a national assessment of the programs assisted under this title and the impact of this title on States, local educational agencies, schools, and students.

“(3) SOURCES OF INFORMATION.—In conducting the assessment under this subsection, the Secretary shall use information from a variety of sources, including the National Assessment of Educational Progress (carried out under section 411 of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994), State evaluations, and other research studies.
Evaluation of Title I Program

NCLB + NAEP
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Standards under this paragraph shall...

“(II) describe two levels of high achievement (proficient and advanced) that determine how well children are mastering the material in the State academic content standards;”
Interpretation and Use of NCLB Achievement Levels

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

The “proficient” achievement level represents the attainment of grade-level expectations for that academic content area.


Secretary of Education

We remain committed to ensuring that all students can read and do math at grade level or better by 2014. This is the basic purpose and mission of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Interpretation and Use of NAEP Achievement Levels

National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB)

NAEP Achievement Level Reports (2001)
NAGB Ad Hoc Committee Report (2002)
NAEP Frameworks
Achievement Levels Report

Reading

Writing, Mathematics, Science, U.S. History, Geography, and Civics

How Should Achievement Levels Be Interpreted?

Notice that there is no mention of “at grade level” performance in these achievement goals. In particular, it is important to understand clearly that the Proficient achievement level does not refer to “at grade” performance.

Nor is performance at the Proficient level synonymous with “proficiency” in the subject. That is, students who may be considered proficient in a subject, given the common usage of the term, might not satisfy the requirements for performance at the NAEP achievement level.

Further, Basic achievement is more than minimal competency.

Finally, even the best students you know may not meet the requirements for Advanced performance on NAEP.
NAEP can be used as evidence to confirm the general trend of state test results in grades 4 and 8 reading and mathematics.

Confirmation of state AYP results should NOT be conducted on a point-by-point basis.

When confirming state AYP results, differences between NAEP and the state testing program must be explored and reported.
Differences must be explored and reported . . .

“Potential differences between NAEP and state testing programs include: content coverage in the subjects, definitions of subgroups, changes in the demography within a state over time, sampling procedures, standard-setting approaches, reporting metrics, student motivation in taking the state test versus taking NAEP, mix of item formats, test difficulty, etc. Such differences may be minimal or great in number and in size and cannot reasonably be expected to operate in all states in equal fashion.”

NAEP’s “percent At or Above Basic” is the most directly comparable statistic for confirming state AYP results.

Note: In some NCES prepared reports with results from NAEP 2005, the percent at or above Basic was given prominence for the first time. This change in reporting practice is in harmony with the NAEP Validity Studies Panel’s recommendations.
Fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should demonstrate an understanding of the overall meaning of what they read. When reading text appropriate for fourth graders, they should be able to make relatively obvious connections between the text and their own experiences and extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences.
Proficient readers will have sizeable meaning vocabularies, including knowledge of many words and terms above grade level.”

"Letter Grades" for NAEP Achievement Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Level</th>
<th>NAEP Achievement Level Descriptors</th>
<th>Letter Grade Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Some of the best students you know</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many words and terms above grade level</td>
<td>↑↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery of challenging content</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficiency in subject (common meaning)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall understanding of grade-appropriate text</td>
<td>↑↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than minimal competency</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>Minimally competent</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority (56%) of Proficient and above performers on the 1992 NAEP-scaled mathematics assessment maintained an “A” average in mathematics throughout high school. Some 20 percent of “B” students and 5 percent of “C” students reached the proficient or advanced levels.

The Percentage of High School Seniors by Mathematics GPA Who Scored "At or Above Proficient" on a 1992 NAEP-Scaled Mathematics Assessment

Source: NCES 2007-328
NAEP’s current achievement levels should continue to be used on a developmental basis only. If achievement-level results continue to be reported for future...the reports should strongly and clearly emphasize that achievement levels are still under development, and should be interpreted and used with caution. Reports should focus on the change, from one administration of the assessment to the next, in the percentages of students in each of the categories determined by the existing achievement-level cutscores...rather than focusing on the percentages in each category in a single year.

The 2001 reauthorization law requires that the achievement levels be used on a trial basis until the Commissioner of Education Statistics determines that the achievement levels are "reasonable, valid, and informative to the public" (P.L. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 [2002]). Until that determination is made, the law requires the Commissioner and the National Assessment Governing Board to state clearly the trial status of the achievement levels in all NAEP reports.

A proven alternative to the current process has not yet been identified.

The Board and NCES believe that the achievement levels are useful for reporting trends in the educational achievement of students in the United States. However, [...] NCES concludes that these achievement levels should continue to be used on a trial basis and should continue to be interpreted and used with caution.

See http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/achlevdev.asp?id=re
Trend comparisons require both technical care and substantive consideration. As useful as PAC [percent above cut-score] statistics have been in communicating test results to the public, their properties as trend statistics render them ill-suited for trend comparison.

An Explanation for the Large Differences between State and NAEP “Proficiency” Scores Reported for Reading in 2005
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Abstract

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) permits the Secretary of Education to use NAEP achievement level scores, in concert with other data, to confirm state testing results. The U.S. Department of Education has not yet published a guidance document describing how NAEP might be used appropriately. A review of the literature from the...
Common (but False) Assumptions

► American public schools are a dismal failure ...

► Proficient is proficient is proficient ...

► A test is a test is a test ...

► Everyone is entitled to his or her own belief about how to interpret and use a test score ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>This level signifies superior performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>This level represents solid academic performance for each grade assessed. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>This level denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work at each grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work.

A grade of C- to B denotes partial mastery of prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for B+ to A work.